

12                   JOHN HADDER: Good evening, everybody. My  
13 name is John Hadder. I live in Reno, Nevada. I'm on  
14 the board of directors of an organization called HOME  
15 and we'll be submitting our detailed written comments  
16 at a later time, so I'm just going to make a few  
17 general comments right now.

18                   [First of all, HOME, for the record, supports  
19 the Treaty of Ruby Valley as well for the reasons  
20 that Kathy had just outlined. We feel this issue has  
21 not been resolved and the federal government needs to  
22 honor its treaties, and that's on the highest level.]

1

23                   [Also, I'm glad to see that we are doing  
24 verbal comments. I agree, I think it's good to have  
25 a Q and A with everyone and to hear what the  
1 responses are, but I'm glad to see that we are at  
2 least doing a formal hearing process. Some agencies  
3 have not been doing that so I'm glad to see it.

2

4                   That being said, I am disappointed that  
5 we're only doing hearings in Nevada, as far as I  
6 know. This is a national project, this is not just a  
7 Nevada project. The transportation alone makes it a  
8 national project. There should be hearings all along  
9 the transportation corridor, just like was done back  
10 in 2000 should be done every time they modify this  
11 document.

12                   The fact that it's expensive is no excuse.  
13 We're spending billion of dollars on the project, we  
14 can certainly spend money on public outreach. People

15 should be informed. So the public process, while  
16 better here in Nevada, could be much better elsewhere  
17 in particular.]

18 [Regarding the Mina route, also we'd like to 3  
19 say that certainly this should be -- we shouldn't  
20 even be studying it now because, of course, the  
21 Walker River tribe has rejected this route. It's not  
22 clear to me why it's considered even a viable  
23 alternative at this phase. It seems as though this  
24 could even be a potential violation of the NEPA  
25 process, which we'll look into more in our detailed  
1 comments. It just seems like an enormous waste of  
2 time to study a corridor which is clearly not even  
3 really viable at this stage.]

4 [I want to remind everybody also that there 4  
5 is no radiation protection standard for this project.  
6 The original one was rejected. A proposed standard  
7 has now been floating for over a year now, which, if  
8 it does get finalized by the EPA, we'll also be going  
9 to the courts. It should be a very important  
10 consideration about moving forward on any project  
11 when we don't know what kind of protection we're  
12 going to provide for future generations.

13 I want to make one little point on the  
14 radiation standard that is proposed, and it's a two  
15 tiered standard, that after 10,000 years a standard  
16 becomes relaxed by a factor of 24. And this seems to  
17 be also unjust to those generations that are going to  
18 live afterwards. If we're going to have a standard

19 at all, it should be consistent for all times and  
20 protect people equally for all time. But right now  
21 we don't have one. So this project really is at a  
22 standstill at that point, at least it should be.]

23 [The last point I want to make is more of a 5  
24 technical one and regards the analysis the Department  
25 of Energy has done over the years on this project.

1 And while I understand there's lots of good science  
2 that goes into this, it's also an enormously complex  
3 series of calculations which is built on a variety of  
4 models, many of which are chaotic systems or even  
5 possibly orgotic systems. What are chaotic systems?  
6 Weather is a chaotic system. How far can we forecast  
7 the weather?

8 It's becoming a more and more common  
9 process, they use this kind of analysis to make  
10 decisions. I think we need to seriously step back  
11 away from this process because we don't really know  
12 what answers we're going to be getting out of it.

13 There are so many uncertainties, so many  
14 complexities involved in this calculation that it's  
15 possible that at the very worst it may be a rough  
16 estimate, excuse me, at the very best it may be a  
17 rough estimate, at the very worst it could be sheer  
18 fantasy. And we have to be very serious about what  
19 we do with the over 70, potentially over 70,000  
20 metric tons of highly radioactive waste. We can't be  
21 fantasizing about this.

22 I think one thing that underscores the  
23 problem with nuclear power in general and this issue  
24 of the waste is that we don't really know what to do  
25 with the material. And because of the longevity of  
1 the waste, it was pointed out earlier by  
2 Mr. Halstead, we don't really have the capability to  
3 understand what's going to happen to it in the long,  
4 long future. And we need to consider that very, very  
5 carefully in moving forward on any project. We do  
6 have waste now so we do have to find some kind of  
7 thing to do with it in the meantime.

8 HOME also agrees that on-site storage should  
9 be the way to go, certainly in the short term, but be  
10 very, very careful of the results that you hear  
11 reported about these calculations that are being done  
12 on this project. Again, these are not simple  
13 systems. Ecological systems are very complicated.  
14 Like I said, they tend to be chaotic. Change  
15 conditions just a little bit and you get quite a  
16 different answer, which I noticed in the summary  
17 documents that the answers that they're getting for  
18 doses are quite a bit different than they were a  
19 couple years ago, which is most likely just tweaking  
20 a few of those little variables. Thank you very much  
21 for your time.]