

FEB 22 2000

EIS002284

MR. HADDER: Well, so you don't see the tired old face, I thought I would do a multi-media thing.

Okay. That's what Citizen Alert thinks should happen with nuclear waste in its nutshell. My name is John Hadder. I work for Citizen Alert out of Reno, Nevada. And I just wanted to put that up.

1 I think we have got plenty of energy in the sun, and we don't really need to use nuclear power. We don't need to use fossil fuels; we have alternatives.

2... Citizen Alert rejects the political process; we shouldn't be here today on this and dealing with nuclear waste in this way. We think that this entire process is incomplete, flies in the face of the intent of the National Environmental Policy Act, and an insane solution for what should be done with nuclear waste.

3 There is insufficient time to review this document. I think that that has been one of the problems we have had all along. This is something -- we do appreciate the Department of Energy adding hearings at the request of various politicians and the public, and I know the staff from the Department of Energy doesn't like to hear this, but we think there should have been more.

I think that serves to indicate how the public has not really been engaged in this process, and this is a project of monumental scope. And I think it should have been -- John, my next overhead.

4 I am not used to having this kind of assistance. These are actually -- the next one is an interesting slide because it's "Should Yucca Mountain be the place for the waste?" Well, after looking at this document, it's hard to tell. It's hard to know. And I think this is one point I want to underscore, is that this document should create a focused picture of the action intended here, including a clear sense of what the -- how Yucca Mountain would function as a repository, how it's intended. And I don't think this document does that.

5... There's a lot of -- let me be specific on this. I have a couple of examples. For example, one of the things I noticed in this document is sort of a summary of impacts, and it's -- you come to it kind of quickly, and they have bullet points on page 279. And one of the bullet points reads: "Risks associated with sabotage, materials diversion, in relation to the fusionable materials stored at the 77 sites would be much greater than if the fusional material were stored at" -- and that's because you have to guard them at all of these sites.

I thought, well, that's interesting. I wonder where that came from. Okay. So I go back here to table of contents. Let's see. Where do I look?

Um, okay. Here we have got -- this will just take me a few minutes. I will find it eventually under Section 2 where I found the table repository. Now, what's this subtitle? Let's see now. I have to look through this a while. Actually, this process took me about 15 minutes to find, actually, in the table of contents.

The point I'm trying to make is that that's one thing about the document right off the top; it's not easy to find stuff in it. There was a view graph that was put up earlier by Wendy Dixon that would have been much nicer to have in the front. In other words, the major sections outlined clearly.

When you look in the table of contents, it would be nice if Section 2 were boldfaced and Section 2 clearly defined. It's not easy to find a lot of the information in the document. So that's one thing.

The layout itself is not clear. And there's a lot of examples of that. This is just one. It should be designed for the public to use easily. They should be able to see a section, move to the table of contents, find

...5 where you want to go, otherwise you just get tired of the process. That's one thing. Usability is sort of low on my list.

6 Another thing is uncertainty of the discussion. And this is a big one for me.

There's a lot of numbers used in this book, in this document, about probability of a possible volcanism, seismic activity, and so on. And I think I have an example here in mind. Yes, I believe it's on Page 544. For example, under the Enhanced Source Terms scenario, it says in one Monte Carlo simulation the volcanic event would interact waste approximately 100,000 years after repository closure and would result in a peak dose of four times the peak dose of the base case, with a peak occurring at about 350,000 years after the repository closure. Fine. But what about those numbers? Is that 100,000 figure -- is it good to a factor of two? Good to a factor of ten? Is 30 percent good? I think that all the numbers like that quoted in that document should have some kind of error bar with it; some kind of analysis so the reader gets a sense of how much we really know about this site.

It should be really clear. The discussion of uncertainty that appears later in Section 5.24 I believe it is, is also not really very easy to follow.

Now, I kind of read through it, and I think I understand what they are getting at here; but I think -- and this is a suggestion that might be helpful -- is a graphic image would have been helpful for the general public for people to look at and understand how they are evaluating uncertainty; how they do the computer model -- how the parameters and how they do the analysis -- it's really not very clear.

FACILITATOR LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

2 cont. MR. HADDER: Thank you. And so that's -- there's a lot of examples. There's a lot of examples like that in the document. So overall, you should be able to walk away with this document understanding what's going on, and how much we really understand -- know about it and how certain we are about the various aspects of the repository. Whereas, I think probably most people walk away with more questions than understanding.

The sum of all of this is, is it effective? Specific public comment is difficult. Citizen Alert challenges that this document engages the public in a meaningful way and engages public debate and feedback on the project. And as such, it flies in the face of what it's really supposed to be doing: Informing the public for an informed decision. And we feel like it doesn't do that. And that is another reason why we think this whole process needs to be revisited.

Thank you very much.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I got a question before you leave. If they pile all of that crap in one place and it's radiating on itself, couldn't that possibly trigger one hell of a vast explosion and just about knock everything in the ocean?

FACILITATOR LAWSON: If that's a question you want to make at the end, you can make it. But if that's a question you want to ask him, you do it after the hearing is over, please.

The next person to speak is Susi Snyder, and she will be followed by Graham Sullivan, and I believe Ervin Lent would like to speak again.