

only site to be studied, and the scientific evidence against the Mountain continues to grow. Yucca Mountain is located in an earthquake and volcanic eruption zone. As recently as last month there was so much moisture at the proposed site that electrical test equipment was shorted out. It is widely known that ground water will corrode the waste storage containers, and release the deadly toxins into the environment.

Scientific evidence against the proposed Yucca Mountain site is plentiful, but just like the 1987 "Screw Nevada" bill, each time legitimate arguments are raised, standards for Yucca Mountain are changed. Regarding the current situation with groundwater and personal radiation dose standards, the goalposts have again been moved. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) set a groundwater standard of no greater than 4 millirems, and a personal radiation dose standard of 15 millirems per year at 18 kilometers, for the first 10,000 years of waste disposal. Despite the fact that the personal dose radiation standards are significantly weaker than similar sites around the country, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has still asked the EPA to rewrite these standards to allow an even higher dose of radiation. The NRC knows full well that without reduced standards, Yucca Mountain can never be found suitable. So again, the rules must change.

On three separate occasions the State of Nevada has demonstrated, using DOE's own data, that the site should be disqualified under both the EPA standard and DOE's own internal site screening regulation. And each time, the DOE or Congress has changed regulations to ensure that Yucca Mountain would not be disqualified, regardless of the health and safety consequences to Nevadans.

In fact, the DOE has found the geology at Yucca Mountain so poorly serves the need of a repository, that over 95% of the waste isolation capability would have to be provided by metal waste containers, and other so-called engineered barriers around the waste. When this project started, the idea was to find a site capable of containing the radiation entirely through its natural geologic features. That standard has since been lowered from 100% to 5%.

Aside from the earthquakes and the potential for volcanic eruption, an aquifer flows beneath the mountain, with water moving so rapidly that even with all engineered barriers, radiation will unavoidably escape the repository and contaminate our water table. This fact is underscored by a U.S. Geological Survey report entitled "Flooding in the Amargosa River Drainage Basin, February 23-24, 1998, Southern Nevada and Eastern California, including the Nevada Test Site." This document, which I would like to include with my statement, details two floods, one in 1995, and one in 1998, that, would have had severe repercussions on the proposed repository. Most notable is the conclusion that, "Both the 1995 and 1998 floods indicate . . . that the Amargosa River, with contributing streamflow from one or more among Beatty, Fortymile, and Topopah Washes, has the potential to transport dissolved and particulate material well beyond the boundary on NTS and the Yucca Mountain area during periods of moderate to severe

streamflow." Yet once again, in clear English, scientific evidence condemns the Yucca plan.

In addition to the mounting scientific evidence against Yucca Mountain, there are also ongoing General Accounting Office investigations into mismanagement by senior staff, and a review of the Inspector General's report on bias at the DOE.

The first issue was brought to my attention by an anonymous letter I received at my office from an individual who appears to be highly knowledgeable about the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Site Characterization Project. The letter reflects a high level of expertise and first hand knowledge. It is alarming to say the least. Among the allegations are the lack of oversight in relation to the continually escalating lifetime costs for storing nuclear waste at the mountain, unnecessary travel abroad by senior level managers, lack of experience and technical background of those in charge of the project, and an adversarial relationship between managers of the project—and this very body—the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The General Accounting Office is still in the process of investigating these very serious charges.

As for the second issue, as you are likely aware by now, the Inspector General has found that there were several statements in the draft Overview and a note which was attached to one version of the Overview, that "could be viewed as suggesting a premature conclusion regarding the suitability of Yucca Mountain." Of particular concern to me is the section of the I.G.'s report that states, "Based on Correspondence received by the Office of the Inspector General, it is fair to observe that, at least in some quarters, public confidence in the Department's (DOE) evaluation of Yucca Mountain has eroded." The IG also noted disincentives at DOE for Yucca Mountain employees to question assumptions, or to, in any way, "rock the boat."

The Inspector General's report serves to underscore what Nevadans have been saying since the origins of the "Screw Nevada" bill. Politics plays the leading role in determining the fate of the Yucca Mountain project.

It is pointless to discuss how we can restore the public confidence into this doomed project. The American public has seen behind the curtain, and we cannot erase from our memory that we have seen a tainted process, driven by politics, with questionable scientific merit. The further we investigate Yucca Mountain, the more money we spend, the more obvious it becomes that Yucca Mountain is not the answer.

Scientific evidence and ongoing investigations continue to shed doubt on the feasibility of a Yucca Mountain Repository. Now is not the time to increase this budget, while the GAO continues to investigate, and science continues to condemn this plan. I again request that federal agencies change their course, and stop trying to fit a square peg in a round hole. Instead of trying to change the rules to keep the proposed plan alive, they should immediately begin the decommissioning of the Yucca Mountain Project.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 2001

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this chamber when roll call votes number 87, 90, 91, 100 and 101 were cast. I want the record to show that had I been present in this chamber at the time these votes were cast, I would have voted "no" on roll call vote number 87, "yes" on roll call vote 90, "yes" on roll call vote 91, "no" on roll call vote 100 and "yes" on roll call vote 101.

HONORING THE CITY OF MONTROSE, COLORADO

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the City of Montrose, Colorado on receiving the 'Small Community of the Year' award from the Economic Developers' Council of Colorado. Montrose was given this honor for its economic activity through out the year.

Every year the EDC honors a small community that has distinguished itself in economic or community development. "The Montrose Economic Development Council has shown itself to be one of the most effective, viable and responsible economic development programs in Colorado," said Don Dunshee, president of the state council, in a Daily Sentinel article. Clearly, the Montrose EDC has been the driving force behind Montrose's prosperity.

In 2000, MEDC facilitated four deals that by 2005 will have contributed more than \$12 million in annual payroll to Montrose. It retained three local companies and recruited a New Jersey manufacturer, generating 117 additional jobs. Also in 2000 the MEDC launched its new five-year prosperity plan, which predicts a \$188.4 billion return to the area's economy on an investment of \$2 million. "It's that can do attitude that we possess, I think, that this award reflects," said Steve Jenkins, executive director of the MEDC.

In 2001, the MEDC is implementing its "Cornerstone Initiative" to shepherd economic growth into the future. "What we want to do is create the right type of jobs without the impact to the community. That ensures the community is prosperous in the long term," said Jenkins.

Mr. Speaker, for years the Montrose Economic Development Council has helped small, local businesses achieve their American Dream, and with that, the City of Montrose is experiencing a period of economic growth that benefits everyone. For that, they deserve our thanks and praise.