DOE/EIS - 0138
Volume II A.2 Pages 1-320

FINAL
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

Volume II
Comment Resolution Document

A. Comments
2. Transcripts

December 1988

U.S. Department of Energy
Washington D.C. 20585

225-775 88 - 1. (BOOK 1)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Public Hearing on the Matter of:

SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

Arizona State University
School of Law
Tempe, Arizona

Monday, October 3, 1988

APPEARANCES

PRESIDING:

DR. ED TEMPLE
Executive Director, SSC Site Task Force

MODERATOR:

ROY EIGUREN
Lindsay, Hart, Neil & Weigler

PANEL:

DR. ED TEMPLE
DR. JERRY NELSEN
DR. ROGER MAYES
U.S. Department of Energy

PUBLIC SPEAKERS:

First Session:

DAVID JANKOFSKY
MIKE MORALES
HON. JOHN MAWHWNEY
HON. DOUG TODD
HON. ALAN STEPHENS
HON. LELA ALSTON
JACK DAVIS
JOE COMFORT
DON MORRIS
DR. GEORGE B. BROOKS
CHARLES HAMILTON
JOE HOUCHIN
JOHN MOTHERSHEAD
JIM OXLEY
GUIDO ARDAYA
DR. SCOTT MILLS
JOHN OLSON
WES OLOWSKI
PAUL SCHEIDIG
LOUIS THANUKOS
GLENN RICE

Second Session:

CHRIS TRASK
BRAD GALLMAN
DAVID HARBSTER
RICHARD SCANLON
GARY S. MASKARINEC

FIRST SESSSION

(October 3, 1988: 9:00 a.m.)

MR. TEMPLE: Good afternoon. My name is Ed Temple, and I am the Executive Director of the SSC Site Task Force. I am also the presiding official for this hearing. The purpose of my brief remarks is to tell you why we're all here. After my remarks I will ask our session moderator, Mr. Eiguren, to outline how we will conduct our meeting this afternoon.

The purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens an opportunity to comment in person on the Department's draft EIS on the SSC. This hearing is not your only opportunity, you may also send us your written comments, which must be postmarked by October 17, 1988. We want you to know that we are sincerely interested in hearing your comments on this document. And that each of your comments will be considered and responded to in the final EIS.

Let me refresh your memories regarding the SSC site selection process. In January 1987, President Reagan's decision to proceed with the SSC was announced, and construction funds were requested from Congress. In April of 1987, the Department issued an invitation for site proposals. We subsequently received 43 proposals, and 36 of these were found to be qualified. These qualified proposals were forwarded to the National Academies of Science National Academy of Engineering, where a joint committee used the criteria set forth in the invitation and recommended a Best Qualified List of eight sites tr the Department in December of last year.

One of these proposals was later withdrawn by the proposer. Following the review and verification of the Academy's recommendations, Secretary Herrington announced the Best Qualified List, including the Arizona proposal, on January 19 of 1988. Three days later, on January 22, the DOE formally announced that it would develop an Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed SSC. This followed an advanced notice of intent to prepare an EIS which had been issued in May of 1987. In February 1988 we held scoping meeting in each of the seven states, to obtain public comment on the nature and scope of environmental issues to be considered in the EIS. Scoping meetings were held on February 9 at this location. The DOE received approximately 2,100 comments on the scope of the EIS. These comments were considered in the preparation of the draft EIS. Following public hearings here and in the other BLQ states, we will develop a final EIS to be issued in December of 1988. The draft EIS evaluates and compares four types of alternatives, site alternatives, technical alternatives, programmatic alternatives, and the no-action alternative.

Site alternatives addressed the seven locations identified on the BQL. Technical alternatives considered different technology, different equipment, or different facility configurations. Programmatic alternatives included possibility of using other accelerators, international collaboration, or project delay. And the no-action alternative meant the option not to construct the SSC.

This draft EIS identifies and analyzes the potential and environmental consequences expected to occur from siting, constructing and operating the SSC at the seven site alternatives. The sites are located in Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee and Texas. The draft EIS provides as much information as possible at this stage of budget development regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed construction and operation of the SSC at each of the seven alternative sites. However, the DOE recognizes that further review under NEPA is appropriate, prior to the actual construction and operation of the proposed SSC. Accordingly, following selection of the site for the proposed SSC, the DOE will prepare a supplement to this EIS, to address in more detail the impacts of constructing and operating the proposed SSC at the selected site and to identify, where possible, alternatives for mitigating these impacts.

Let me tell you a little about the draft EIS. This is a large document containing more than 4,000 pages. It is organized into four volumes. Volume I is entitled Environmental Impact Statement, Volume II is the Comment Resolution Document, and is reserved for our response to public comment and for publication in the final EIS only. Volume III describes the methodology for site selection, and Volume IV contains 16 appendices providing detailed presentations of technical information, which back up the conclusions in the Environmental Impact Statement. Comments received at this hearing will be used by the DOE to prepare a final EIS to be issued this December. This document will identify the Department's preferred site. No sooner than 30 days after the final EIS is distributed, the Department will publish its record of decision, which will include the final site selection and complete site selection process. This afternoon we will use a professional moderator to assure a fair and orderly proceeding. Measures have been taken to permit the maximum opportunity for interested citizens to utilize this session for expressing their comments. We urge all participants in today's meeting to focus their comments on the draft EIS, and to avoid or minimize statements aimed solely at expressing opposition or support for the state's proposal.

While all comments will become a part of the formal record of this proceeding, those specifically representing the draft EIS will be most useful to the DOE in preparing the final document. As I noted earlier, in addition to this opportunity for oral comments, individuals may also provide written comments to the DOE. These should be postmarked by October 17, 1988, the end of the formal 45-day comment period, to ensure they will be considered in the preparation of the final EIS. We will, however, consider comments received after that date, to the extent possible.

One final word on the role of the EIS on the site selection process. The National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, requires that environmental impacts be considered by Federal decision makers in taking major Federal actions with potential environmental consequences. The EIS is one of the methods used to do this analysis, provide for public comment and participation, and to make a final decision that meets the NEPA requirements. The EIS will be considered by the Secretary in making the site selection. Thank you in advance for your interest and participation. Let me now introduce Mr. Eiguren, who will describe how we will conduct today's session.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you Dr. Temple. Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. My name is Roy Eiguren. I'm an attorney in private practice with the law firm of Lindsay, Hart, Neil & Weigler, which has offices in Seattle, Washington; Portland, Oregon; San Francisco, California; and Boise, Idaho. My practice and that of our law firm is heavily concentrated in the areas of environmental and energy law. Both in private practice as well as in prior governmental service, I've had over a decade's worth of experience in either conducting or helping participate in a significant number of national environmental policy act hearings, such as the one we're conducting here today. I've been retained by the Department of Energy as moderator for this and other hearings in this series, for one express purpose, that is to say my single express purpose is to serve as an independent, unbiased, objective individual to moderate the hearings. I'm not an employee for the Department, nor am I an advocate for or against the Department's proposed action in the proceeding. My role is to help assure that the Department fully complies with the letter and spirit of the Federal National Environmental Policy Act, so as to allow all individuals and organizations fair and equal opportunity to comment on the record relative to the Department's proposed action.

Dr. Temple stated the purpose of this hearing is to give all interested citizens an opportunity to comment on the record, relative to the Department of Energy's draft Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed SSC project.

In February, the Department conducted and I also moderated a scoping meeting here in this auditorium, to hear comments from individuals and organizations on what issues they felt should be considered in the preparation of the draft EIS. Now that the Department has prepared the draft EIS, it seeks comment from the public, once again, on it. In particular, we are seeking specific comment on issues that members of the public feel are relevant and should be considered by the Department prior to finalizing the EIS, and prior to the Department selecting its preferred site for the SSC.

This is a record proceeding, that is to say everything that is being said at this, as well as the other draft EIS hearing held in other states still under consideration, are being recorded by court reporters. And we obviously have a court reporter here. The court reporter will make a verbatim transcript of all comments received and submit that transcript to the Department of Energy for inclusion in the final record of the proceeding. The Secretary of Energy's decision will be based upon the information contained in that record. At this time I would like to tell you what procedures we have been following, and will follow today, in the conduct of this as well as other hearings in this proceeding.

I will announce speakers working from a list provided to me by the Department of Energy personnel, located at the registration table out in the lobby. I will call speakers in the order in which they signed up in advance. If you have pre-registered to speak, but have not checked in at the registration table, we'd ask you to do that. Every individual who was commenting will have up to five minutes with which to make that comment. At the end of five minutes I will signal individual speakers that their time has elapsed. As stated earlier, the purpose of this hearing is to receive comments on the draft EIS. Accordingly your comments should be focused on the issues that are addressed in the draft document. I do reserve the right to ask individuals to focus on issues contained in the draft EIS, if they wander from the topic of the session. It's not my intention to limit remarks, but rather to assure that what comments you do provide are effective in achieving the objectives of this hearing as outlined by Dr. Temple. Written comment and oral comment will receive the same weight in the record of the proceeding. Therefore we will encourage you to submit written comment as well as any written questions you may have about the project, either before the presentation or after your presentation, or any time prior to October 17, which is the close of the record in this proceeding. There is, at the registration table, a business card such as this, that will give you the address where you will send your written questions or comment.

There's also a toll-free number listed on there where you can call for additional information. This session will run from 2:00 this afternoon until 5:00 and reconvene again this evening at 7:00 and continue on until approximately 10:00 p.m. Throughout the course of the hearing, in order to allow the court reporter to change tapes as well as allow members of the audience to take a rest, we'll have brief recesses throughout the course of the hearings. Approximately 30 minutes before the scheduled end of this session, I will call any speakers who registered at the door to testify, given the fact that we have such a relatively small number of pre-registered commenters, I will be calling individuals who registered to comment at the door, earlier than that. Again, the same rules would apply to them. That is to say, when it comes your turn to speak, after your name has been called, we would ask you to step forward to the microphone here in the front, give us your name and address, and give us the name of any organization that you might be speaking on behalf of, and then go ahead and proceed into your oral comment. I will begin timing you for your five minute limitation after you've made your brief introduction. Finally, I'd like to indicate that the members of the panel who were here with me in the front of the room are here for the express purpose of listening to your comments, and as appropriate, asking clarifying questions on your comments. The purpose of your doing that is to help assure that we build a complete and full record of your concerns relative to the environmental issues associated with the SSC project. With me on the panel is Dr. Temple, who is a presiding official; he is the Executive Director of the SSC Site Selection Task Force for the Department of Energy. To my left and your right are Dr. Roger Mayes and Dr. Jerry Nelsen who are environmental specialists with the Department of Energy, who were senior environmental specialists assigned to this particular project. At this time we're going to move into the receipt of public comment on the draft EIS. The first 30 minutes have been reserved for presentations or comments by the state of Arizona. And the way we've structured this is we've given the State 30 minutes in total for their presentation, and that will be led by Mr. David Jankofsky, who is representing Governor Mofford. Mr. Jankofsky.

822 STATEMENT OF DAVID JANKOFSKY, ON BEHALF OF HON. ROSE MOFFORD

MR. JANKOFSKY: Thank you, Dr. Temple, Mr. Eiguren, site task force, EIS members, Arizona SSC project members, ladies and gentlemen. I'm David Jankofsky, Director of the Arizona Department of Commerce. It is with great pleasure and enthusiasm that I welcome you to Arizona and to these proceedings.

As you know, we're gathered here this afternoon to address in a public forum the contents of the draft Environmental Impact Statement that has been prepared by the Department of Energy in connection with the site selection process for the Superconducting Super Collider. As you also know, Governor Mofford, along with a group of Arizona business, academic and governmental leaders, are at this moment in Washington to prepare for a personal briefing with Secretary of Energy Herrington, on the Arizona site. But for the timing of the briefing tomorrow morning, I can assure you that Governor Mofford and members of the entourage would have been in attendance here today at this meeting. The governor has asked that I convey to all of you her personal greetings and assurances that she continues to regard the SSC as both a national imperative and an Arizona priority.

The draft EIS, as you're well aware, is an extremely detailed and comprehensive collection of data on all the best qualified list sites. As part of the process to identify the preferred site for the SSC, the Department of Energy has compiled, along with the National Environmental Policy Act has complied, excuse me, with the National Environmental Policy Act to ensure that the siting of the SSC is done in conformity with national environmental policies. In this regard we welcome the opportunity to give comments and entertain comments on the environmental and socio-economic impact of the SSC at the Arizona Maricopa site. I'm extremely gratified that the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering site evaluation committee recognized "the Arizona proposal was particularly strong in its response to the environmental criteria of the invitations for site proposals." Although I personally have not read the entire nine volumes of the draft EIS, I along with members of the SSC project technical committee have examined the pertinent portions of the document, and remain convinced that the environmental and related components of the site selection process will be best satisfied through the selection of the Arizona Maricopa site as the preferred site for the SSC.

This afternoon we'll be hearing from a representative of our congressional delegation, members of the Arizona SSC project technical committee, and various other State-elected officials concerning portions of the draft EIS by the Department of Energy. We remain convinced that, following such an examination, the final EIS will once again reveal the superiority of the Arizona site. We remain convinced that the site is free of any potential problematic conditions which cannot be easily mitigated or eliminated. Finally, on behalf of Governor Mofford, I wish to commend the Department of Energy for its adherence to extremely high standards of conduct with regard to the site selection process. In particular I would applaud the Department's observance of the need to focus on the technical merits of the sites still under consideration.

The SSC is too important a national priority to permit the process to evolve in any other fashion. Dr. Temple, Mr. Eiguren, once again I would repeat my welcome, and with your permission I would like to turn the microphone over to Mr. Mike Morales, who will read a statement on behalf of our congressional delegation. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Could we have your name and affiliation for the record, sir?

MR. MORALES: My name is Mike Morales, and I'm Administrative Assistant to Senator John McCain.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

659 STATEMENT OF MIKE MORALES, ON BEHALF OF CONGRESS DELEGATION

MR. MORALES: I have a letter from the congressional delegation addressed to Secretary Herrington. "Dear Mr. Secretary, As you're in no doubt aware, the Arizona congressional delegation must be in Washington today, as the 100th Congress completes its legislative business, and we prepare for our State's presentation to you tomorrow in support of our efforts to construct and operate the Superconducting Super Collider. We did however wish to have included in the record of this important hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement published by the Department, August 28, 1988, some thoughts we share on the subject. We have long contended that Arizona is uniquely positioned to provide the land, resources and skills required to make this vital project a success. Our state offers exceptional geologic and weather conditions, readily transferable land, a highly skilled and experienced construction and technical labor pool, and outstanding cultural, educational and environmental resources. Perhaps, as significant and distinguishing, is the fact that there is presently no discernible opposition from any constituency affected by this project. That there are so few public witnesses that have sought an opportunity to submit testimony here today should be construed only as evidence of the very broad and enthusiastic support this project enjoys in our state. And we would add, in the West generally, the political, academic, environmental, business, labor and other communities that maintain an interest in this endeavor are four square behind it, and resolve to ensure its success into the future.

As the draft EIS underscores, the Arizona Maricopa site would permit tunneling above the water cable; and would not adversely impact any surrounding water sheds or ecosystems. Further, the requisite land could be easily transferred; sufficient electrical power, natural gas and water are available to site; and necessary infrastructure improvements and vegetation relocation can be achieved with minimal effort. A superb geological setting permits optimal construction flexibility, and would allow in our view significant savings in cost and construction time.

We are pleased that the draft EIS underscores the merits of the Arizona Maricopa site, which we have long touted, and that there exists no known unacceptable or unmitigatable environmental impacts of building the SSC here. We are satisfied that the executive and legislative branches in the State are committed to satisfying the infrastructure requirement set forward in the draft EIS. Further we reiterate our own resolve to work with the appropriate committees in the House and Senate to give expeditious favorable consideration to wilderness area redesignations that would be necessitated by the selection of the Arizona Maricopa site.

Finally, Mr. Secretary, we applaud you for your continued leadership in promoting the SSC as a national imperative, and in conducting this site selection process in a manner that is even-handed and that grants primary consideration to the technical merits of each site. We, the members of the Arizona Congressional delegation, pledge our continued best efforts to elevate this project to the forefront of the debate on domestic priorities, and to securing the requisite political support to sustain the project through the construction and operational phases. Sincerely, Senator Dennis DeConcini, Senator John McCain, Representatives Bob Stump, Morris Udall, John J. Rhodes, III, Jim Colby, and John Kyl."

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

MR. JANKOFSKY: Now, Dr. Temple, Mr. Eiguren, I'd like to introduce, with your permission, the Honorable John Mawhwney, State Senator from the city of Tucson.

823 STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN MAWHWNEY

MR. MAWHWNEY: Good morning, sir. I'm John Mawhwney, I'm a resident of the city of Tucson and a member of the Arizona State Senate, and have been for the previous ten years. I'm pleased to appear in this forum to affirm my support for the Superconducting Super Collider project as a national imperative. In addition, my experience as a member of the Arizona State Senate allows me to speak with some familiarity about the long history of strong State government support for the Super Collider project here in Arizona.

1

Site studies for the SSC were initiated by our universities in 1982. In early 1985, then Governor Babbit established the Arizona Superconducting Super Collider State Task Force. In the same year, the legislature appropriated $500,000 for intensive engineering and geological studies. Governor Mecham continued Governor Babbitt's strong support for the Superconducting Super Collider. Soon after Secretary Herrington's announcement that the competition was on, the State Legislature allocated $1 million for technical work necessary to prepare proposals for the Arizona sites. After the Maricopa site was selected for the best qualified list in January of 1988, another appropriation of $900,000 was made despite an extraordinarily large state budget deficit. In every case the appropriations for the Superconducting Super Collider passed by large margins, both houses of the legislature.

2

When Rose Mofford became governor, she quickly made the SSC a central item on her agenda. Governor Mofford, as you know, could not be here today; she's in Washington for a hearing tomorrow before Secretary of Energy Herrington. Clearly there has been consistent, bipartisan, bicameral support for the SSC throughout the political changes that have occurred in Arizona over the past six years. In addition many State agencies have labored enthusiastically on behalf of the SSC project. Everyone in our State government understands clearly the value of the SSC for the future, and is determined to provide a hospitable home for the project if it's located here. I can speak for myself and clearly from my experience with my colleagues in the Legislature that we shall act swiftly, provide all needed SSC infrastructural legislation if our State is awarded the site. At the same time, we will act equally enthusiastically to support any legislation necessary to mitigate any negative environmental impact that you gentlemen may determine in the preparation of the report. I think that the success of the discovery project today shows that the United States is committed to excellence and technical expertise. The SSC and, I think, Arizona are willing to take the challenge and move forward in those
3 areas. I'd be glad to answer any questions about legislative support. I have some colleagues here who represent other houses, other parties all of which want to guarantee our strong support and commitment to the SSC site here in Arizona. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you Senator.

MR. JANKOFSKY: Dr. Temple, Mr. Eiguren, at this time I'd like to introduce the Honorable Doug Todd, State Senator from our host city, Tempe.

824 STATEMENT OF HON. DOUG TODD

MR. TODD: Good afternoon Mr. Chairman, and member of the committee, and welcome to Legislative District 27. And this is my legislative district, and this is my constituency, Arizona State University. I am a native Arizonan, a second generation. And it is warming and encouraging to me that as the project has developed and come along, that so much has been taken care of in protecting and looking at the environment in my home state.

I grew up here in Arizona thinking that our environment was absolutely perfect. That our climate was perfect, and we had all of the answers, and that's why everybody wanted to come to Arizona. Now they
1 want to build a Superconducting Super Collider in my neighborhood, close to my legislative district, and in my State. And I am fully supportive of the efforts of the committee to protect, after they investigate fully, the environmental impacts of such a project. Not only do I support the environmental study to protect Arizona's environment, but I am tied in two ways to support this project in others. Number one, my university, in close cooperation with University of Arizona in Tucson, have worked hand in glove cooperating in producing those efforts, those parts of this project that have proved this project to be so geologically sound. Environmentally, yes, geologically, yes. In the third case, in the
2 legislative process, not only have I been supportive our actions that we have taken previously, my commitment to you and my commitment to our constituents is to continue to support this effort in any way that I am needed. We are glad you are here checking all of this out. We wish you success, and feel, of course, that the Arizona Maricopa site is probably the best one for the United States of America. Thank you gentlemen, very very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you Senator.

MR. JANKOFSKY: Dr. Temple, Mr. Eiguren, at this time I would like to introduce, with great pleasure, the Honorable Alan Stephens, Senate minority leader from the city of Phoenix.

825 STATEMENT OF HON. ALAN STEPHENS

MR. STEPHENS: Mr. Chairman, member of the committee would like to welcome you to Arizona. I hope your stay is pleasurable. It's a good time of year, weather-wise. I'm here today as a State Senator. I've been a State Senator since 1984, and I represent the legislative district in which we hope the project will be built, namely the Maricopa mountain area. I was appointed and have remained a member of the Governor's Super Collider committee since 1985, so I'm somewhat involved in the technical aspect, also, since our proposal really hit high gear back in 1985. I've also organized and participated in several community meetings in the adjacent areas nearby the Super Collider area. And that is namely the town of Hilo Bend, the town of Mobile, also the town of Aho, which is somewhat south of that, but also would be effective, as well as Rainbow Valley. And I can attest to the enthusiastic support that we see at each one of these meetings, by the local community members. I know that's somewhat different than you may have experienced in other states, but certainly in the areas that are going to be adjacent
1 to the project area in Arizona, there is nothing but enthusiastic support.

As I was reading the Environmental Impact Statement, I think it clearly shows that Arizona is one of the superior sites. We have the fewest residential and business locations, or relocations, I think there's only going to be four. We have the fewest lost water wells and wetlands, none. We have the smallest amount of lost farmland, 36 acres, and we also have the smallest percentage increase in air pollution emissions during operation, something that's to Arizona right now, and I'm sure important as a priority to the Federal Government. We also have the fewest number of people that would be incon-
2 venienced by construction noise. I, as other speakers from the legislature today, have come here to

tell you of our continued support for the project and as our governor and other leaders will be telling Secretary Herrington in Washington tomorrow, our legislature remains committed to provide the necessary funds for infrastructure needs as evidenced by the Environmental Impact Statement, and other issues which may come up.

There is a lot of development in that area right now, and I know that the local folks involved in local development also remain involved in helping the State government provide some of the funding for that local infrastructure. And so again, I would tell you that the legislature remains committed to providing the necessary funding to bring this project to the state of Arizona, to fill our commitments that we've made to the Department of Energy and Secretary Herrington.

Again, thank you for coming to Arizona, and I look forward to seeing you after we've been designated as the site. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Senator.

MR. JANKOFSKY: Dr. Temple, Mr. Eiguren, at this point I would like to introduce the Honorable Lela Alston, state Senator from the city of Phoenix.

826 STATEMENT OF HON. LELA ALSTON

MS. ALSTON: Good afternoon gentlemen, and welcome to Arizona. I, like Senator Todd, am a native of Arizona, and have represented my district, my Legislative District 20 in west Phoenix for 12 years. We are in Arizona excited about your project and having it here. We have seen monumental support, both legislatively and with our business communities and the citizens of this State, as it has gone along. We, the representatives and senators you've heard from today are of different political parties. And
1 we want you to know that even though there may be some political problems in Arizona, this is one project that has received bipartisan support throughout the entire time of the project. I anticipate that that will continue to be the case. Both Republicans and Democrats have joined together to support this project, and in my opinion, will continue to do that to a great extent, and enthusiastic extent. We will do what we can that you require to mitigate any environmental [sic] that you find, and I have served on the appropriations committed 10 of the 12 years, and feel comfortable that members of that committee will continue to be supportive of this project.

Thank you very much for being here. And I hope you smile favorably on Arizona as our sunshine smiles on you today. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Senator.

MR. JANKOFSKY: Dr. Temple, Mr. Eiguren, it's now my pleasure to introduce Mr. Jack Davis of the Arizona Public Service Company who has a short statement he'd like to make.

656 STATEMENT OF JACK DAVIS

MR. DAVIS: Dr. Temple, Mr. Eiguren, members of the task force, my name is Jack Davis, I'm manager of contracts for electrical public service company. As manager of that area we were responsible for the
1 data that was put into the Environmental Impact Statement regarding electric utility service. After reading the draft Environmental Statement, we have some concerns with the tenor of certain statements made in that report. I'm here to assure you that electric power supply is not a problem.

The first area of concern is the matter of transmission. The Maricopa site is ideally located for access to require transmission. As explained in the draft report, a 230-kV system is needed to provide power to the Super Collider site. That line has already been approved by the state siting committee
2 and presently it is just a matter of setting a time for construction. All the engineering has been completed. I might add that the 230-kV transmission system that has been approved provides dual transmission feeds to the site, with a tie-line between two feeder substations. This is unique among our competitors' proposals, and will provide increased reliability for the site.

Of greater concern, though, is the inference by the draft report that generation capacity availability will be a problem. This cannot be farther from the truth. And if there's any message I want to leave you here with today, is that APS is ready, willing and very capable to service the SSC load.

The draft report mentions that planned generation resources timing will be changed. That's nothing new in our business. The fact that planned generation resources are shuffled to meet SSC load is a result
3 of normal prudent utility plant processes. In fact, it is on a public service, we do this on an annual basis to assure that all electric loads are met and served in the most reliable and economic manner. Providing the required electric service to the SSC is not a problem. In fact, upon close evaluation of the long-range plans submitted to you by Arizona Public Service reveals that the future resources required for providing power to the SSC load is readily available.

In summary, I want to leave you with one clear message. Electric service for the SSC site does not pose a problem. In fact, Arizona has a distinct advantage over its competitors in that both transmission and generation resources are readily available and APS is prepared to move ahead.

I would like to submit for the record a written letter which confirms these statements I've made, and I appreciate this opportunity to present our views. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. I'm going to take that if I could sir, and I'll put it in the record. Thank you, Mr. Davis. Mr. Jankofsky, we're going to have to take a very brief recess at this point, I'm told that they need to change the tapes in the recording system, so we'll be in recess for five minutes. Thank you. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MR. EIGUREN: Ladies and gentlemen, we are back on the record for this the October 3rd hearing in Tempe, Arizona on the DEIS for the SSC project. I would once again give the floor to Mr. Jankofsky.

MR. JANKOFSKY: Thank you, Mr. Eiguren and Dr. Temple. It's now my pleasure to introduce Mr. Joe Comfort for the Arizona SSC task force, who has a statement to make. Welcome.

662 STATEMENT OF JOE COMFORT

MR. COMFORT: Dr. Temple, Mr. Eiguren, it is a pleasure to have you here today. My name is Joseph Comfort, and I am the associate project manager for the Arizona SSC project. My address is the Physics Department of Arizona State University, where I am also professor of physics. My research interests are in experimental nuclear and subatomic particle physics. I have been an associate of the Arizona SSC project since its inception five years ago. I wish to comment briefly on the draft Environmental Impact Statement that was issued by the Department of Energy, especially with regards to the overall impact of siting the SSC in Arizona.

In a dynamic environment, it is important to distinguish between the direct social economic impacts of a large-scale project such as the SSC, and the otherwise natural development in the region. In my view, the draft EIS does not make this distinction sufficiently clear in Arizona's case, nor does it recognize the regional developments that will provide important benefits and offset some of the direct impacts of the SSC itself. Just last week the U.S. Census Bureau reported that during the 1980s, Phoenix was the nation's fastest growing metropolitan area of those having populations in excess of one million. This growth speaks early to the attractiveness of the region in terms of jobs, climate, lifestyles and future opportunities. At current growth rates, only a few months of the normal influx of new residents will accommodate all of the new jobs created by SSC during its construction and operation over the next 20 or 30 years, as well as all of the other jobs stimulated by having the SSC in the region. In human terms, the SSC slips right into the Arizona SSC site. Arizona has all of the resources and experience needed to construct and operate the SSC. The $3 billion central Arizona project, the $9 million power generating station, and the $5 million freeway system in Maricopa County now under construction are clear examples. The SSC is a welcome addition and not a burden. In economic terms, the SSC slips right into the proposed Arizona SSC site. The dynamics of the region are best illustrated with the accompanying map that's been presented on your table. One of the areas of greatest growth at this time is along the Interstate I-10 corridor to the west. Once beyond the Estrella Mountains, development can and will occur down into Rainbow Valley towards the SSC site itself. In fact, construction for a major plant community there has already begun. A second area of major growth is along the I-10 corridor to the southeast towards Tucson. Master plans for another major planned community just west of Casa Grande and against towards the SSC site have already been approved. In terms of community development, the SSC slips right into the proposed Arizona site. The SSC campus is near Interstate I-8, a transcontinental freight railway, transcontinental oil and gas pipelines and an extension canal of the CAP. Plans exist for a new 138-kilowatt electrical transmission line to pass across the site, and it has a disposal facility is under construction inside the SSC ring parameter. Except for four relocations, the SSC will not impact existing infrastructures, but will instead slip right into the proposed Arizona site. The Arizona SSC project takes exception to the comments in the draft EIS that the SSC might be visually incongruous at the proposed Arizona SSC site. Architecture that is environmentally sensitive is possible and should be mentioned as a mitigation. In fact, infrastructure impairing visual resources already exists. The most important eastern portion of the site is land that has overgrazed and has been revegetated with creosote bush.

Near the adjacent community of Mobile, a conventional waste facility is being planned. One or two oil refineries are under study, and land is being purchased for pilot training air strip. These developments will occur with or without the SSC. However, in terms of the potential for the growth of industrial infrastructures, the SSC slips right into the proposed Arizona site. Finally, the proposed Arizona site includes portions of three wilderness study areas managed by the Bureau of Land Management. The BLM has recommended that the areas not be classified as wilderness, in large part because of the extensive human presence that has already occurred. The Arizona SSC project, however, endorses all efforts to maintain the Maricopa Mountain region in as primitive a state as is reasonably feasible, and the project believes that the SSC will be able to demarcate the boundaries of such a primitive region, and that it will have the political leverage to preclude damaging intrusions into an environmentally sensitive and attractive regions. Environmentally, therefore, the SSC slips right into the proposed Arizona site.

With that, I would like to submit for the record copies of this presentation. Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. For the record, both the written comments of Joseph R. Comfort, Professor of Physics, Arizona State University as well as the accompanying maps. Mr. Jankofsky.

MR. JANKOFSKY: Dr. Temple, Mr. Eiguren, as our final speaker I would like to introduce Mr. Don Morris from the Arizona SSC task force.

658
828

STATEMENT OF DON MORRIS

MR. MORRIS: Dr. Temple, distinguished members of the panel, I am Don Morris. I am the project manager for the Arizona SSC technical team. Our office is at 1317 East Speedway in Tucson. Previous speakers have talked briefly about the history of the SSC here in Arizona. In 1982, it was formed. A team went out to begin looking across the state for the best site. Some 35 sites were looked at. In 1985, they brought that down to two sites, and then we added most of the team at that time to begin the completion of the two proposals that were submitted.

That team still stays with us today. They have the experience and much of my comments here and submittals will really come from that, what I consider to be a high quality team.

1 Their comments, after completing a detailed assessment of the EIS, are these. That there are internal inconsistencies, errors and incorrect conclusions. Mostly, this is a result of the rapid, or the limited time available to really complete the EIS for the seven sites.

I will submit those comments at the end of my statement here. But, first, let me bring your attention to four broader points.

The first finding or concern of the technical team was that it appears the State that has provided the most environmental information in response to the DOE and the RTK request has the most environmental impact. It was earlier indicated that the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering report that was issued back in January of '88 was complimentary about the responsiveness of
2 Arizona and the quality of the data. And since that time, we have submitted almost an additional ton of information to either RTK or DOE.

My point is, and this is a third, it is at least the third-level factor that is going to be used by the Secretary in making a decision. We just ask that the Secretary carefully consider the inequities and the responses from the different sites in the draft EIS before rendering his decision.

A second point, and this is a recent happening. Another important consequence left out of the EIS is a recent court case that was settled in the Second Circuit of the U.S. Court of Appeals concerning con-
3 struction in the wetlands. As I understand it, the ruling from the Bruchant and Roversheit case may directly be applicable to the siting of the SSC. I would like to remind DOE that the Arizona Maricopa site is the only BQL site that does not include any wetlands. A third observation made by Dr. Joseph Comfort, much of that area to the east of the campus site for the SSC is already planned development.
4 It will occur with or without the SSC. The SSC will only speed up that process to some degree. Hence, not all of those environmental impacts that occur in that area should be attributed to the SSC. In fact, in some ways, we feel, that that area to the west of the main campus, the highlands area which is
5 *more fragile, can actually be protected as an environmental part, something like Los Alamos National* Lab or Argonne or Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory has established. So we would like to protect the environment, and we think we can create a good marriage of high tech and protection of the environment. A fourth and final observation from staying aware of what's going on in other states, we just want to stress that at least in Arizona, we're not looking at the SSC and trying to recruit it as the solution
6 to an unemployment problem or a weak economy. We have a strong economy. We have an economy where the SSC fits in, a high tech economy that fits with the goals and the quality that we want to see here in this state. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Mr. Morris, was the Second Circuit you cited included in this information?

MR. MORRIS: That's correct.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. We will include for the record the response to the draft Environmental Impact Statement provided by the Arizona SSC technical team. Mr. Jankofsky.

MR. JANKOFSKY: Dr. Temple, Mr. Eiguren, that concludes the formal presentation we had. At this point in time if you have questions, I will be happy to direct them to the member of our team.

MR. EIGUREN: Questions from the panel?

DR. TEMPLE: No.

MR. JANKOFSKY: If not, we thank you for your courtesies.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, we appreciate your being here. At this time ladies and gentlemen we will now begin receipt of comment from those members of the public who pre-registered to speak this afternoon. I would ask those of you that are commenting to once again remember the ground rules for this hearing as well as the other hearings. That is, that we would ask you to step forward to the microphones here at the podium so that we can pick up your comments for the court reporter. We would ask that you would identify yourself and give us a business address or a home address. And if you are speaking for an

organization, please identify that organization. You will have five minutes in which to comment. I will signal you when your time has elapsed. We would ask you, once I do signal you, to bring your comments to a fairly rapid conclusion. In addition to that, if you do have written comment, we would like to receive that. You can give it to me here at the desk, or you can give it to the individuals at the registration table out in the lobby, or as I mentioned earlier, you can submit written comments provided it is postmarked before October 17th, directly to the Department of Energy at the address that's contained on the business card that I am showing you now that's available back at the registration table. We are going to be here until 5:00. In the event that we have gone through our list, it is now 14 commenters, before that time, which obviously we will, we will still be here until 5:00 in the event that someone else would like to sign in and register to comment. So with that, we will now begin with our first pre-registered commenter from the public. That is Dr. George B. Brooks.

660 STATEMENT OF DR. GEORGE B. BROOKS

DR. BROOKS: Dr. Temple, members of this very distinguished panel, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to express my comments here this afternoon. My name is George Benjamin Brooks. Society has inflicted me with the title of Reverend because I am the pastor of the South Minster Presbyterian Church. I went to school, earned a doctorate degree, and discovered that Dr. Brooks had no influence, but Reverend did. I have been a landowner in the Mobile area for more than 20 years. I have seen and been a part of tremendous change here in the Phoenix community. With continued growth being encouraged and inevitable, I think the SCC would be a tremendous guide in developing intelligent and environmentally sensitive growth for this area.

One of the reasons I have been following the progress of the SSC during the past several years is that I saw it as the means of responsible growth as an anchor on the western side of the Rainbow Valley towards which development could be focused as Phoenix continues to grow south and west. The SSC can ensure that the Gila Bend Indians are not left by the wayside as the technology corridor fills in not only towards Phoenix, but the SSC towards Gila Bend. I am not troubled by the fact that should the SSC come to Arizona, my land and that owned by friends of mine will be a part of it, and might be needed for this project. I would welcome its arrival because I believe that central Arizona can be and will be a national focus for high tech research and development. The SSC can and will be a major addition to what is now a developing corridor of science and technology between Phoenix and Tucson. I have seen from first-hand a great deal of concern exercised by the Arizona team over the past few years, and this concern is confirmed in the draft Environmental Impact Statement that the Arizona site does work. In some areas, the study understates some truly unique benefits of that site, including an ideal climate, beautiful scenery which is beautiful yet common here in Arizona, and a site which is perfect not only for development of a science research facility, but also that the land needed for the inevitable partnership between science and industry when the research from the SSC are developed into new technologies of the future. In looking toward the DEIS, and learning more about other sites, one thought comes to mind. Regardless of the SSC's effect on the plants and animals in that area, the most important impact will be on people. People wherever this grand industry, this grand technological center is located, and the Arizona far and away will pact on the fewest number of people. Nowhere else in the country can you find a large an area of nonunique, undeveloped and yet easily obtainable land so close to a major metropolitan area with all of its social and economic amenities. I am also surprised to see that there is no mention to the edge that Arizona has in being able to build SSC on time and on budget. Did any of the other states do as complete a job as in Arizona? I don't want to see another pork barrel project which takes more years and more billions of dollars to complete.

Arizona, by its history, has shown with its detailed studies on construction scheduling and cost that the job can be done, not just on time, but ahead of time. That is the Arizona spirit at work. I see Arizona in the next century as being not just another -- a new Silicon Valley, but a new focus for the development of technologies only dreamed of today. The SSC offers a promise for America in the 21st century. Our Lord created this vast landscape. He created this great land to which the people of Arizona have come. Together we are a resource which can -- no, we will, build the SSC and man its operation, bring into the SSC the Arizona spirit of resourcefulness and hard work. Mr. Chairman, members of the panel, I thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Reverend Brooks. Sir, could we get your address for the record?

(Applause)

MR. EIGUREN: Reverend Brooks, could I get your address for the record? That's not on here.

DR. BROOKS: Address?

MR. EIGUREN: Your address, sir?

DR. BROOKS: I'm sorry, sir. 5018 South 21st Way. I included it in my draft, but not yours. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. The next scheduled commenter for this afternoon's session is Charles Hamilton.

661 STATEMENT OF CHARLES HAMILTON

MR. HAMILTON: My name is Charles Hamilton. I am president of Trivestcor, Inc. I live at 5478 East Oakrest, Scottsdale, Arizona. Dr. Temple, members of the panel, I appreciate the opportunity to speak here today in this open forum. I would like to speak today as a geographer. I have a Master's Degree in geography with a specialization on land use planning. I was in Texas last Monday and witnessed the show put on in Waxahachie, Texas, by the preponderance of civic leaders, who claimed to have thoroughly analyzed the EIS report. They continually stated from their analysis that the Texas site was supported by the EIS report, and it should be built in Texas in spite of numerous problems. They felt, from their own analysis, that all problems were minimal. In articles written about other sites, similar statements have been made. I contend that there are some real problems at these sites that cannot easily be mitigated. As you well know, an organization called CATCH, Citizens Against The Super Collider Here, has been formed in Illinois, North Carolina and Tennessee. This is not a small organization. The numbers of people who belong to CATCH in state are substantial. In Texas, an organization called TASC, Texas Against the Super Collider, has been formed. They claim they sent to you 400 petitions signed by Texans against the collider. They also claim that for every person who signed the petition, at least three to five others wanted to but were afraid to because of the local political pressure. It is my contention that if you locate the collider at any one of these sites, you will be buying litigation, which we all know will be extremely expensive and time-consuming. But more important, you will be creating battlefields within these communities. These battlefields will destroy the internal fibers of all these communities together. In all sites, with the exception of the Arizona site, a Super Collider will have to be forced on either the physical or cultural landscape, and in most cases both. This is substantiated by the EIS report, and at what expense. When you tunnel under a water table, it becomes very expensive. It is extremely difficult to guesstimate the problems that will be incurred and the costs related to those problems. When you move people, it is not only expensive, but in many cases it is emotionally traumatic. When you change a floodplain, it is very costly and it also creates new problems. It is incomprehensible that the DOE would consider disrupting thousands of acres of wetlands or affecting the preservation of historic and prehistoric sites. A common thread was stated at the Texas hearing and it has been stated at other sites, and that is, whatever it costs environmentally is small in comparison to the economic benefits that would be received. I ask, received by whom? It would be nice to think that 1988 man has learned the overwhelming importance of living in harmony with his environment. Throughout history, man has abused both his physical and cultural environment for economic benefit, and all too frequently man has found the economic benefits not to be worth it. We in Arizona, unlike some of the other sites, have learned the importance of working with our environment. Arizona has developed quality land use plans as evidenced by the planned communities on your maps of Sun Cor, Stan Mar and Estrella, all in close proximity of the collider site.

Gentlemen, we have an opportunity here in 1988 to show the world that we have learned something about how to live in our environment; that man, nature, science and business can live in harmony with each other instead of at the expense of each other. The Arizona Super Collider site offers such an opportunity. It has a site that has superior geology. It is a site that can enhance its own physical environment. It is a site that has no water problems. It is a site that has no detrimental effect on nature. It is a site that affects no floodplains, and most importantly, it is a site that does not disrupt the lives of people. In fact, it is the only site that not only meets your criteria, but substantially exceeds it. Instead of superimposing the collider ring on an area, that can be blended into the Phoenix infrastructure and be a model for the world. We have an opportunity to create something very special here instead of destroying something very precious elsewhere, our environment. Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. (Applause)

MR. EIGUREN: We will include Mr. Hamilton's written comments as a part of the record of this proceeding. The next commenter is Mr. Donald Morris. He is not? Okay, I'm sorry.

The next commenter is Joe Houchin.

829 STATEMENT OF JOE HOUCHIN

MR. HOUCHIN: Good afternoon. My name is Joe Houchin. I live in Scottsdale, Arizona. If you want my address for the record, mailing address is P.O. Box 5082, Scottsdale. Zip is 85261.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

1 MR. HOUCHIN: I want to talk to you today about some areas that were covered in the visual and resource area of the DEIS. First of all, I don't want you to get misled by my Texas accent. I was born and raised in Texas, but I've been living here since 1977, and feel like the best thing that ever came out of Texas was Highway 8. (Laughter.)

MR. EIGUREN: We didn't notice you had an accent. (Laughter)

2 MR. HOUCHIN: And after reading some of the sparse information that was supplied in the EIS by the Texas committee, I think a lot of them have been spending too much time, but I was a former director of marketing for the Arizona Office of Tourism, and even in that capacity, I feel that the concern over

the views that would be spoiled in the jeep tour trails in the Maricopa area were inordinate, to the extent that I would say that there is scarcely a handful of even the most avid off-road enthusiasts that know about that area, much less use it to the extent that was of the concern in the EIS study. As Dr. Brooks mentioned to you, such pristine mountain areas as they were described in the EIS are the normal here in Arizona. They are not the exception. And we have learned to live and build and grow in the midst of all of these pristine areas. And no man-made structure is going to intrude on the grandeur of an area such as the Maricopa Mountains. In fact, even in that light, the collider itself is not a Medusa. Nobody is going to turn to stone by catching a glimpse of it as they drive through a jeep trail through the Maricopa Mountains. In fact, from a tourism and a visitor's aspect, I see the Maricopa Mountains as being an absolute, awe-inspiring backdrop for the thousands and thousands of visitors and employees that are going to be visiting and working in the Super Collider area, and coming to see the scientific and architectural wonder of this area that we are sure if we build it here in Arizona is going to blend the future with the desert here. So I thank you for your attention.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Our next commenter is John Mothershead.

830 STATEMENT OF JOHN MOTHERSHEAD

MR. MOTHERSHEAD: Good afternoon, gentlemen. My name is John Mothershead. I live at 2224 South Catarina Court, Mesa. Basically what I am here today to talk about are mitigations. I understand that one of the primary goals of the EIS is to mitigate the environmental impact of siting the SSC at various locations. My first area of interest is the disturbance of unforeseen archaeological resources. The mitigation is to continue with surveys and continue the archaeological findings. As I read here in the DEIS, I'm using Volume IV simply for speed sake. The Arizona portions of the Super Collider in the cut-and-cover area have been intensely surveyed. The Arizona site had some surveying. However, many
1 areas were not surveyed due to poor visibility or limited access. A reconnaissance level archaeological survey has been undertaken in Tennessee, and no project-related archaeological surveys have been done in Michigan, North Carolina or Texas. My second area of concern is floodplain improvement, and the DOE has a goal and mitigation to minimize the harm caused by siting in the floodplain. And in Chapter 4, we find that under Executive Order 11988, floodplain management, Federal agencies must consider the protection of floodplains in decision-making processes. DOE Regulation 10 CFR 1022 provides that flood-
2 plains were planned in the environmental review. Their requirements provides for procedures which DOE follows to assure adequate consideration of floodplains. And continued in that same area, the Arizona site is not situated within any adjacent, or adjacent to any major river system or floodplains. No NEMA mapping has been done. It continues on. Therefore, there will be no impacts to or encroachments on the floodplains. This, as we all know, is the only site which there will be no impact on the flood-plains. Paleontology of the Arizona is quoted in here as being the least likely to be -- to provide
3 paleontological finds of any of the seven sites. In terms of wetlands, there are no USFWS certified wetlands in the area of the proposed Arizona site. Again, this is the only site where no damage would
4 be caused to any wetlands due to the siting. Potential for soils to shrink and swell, the geo-engineering. The geo-engineering conditions at all sites except Arizona show a moderate to high pro-
5 pensity for soil expansion. I think this is very dangerous considering the shafts that are going down into and below the aquifers at all the other sites.

Infiltration into groundwater. Although it is often said that both Texas and Arizona have rains
6 located above the respective aquifers, Texas has two separate aquifers, as was pointed out in the scope of the hearing in Waxahachie, which I also attended a week ago today. That was pointed out by a professional geologist, and I believe he gave you some written findings on that. My basic point is here, if we are going to -- if there is a need to mitigate, the DOE has a requirement to mitigate, why
7 not put it at the site where there is no mitigation required? Why go through all the hassles of mitigating when you can locate it in Arizona and not have to mitigate anything? Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

DR. NELSEN: Mr. Mothershead, could I ask you a clarifying question here? Go back to the microphone, please. Your first point about the intensive archaeological survey, I think I missed that.

MR. MOTHERSHEAD: Do you want the areas in that?

DR. NELSEN: Yes, could you repeat that briefly what you said?

8 MR. MOTHERSHEAD: Sure. Basically what I was saying was that the archaeological surveys of the sites, and I'm quoting from environmental consequences and mitigative measures, 5191, and it states here that the Arizona portions of the collider range be constructed by cut-and-cover have been intensely surveyed. Then it goes on. The Illinois site, also locations of the proposed facilities, have been surveyed. However, others were not studied due to circumstances of poor visibility or limited access, and a reconnaissance level survey, archaeological survey has been undertaken at the proposed Tennessee SSC site, and no project-related archaeological field survey has taken place at the proposed Michigan, North Carolina or Texas sites. A sample survey was provided in Colorado of the proposed roadways to the site.

DR. NELSEN: And your comment is to bring out that.

MR. MOTHERSHEAD: My comment is to bring out that Arizona has obviously provided much more detailed archaeological information than any of the other sites. If we are to start as a basis of mitigating any of the environmental impacts that would be imparted on the archaeological or paleontological findings, then with the basis already given by Arizona, much less -- and much less worrisome problems will occur here than in any other site.

DR. NELSEN: Thank you.

MR. MOTHERSHEAL: Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to once again need to change the tapes and the recording system. So we will be recess for five minutes. (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. EIGUREN: We will formally reconvene the public hearings on the Superconducting Super Collider project, being held on Monday, October 3, in Tempe, Arizona. At this point in time we are moving down a list of individuals who have registered at the door to comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, and just so that you know, we have nine individuals yet to comment this afternoon. The next commenter is scheduled to be Jim Oxley.

655 STATEMENT OF JIM OXLEY

MR. OXLEY: Dr. Temple, Mr. Moderator, panel, my name is Jim Oxley. I am an assistant state engineer, Arizona Department of Transportation in charge of design. My comments have been presented by a paper to your staff. I will amplify on those comments somewhat in the matter of the issue in the Environmental Statement involving traffic disruption. There is what appears to be somewhat erroneous information regarding traffic disruption on Interstate 8. By virtue of building this project they suggest that there will be a traffic problem. This is not the case. In the supplement, Part IV, it suggests that Interstate 8 currently operates at level of service A. In the 20-year project it will continue to operate at level of service A. For your information, there is a six-stage measurement of level of service, listed as A, B, C, D, E and F. Level of service D is your normal design criteria for a 20-year
1 projection. You will note in the Environmental Impact that it states Interstate 8 operates at level of service A. It would thus stand to reason that at level of service A there is no real traffic disruption, as it so states in the summary. It further states in the summary that the local traffic will be disrupted during the course of construction, and suggests that the level of service would drop on State Route 238 to level of service B. Again, I point out that there are six levels of service. The norm for a 20-year projection is level of service D. Again, the level of service is such that you can expect little or no disruption. The draft suggests that there will be a stoppage of rail traffic during construction of crossings. We have never stopped rail traffic in Arizona to construct a crossing. Either rail traffic is routed through shoe flies or is carried through construction, albeit under peak speed. That particular isolated stretch of track, the trains do move rather rapidly. Overhead crossing as would be considered in the near future would be built under traffic with no disruptions of rail traffic. What this suggests is that perhaps the impacts upon the local transportation system are minimal or none during the course of the development of this project. We would suggest further that though there are two maps, one showing connections directly to Interstate 8 and to the south, ring roads, this would not be the case. Under the Federal Highway Administration rules and regulations, you cannot connect at arbitrary points to an interstate system, but only through designated interchange sites. We have selected Fremont interchange as the single site to make that connection, so there would be no traffic hazard in any way. The Department of Transportation has committed, along with Maricopa County, some considerable money for developing this bridge system. For the start-up of the site, we have included a four-lane connector road that will interchange to the campus site, which was not noted in the Environ-
2 mental Statement. Any other comments would be in my written remarks.

MR. EIGUREN: Mr. Oxley just a question for clarification of the record. You indicated that written comments have or will be sent?

MR. OXLEY: Have.

MR. EIGUREN: Have been sent by the State Department of Transportation?

MR. OXLEY: I delivered them to the front door.

MR. EIGUREN: Very good. Thank you. We appreciate that.

MR. OXLEY: Thank you.

DR. NELSEN: Mr. Oxley, do your comments include the specifics on, for example, the level of service that focus on the data presented in the DEIS, the number of vehicles, or on the methodology?

MR. OXLEY: The EIS comments on level of service, without discussing how level of service is arrived at or what it means. The level of service criteria set by the Ashto organization, and is a measure of traffic flow. There is not any comment in the written comments that I've provided to explain. It is all part of your Ashto criteria that's available in any library including the school here. So I didn't

expand on that further. But to give you a mental picture, level of service A means that you can pretty much drive at your leisure, choosing lanes and speed within the law that you can operate. Conversely, level of service D, which is our normal 20-year design level, means some level of congestion where you would not have a free choice always to pick the speed and the lane you wish to be in. They are just alphabetical numbers given to traffic flow conditions.

DR. NELSEN: You may have misinterpreted my question a bit. What I was focusing more on is not what is meant by the level of service, but what was meant by your comment with regard to the designation of level of service in the DEIS? Did your comment focus on how that was arrived at in the DEIS?

MR. OXLEY: No. The Interstate 8 level of service listed was level of service A, which was correct. In the summary, they suggested that we were going to have a disruptive problem. It is somewhat countered by the -- what is it, Chapter 4, Volume IV, Appendix 14, and the data provided there is somewhat contrary to the data provided in the summary.

DR. NELSEN: Okay, so the summary did not properly--in your view, the summary did not properly summarize what was in the Appendix.

MR. OXLEY: That's correct.

MR. EIGUREN: Okay. Further questions? Thank you, Mr. Oxley. We appreciate that. Our next scheduled commenter is Guido Ardaya.

653 STATEMENT OF GUIDO ARDAYA

MR. ARDAYA: Good afternoon, Dr. Temple and members of the panel. My name is Guido Ardaya, Maricopa County Community Development Agency, 111 South Third Avenue, Phoenix. I am the principal economic planner for the Maricopa County Community Development Agency, and also I am in charge of the environmental review of all community development block projects that we found. As an economic planner and environmental officer, I am very well aware of the necessity to balance economic development with environmental conditions. I'm here to offer you comments that offered through Dr. Wilmot Hess, who is the chairman of the Office of Energy Research at the United States Department of Energy. I offered my comments in a letter sent to him on September 27, 1988. The key comments that I sent him were as follows. Our overall conclusion is that the EIS draft is a well-written, structured and documentary report. The facts appear to be balanced throughout. The document reinforces the position of the Maricopa County SSC site as it clearly demonstrates the excellence of the technical and environmental characteristics of the area in which the SSC has been proposed. It is clear that the Arizona site will demand less land acquisition of private property, or acquisition of private property itself, than the other contending states. This is an important point to consider, because massive land acquisition can be time-consuming, disruptive, and have a negative social impact on the community. Also climate, meteorological conditions and the availability of materials, equipment and labor force favor the selection of Arizona. One can derive the ecological impact on Arizona is not significant, and that mitigation measures will be implemented throughout the project, to reduce habitat loss. The impact on farm land is limited, and no wetlands will be disturbed. Furthermore, Arizona has had recent experience in major infrastructure construction, such as the Palos Verde nuclear generating station, and the Colorado-Arizona project with its tunneling expertise. The Phoenix metro area compares favorably with the other sites when one deals with the accelerated population and economic development in Arizona, as well as quality of life factors. It has been calculated or has been calculated that Maricopa County alone is going to double in population, in labor force and employment by the year 2010.

Air quality at the site is excellent. The Arizona site offers opportunities for solar energy utilization. However, solar energy is not addressed in the study. Another factor which is not considered in the study, but which is important is the location of the site in the southwestern portion of the United States, as it relates to the Pacific Rim area. We are encouraged that the socio-economic and infrastructure analysis on page 111 of Volume IV, Appendix 5a of 16, will be strengthened, particularly when discussing the future completion of Maricopa County's freeway system. It is important to note that ever since a half-cent sales tax was approved to complete a multibillion dollar highway network in Maricopa County, I think we're going to see approximately 230 more miles of highway within Maricopa County within the next 20 years. It is also valuable to mention that Phoenix Sky Harbor is an international airport. The study does not refer to the airport as an international airport. And Phoenix International Airport is one of the busiest in the nation -- actually it's the ninth in importance. On the same page with respect to airport operations, we need verification as aviation delay figures might have changed recently due to competition among airline companies, which may have resulted in a more efficient aviation system. Furthermore, characteristics for the Phoenix Goodyear airport should be expanded, due to its original importance in western Maricopa County. The Goodyear Airport is primary in the State of Arizona in importance, after Phoenix and Tucson. Additionally, we find that the two air force bases, Luke Air Force Base and Williams Air Force Base, should be mentioned in the report, due to the significance in Maricopa County. In concluding --

MR. EIGUREN: Your time has expired, go ahead.

MR. ARDAYA: I am requesting that my comments be recorded and included in the EIS report. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. We appreciate that.

DR. NELSEN: Mr. Ardaya, did you say you are employed by the county as a planner?

MR. ARDAYA: Pardon?

DR. NELSEN: You are employed as

MR. ARDAYA: I'm an employee of Maricopa County.

DR. NELSEN: Thank you. These comments are on behalf of the agency, is that correct sir?

MR. ARDAYA: Yes.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you very much. I want to include for the record the comments of Guido Ardaya on behalf of Maricopa County Community Development Agency. The next commenter is Scott Mills.

654 STATEMENT OF DR. SCOTT MILLS

DR. MILLS: I am Dr. Scott Mills. My address is 5620 North Kolb Road, that's K-O-L-B, in Tucson, and I'm here representing the environmental consulting firm of SWCA, Inc. Our company has been involved with the Arizona SSC project for more than two years. Our major involvement was assisting in the preparation of the environmental section of the proposal for the Siarita site. In addition, we have visited the Maricopa site, met with State and Federal resource agencies, environmental groups, and reviewed numerous drafts of the environmental section of the Maricopa proposal and proposals from the other states now being considered for the SSC. We have reviewed the environmental and cultural resource sections of the DEIS and would like to provide the following comments. Overall, the DEIS appears to present a reasonable evaluation of the environmental and cultural resources of each site. However, the amount of information provided for each site varies widely. The greatest disparity appears to exist between the Arizona and Texas sites. Arizona clearly appeared to provide the most complete assessment of any of the states being considered. My company feels the decision should be made on the greatest amount of information that can be gathered, and we strongly encourage the Arizona SSC team to identify and assess as many environmental impacts as possible as early as possible. It has been our experience that a lack of information usually leads to worst case speculation. Given the limited time period available, we think the Arizona team did an excellent job in presenting a fair assessment of environmental impacts that would be caused by the SSC. However, after reading the DEIS, we are concerned that the limited amount of text devoted to potential environmental issues for a number of other sites gives the impression of pure impacts, rather than insufficient information. We trust that our recommendations to provide a fair, detailed assessment of impacts will not be misinterpreted as an indication that the Arizona site will have the greatest impact on the environment. We found a number of errors in the DEIS pertaining to environmental impacts on the Arizona site. I believe most of these have been included in the comments provided by the Arizona SSC project technical committee, but I would like to mention a few in the time I have today. Requirements of the Arizona Native Plant law have been misinterpreted. Mitigation for the disturbance of native plants covered under the law is not required, as stated in Appendix 5, and at various other places in the DEIS. All that is required is notification of the Arizona Commission of Agriculture and Horticulture prior to removal of these plants. We do, however, recommend salvage of native plants and revegetation of areas disturbed during construction, and it is our understanding that such mitigation is planned.

Secondly, Federal statuses of the number of species are used inconsistently and sometimes incorrectly, and population status of the study area is often lacking. Gila monster is incorrectly listed as a category 1 species in Table 4-17, though correctly as a category 2 species in Appendix 11. Wiggin's cholla is incorrectly listed as a category 3 species, which means that it's been dropped from consideration in Appendix 11, though it is likely it soon will be downlisted from its category 2 status. In keeping with the liberal inclusion of any listed species that might occur in the area of the site, peregrine falcon and bald eagle should be included in Table 4-17, Federally Listed and Candidate Species, as well as in Table 4-18, State-Protected Species. It would be better to title these in corresponding tables from other sites, Species That May Occur. It should be made clear which species breed or winter and which are just casual migrants. Swainson's hawk is identified as a migrant only in the Arizona site in Chapter 5, but not in Chapter 4 or Appendix 11. The statement made in Chapter 4 that ecosystems within drainages behave as a series of islands of biological productivity in the sea or desert pavement, overemphasizes the differences between riparian and upland habitats at the Arizona site. Riparian habitats in this area are poorly developed compared with those in many areas with greater rainfall or drainage. Productivity in many areas of the upland subdivision of Sonoran desert scrub are as high or higher than that along washes in the lower Colorado subdivision. It is doubtful whether any of these riparian habitats in the area would be considered woodlands. We disagree with two statements in Appendix 11 concerning water resources in desert areas. The statement in 11.3.1 that creating new water resources can become an attractive nuisance for wildlife which will disturb predator/prey relationships, change exploitation of food resources and increase competition with species not indigenous to the desert is very misleading. Native-water dependent habitats have decreased dramatically in recent years; creation of new ones is desirable. As long as vegetation around water sources is limited to native species, virtually no exotic animals will be likely to colonize these new habitats. The Arizona

Game and Fish Department and the Bureau of Land Management have been creating water sources in desert habitats for years for the benefit of native wildlife. Creation of water sources with associated native riparian vegetation could be an extremely effective wildlife mitigation method. However, availability of permanent water is not a principle limiting factor for the population density of many bird species, as stated in this section. The visual impacts of the campus and injector facility may not be as significant as suggested in Appendix 16, because of the existence of nearby town, freeway and agricultural field which already disrupt the natural look of the landscape. The campus and injector facilities will be no more visible or visually dominating than those existing man-made features. Construction of the SSC will not disrupt the pristine landscape as implied in the DEIS. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

MR. MAYES: Dr. Mills? I recognize many of your comments as being in the State package. Were there some additional comments that you offered in your oral testimony?

DR. MILLS: No.

MR. MAYES: So that most of your --

DR. MILLS: These I have submitted at the desk, so you have them, and I don't know which of these, if any, are in that.

MR. MAYES: Okay, yes. Some of them were definitely.

DR. MILLS: You've got them all at one place or the other.

MR. MAYES: Okay, thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you Dr. Mills. I next call John Olson.

831 STATEMENT OF JOHN OLSON

MR. OLSON: Good afternoon, gentlemen. My name is John Olson. I'm a fourth-generation Arizona native. My family's been here a long time and as pioneers, I'm very glad to have the opportunity to offer my support to the Arizona Maricopa site. As an indication of support from landowners in the surrounding area, I'd like to read that Arizonans for the Superconducting Super Collider here have signed a petition. We, the undersigned owners of land in Maricopa County, Arizona, near the Maricopa site, fully support the U.S. Department of Energy's Superconducting Super Collider project and its attempt to locate the SSC at the best qualified site, and believe that Arizona's Maricopa site is the best qualified location for the SSC. We believe the U.S. DOE draft Environmental Impact Statement clearly demonstrates that the Maricopa site is the ideal location for the Superconducting Super Collider, and I have a petition here from owners of approximately 5,000 acres. Thank you.

/ DR. NELSEN: Mr. Olson? Are these landowners, landowners in the area, are they the ones that maybe were identified in the draft EIS as--

MR. OLSON: There will be some, yes, because those owners there within about 0 to 3 miles of the site, in the Maricopa County area, just to the east of the Super Collider beam belt.

DR. NELSEN: Okay, so they're all identified as very close or--

MR. OLSON: Well, they're very close but they may not be -- perhaps not all of them will be involved in land that will be necessary for the Super Collider. However, I'd like to further offer that on any of the land that I own, if I can convince the rest of my partners, we will be able to give gratis the -- any easement or any right of way within reason, to Arizona, so that they can do what they have to do at the Super Collider. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Okay, thank you Mr. Olson. We'll include the petition that you've given me as a part of the official record of the proceeding. I would note that the petition includes 21 signatures and does have their addresses as well as telephones and the location of the property as it relates to boundary descriptions. Our next commenter is Wes Olowski.

832 STATEMENT OF WES OLOWSKI

MR. OLOWSKI: I'm Wes Olowski of 464 West Cherry Linn, and I am proud as a directly impacted property owner, I want to say I'm both honored and humbled and delighted to be a humble, small part of this
/ marvelous endeavor, and I was never asked to sign that petition, and yet I think they're chopping off about 100 of my 317 acres to the east of the campus. So you know I'm for it, whether I'm on that thing or not. Okay?

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. The next commenter is Paul Scheidig.

833 STATEMENT OF PAUL SCHEIDIG

MR. SCHEIDIG: Good afternoon gentlemen. My name's Paul Scheidig. I'm ombudsman for the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, and on behalf of the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality I wish to thank you for this opportunity to comment, and correct a few errors that we noted in the DEIS. The Department of Environmental Quality is the State's regulatory agency that has its mission to protect and preserve the water quality, air quality and soils in Arizona. In carrying out that charge, we oversee a various number of permit systems and regulatory programs. In that regard, we gave the DEIS a thorough review and found generally no problems or environmental impacts that would be troublesome or would prevent the Department from carrying out its environmental responsibilities. However, there are a few errors as I mentioned earlier that we noted in the DEIS that I'd like to point out and potentially have them corrected. It errs in not providing a more favorable assessment of Arizona's ability to fully protect the environment and meet the waste water and hazardous, industrial and solid waste needs. In particular, Appendix 10, Section 3.3.1, Sewage, on page 107, the DEIS incorrectly referenced a statement from my letter of March 11, 1988, by stating that the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality believes that Arizona's proposal for sewage treatment would not be acceptable because it does not include a tertiary treatment system. This reference to my statement in my letter is an error, and the Arizona proposal to install two aerating operating ponds for effluent is quite acceptable, and provides a good wastewater treatment system. That letter of March 11, 1988, by the way, was amended on April 28, 1988 to emphasize this aspect that was overlooked as a qualifying reference. I will include that as an attachment to our written comments that will be sent shortly. The bottom line is that a tertiary treatment system is certainly unnecessary for the SSC facility. It's not needed and would only add to the already heavy cost of constructing that facility. Also, in Appendix 10, Section 3.3.2, solid waste, on page 117, the DEIS again misinterpreted my letter of March 11, 1988, by stating that "DEQ strongly recommended that an on-site landfill be provided." The Department suggested that an on-site municipal solid waste landfill would be possible to permit and is an available option. However, other current and future offsite solid waste disposal facilities are viable options as well. No special emphasis was ever intended by the Department of Environmental Quality towards an on-site disposal option. In addition, on the issue of waste disposal, the DEIS fails to emphasize the disposal benefits that will accrue to the SSC site by having the Arizona hazardous waste management facility within the influence of the SSC ring near Mobile, Arizona. The Arizona hazardous waste management facility will be available to fully meet the needs of the SSC site for all of its nonionizing hazardous and industrial waste. Moreover, the State's investment in this facility should provide additional infrastructure benefits to the SSC project. In closing, the State and the Department of Environmental Quality are excited about the SSC project in Arizona. DEQ stands ready to assist in any way to ensure that the SSC project can meet its environmental protection responsibilities.

MR. EIGUREN: Just one clarifying question. You indicated that your March 11 letter was modified by a subsequent letter?

MR. SCHEIDIG: Subsequent letter on April 28th, yes sir.

MR. EIGUREN: April 28th, okay. And that will be sent for the record?

MR. SCHEIDIG: Yes sir. I will attach that to our written comments here.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Appreciate that. The next commenter is Louis Thanukos.

664 STATEMENT OF LOUIS THANUKOS

MR. THANUKOS: Dr. Temple, member of the panel. I am Louis Thanukos, project manager for Applied Environmental Consultants. My address is 500 West Broadway Road, Tempe, Arizona 85382. Our company prepared the information requested by the Department of Energy for evaluating the impact of the SSC on background noise and air quality. We have reviewed the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Arizona SSC site and we've found several discrepancies. I would like to highlight what I feel is a major discrepancy which should be corrected. I'd like to first of all state that the majority of the air quality data which we supplied was not included in the preparation of the draft EIS. We assumed that this was due to the tremendous effort necessary to prepare the EIS, and also due to the time constraints under which it had to be prepared. One of the data sets, however, which was not considered and which produced serious and erroneous consequences, is the carbon monoxide data collected at the Sierra Estrellas Airport. The draft EIS gives worst-case carbon monoxide measurements in the Phoenix metropolitan area to represent background conditions at the SSC site. Use of the Phoenix data to represent SSC background conditions is inappropriate, because Phoenix is a major, urban metropolitan area, whereas the SSC site is a rural, undeveloped area. Furthermore, Phoenix and the SSC site are separated approximately 30 miles apart, with the Sierra Estrellas mountains and the Finni [sic] top mountain interposed between them. The carbon monoxide measurements at the Sierra Estrellas Airport provide a better representation of background conditions at the SSC site. The Sierra Estrellas Airport is located approximately 7 miles from the SSC ring, and is in a rural environment similar to the SSC site.

Measurements at this location were used to establish background conditions for the SSC for sulphur dioxide, natural dioxide, ozone and total suspended particulate. There is no reason why measurements at this same location cannot be used to establish background carbon monoxide conditions at the SSC site.

Years of worst case Phoenix carbon monoxide concentrations will indicate that emissions from the SSC activity will produce violations of the carbon monoxide national ambient air quality standards. The fallacy of these calculations are recognized in the appendices of the draft EIS, and I will quote paragraphs 5 and 6 at page 12, Volume IV, Appendix 8. "These high backgrounds of CO are not characteristic of the proposed SSC sites in Arizona, Michigan, North Carolina and Tennessee, each of which is rural. Actual site CO concentrations are expected to be much lower than that estimated. The national ambient air quality standard CO violations are not expected. The impact of SSC site to CO emissions is negligible on the metropolitan area's air quality because (1) these are low CO emission rates and (2) the sites are relatively distant from the metropolitan center." These are -- this is information in the appendices. However, in the main body of the EIS there is no such mention of these qualifiers. Again I'll quote page 37 of Section 3.7.4, which states: "Arizona, Michigan, North Carolina and Tennessee will have regional incidences of national ambient air quality and carbon monoxide limits resulting from SSC-related emissions." Thus, unless one reads the entire document, including the appendices, one is left with an erroneous conclusion that emissions from the facility will produce violations of ambient standards. We thus urge the Department of Energy to take the following actions when preparing the final EIS. (1) Use measurements at the Sierra Estrellas Airport for background conditions at the SSC site, and (2) if for some reason this data cannot be used, then to modify the language in the body of the EIS to include the quotation specified in the appendices, which would acknowledge the calculated exceedances of CO standards would not occur. I have a written statement of these documents. I would also like to take this opportunity to present a final report titled "Summary of Ambient Particulate Measurements in the Vicinity of the Maricopa SSC Site." This document contains the bulk of the measurements which were made and previously submitted to the Department of Energy. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

DR. NELSEN: Mr. Thanukos, the summary of ambient particulate, that reference you made, does this contain the same data that was provided prior or --

MR. THANUKOS: It contains, I believe, all the measurements up to March 15 which were submitted at that time. It also contains about a month and a half of measurements when the program was completed, through May 1st.

DR. NELSEN: Okay, and the author of that document is --

MR. THANUKOS: Applied Environmental Consultants.

DR. NELSEN: Okay, thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Include for the record two separate documents, the documents that were provided to us. One is the cover letter that he spoke of and then the second is the final report, prepared by Applied Environmental Consultants, a Summary of Ambient Particulate Measurements in the Vicinity of the Maricopa SSC Site, dated June 27, 1988. Thank you. Our next scheduled commenter is Glenn Rice.

834 STATEMENT OF GLENN RICE

MR. RICE: Dr. Temple and members of the panel. My name is Glenn Rice, I'm a faculty member in the Department of Anthropology at Arizona State University, and I'm the archaeologist and director of the study of historic and prehistoric sites at the Maricopa SSC site. I want to begin by congratulating the EIS team for drawing together a well-organized and coherent document. This was clearly a monumental undertaking that required the compilation of vast quantities of data from many different sources. I do have a few problems, however, regarding the presentation of the archaeological and historical data for the Maricopa site. I'm concerned that the EIS does not adequately recognize the amount of information on cultural resources that is currently available for the Maricopa site. Field surveys have been conducted of nearly 5,000 acres of the Maricopa site. This includes all of the campus areas and all portions of the ring that will be impacted by cut-and-fill construction. The State Historic Preservation Office has suggested, and in conversations with me, that archaeological surveys will not be required for the tunnel portions of the ring. Therefore, we have archaeological data for all portions of the project area that we know will receive direct impact. There may be a need for additional surveys during the design phase when precise locations for roads are known and spoil to those areas. But with respect to historic and prehistoric resources, the Maricopa site contains no surprises. There are 17 sites, 10 historic and 7 prehistoric, for which a mitigation program will be required. The data on historic and prehistoric sites, presented in appendices, are consistent with the information that we have compiled and provided for the study team. However, we feel that the draft EIS summary contains errors of fact and presents data that are not substantiated by the data appendices or by our own studies. The errors in the EIS consistently minimize the low impact quality of the Maricopa location. In a state of large and complex historic and prehistoric sites, the 10 historic homesteads and the 7 prehistoric camps in the Maricopa location constitute an easily managed resource base. These problems in the draft EIS are discussed in comments that have been submitted by the Arizona SSC study team. I would also like to close by submitting the archaeological survey report that fully documents the scientific data we have previously provided the EIS team. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. We will receive for inclusion in the record a document entitled Archaeological Survey of the Maricopa SSC Site, in draft form, by four separate authors including Glenn Rice, who was the presentor here. It's dated July 1988. I'm informed by the court reporter that we need to take a brief recess to change the tapes. We'll be in recess for five minutes. (Off the record.)

MR. EIGUREN: We will resume this hearing held on October 3, 1988 in Tempe, Arizona to receive public comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Superconducting Super Collider project. We had one additional individual on our list to comment this afternoon, F. Willard. I am told by the registration desk personnel that he has now cancelled. So, that being the case, I would ask if there's anybody in the room who has not commented that has registered to comment and has not had the opportunity, if they would like to step forward at this point. According to my records, there should not be anybody in that category. We have gone through a list of 20 commenters for this session. That being the case, we are going to, since the hour is not quite 5:00, but about 4:20, the hearing panel will remain here until 5:00 in the event that someone else should arrive and would like to receive comment. But assuming that that will not be the case, we will go ahead and formally bring this hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement to a close. On behalf of the hearing panel and the Department of Energy, we thank you for your attendance this afternoon. We do appreciate the comments. I think they are very thoughtful and deliberative and to the point and will be very useful in developing the record of this proceeding for the Secretary to review in his final decision-making on the selection of a site for the SSC. As Dr. Temple mentioned earlier, the Secretary will -- the record in this proceeding will close on the 17th of October and once the final record is complete, the Secretary will begin his deliberations in reviewing both the environmental as well as other documentations associated with this decision. His decision will be made, I believe, in November. A final EIS is scheduled for release in December and the record of the decision is scheduled to be completed in January. So, with that, we will be down here until the hour of 5:00 in case someone else does show up. But at this point in time, we will go ahead and formally adjourn this, the hearing held on October 3, 1988 in Tempe, on the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 4:20 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.)

SECOND SESSION

(October 3, 1988: 7:00 p.m.)

DR. TEMPLE: Good afternoon. My name is Ed Temple, and I am the Executive Director of the SSC Site Task Force. I am also the presiding official for this hearing. The purpose of my brief remarks is to tell you why we're all here. After my remarks I will ask our session moderator, Mr. Eiguren, to outline how we will conduct our meeting this afternoon. The purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens an opportunity to comment in person on the Department's draft EIS on the SSC. This hearing is not your only opportunity, you may also send us your written comments, which must be postmarked by October 17, 1988. We want you to know that we are sincerely interested in hearing your comments on this document. And that each of your comments will be considered and responded to in the final EIS.

Let me refresh your memories regarding the SSC site selection process. In January, 1987, President Reagan's decision to proceed with the SSC was announced, and construction funds were requested from Congress. In April of 1987, the Department issued an invitation for site proposals. We subsequently received 43 proposals, and 36 of these were found to be qualified.

These qualified proposals were forwarded to the National Academies of Science and the National Academy of Engineering, where a joint committee used the criteria set forth in the invitation and recommended a Best Qualified List of eight sites to the Department in December of last year. One of these proposals was later withdrawn by the proposer. Following the review and verification of the Academy's recommendations, Secretary Herrington announced the Best Qualified List, including the Arizona proposal, on January 19 of 1988. Three days later, on January 22, the DOE formally announced that it would develop an environmental impact statement on the proposed SSC. This followed an advanced notice of intent to prepare an EIS which had been issued in May of 1987. In February 1988 we held scoping meeting in each of the seven states, to obtain public comment on the nature and scope of environmental issues to be considered in the EIS. Scoping meetings were held on February 9 at this location. The DOE received approximately 2,100 comments on the scope of the EIS. These comments were considered in the preparation of the draft EIS. Following public hearings here and in the other BLQ states, we will develop a final EIS to be issued in December of 1988.

The draft EIS evaluates and compares four types of alternatives, site alternatives, technical alternatives, programmatic alternatives, and the no-action alternative. Site alternatives addressed the seven locations identified on the BQL. Technical alternatives considered different technology, different equipment, or different facility configurations. Programmatic alternatives included possibility of using other accelerators, international collaboration, or project delay. And the no-action alternative meant the option not to construct the SSC.

This draft EIS identifies and analyzes the potential and environmental consequences expected to occur from siting, constructing and operating the SSC at the seven site alternatives. The sites are located in Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee and Texas. The draft EIS provides as much information as possible at this stage of budget development regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed construction and operation of the SSC at each of the seven alternative sites. However, the DOE recognizes that further review under NEPA is appropriate, prior to the actual construction and operation of the proposed SSC. Accordingly, following selection of the site for the proposed SSC, the DOE will prepare a supplement to this EIS, to address in more detail the impacts of constructing and operating the proposed SSC at the selected site and to identify, where possible, alternatives for mitigating these impacts.

Let me tell you a little about the draft EIS. This is a large document containing more than 4,000 pages. It is organized into four volumes. Volume I is entitled Environmental Impact Statement, Volume II is the Comment Resolution Document, and is reserved for our response to public comment, and for publication in the final EIS only. Volume III describes the methodology for site selection, and Volume IV contains 16 appendices providing detailed presentations of technical information, which back up the conclusions in the Environmental Impact Statement. Comments received at this hearing will be used by the DOE to prepare a final EIS to be issued this December. This document will identify the Department's preferred site. No sooner than 30 days after the final EIS is distributed, the Department will publish its record of decision, which will include the final site selection and complete site selection process. This afternoon we will use a professional moderator to assure a fair and orderly proceeding. Measures have been taken to permit the maximum opportunity for interested citizens to utilize this session for expressing their comments.

We urge all participants in today's meeting to focus their comments on the draft EIS, and to avoid or minimize statements aimed solely at expressing opposition or support for the state's proposal. While all comments will become a part of the formal record of this proceeding, those specifically representing the draft EIS will be most useful to the DOE in preparing the final document. As I noted earlier, in addition to this opportunity for oral comments, individuals may also provide written comments to the DOE. These should be post marked by October 17, 1988, the end of the formal 45-day comment period, to ensure they will be considered in the preparation of the final EIS. We will, however, consider comments received after that date, to the extent possible.

One final word on the role of the EIS on the site selection process. The National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, requires that environmental impacts be considered by Federal decision makers in taking major federal actions with potential environmental consequences. The EIS is one of the methods used to do this analysis, provide for public comment and participation, and to make a final decision that meets the NEPA requirements. The EIS will be considered by the Secretary in making the site selection. Thank you in advance for your interest and participation.

Let me now introduce Mr. Eiguren, who will describe how we will conduct today's session.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you Dr. Temple. Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is Ray Eiguren, I'm an attorney in private practice with the law firm of Lindsay, Hart, Neil & Weigler, which has offices in Seattle, Washington; Portland, Oregon; San Francisco, California; and Boise, Idaho. My practice, and that of our law firm is heavily concentrated in the areas of environmental and energy law. Both in private practice, as well as in prior governmental service, I've had over a decade's worth of experience in either conducting or helping participate in a significant number of national environmental policy act hearings, such as the one we're conducting here today. I've been retained by the Department of Energy as moderator for this and other hearings in this series, for one express purpose, that is to say my single express purpose is to serve as an independent unbiased, objective, individual to moderate the hearings. I'm not an employee for the Department, nor am I an advocate for or against the Department's proposed action in the proceeding. My role is to help assure that the Department fully complies with the letter and spirit of the Federal National Environmental Policy Act, so as to allow all individuals and organizations fair and equal opportunity to comment on the record relative to the Department's proposed action. Dr. Temple stated the purpose of this hearing is to give all interested citizens an opportunity to comment on the record, relative to the Department of Energy's draft Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed SSC project.

In February, the Department conducted, and I also moderated, a scoping meeting here in this auditorium, to hear comments from individuals and organizations on what issues they felt should be considered in the preparation of the draft EIS. Now that the Department has prepared the draft EIS, it seeks comment from the public, once again, on it. In particular, we are seeking specific comment on issues that members of the public feel are relevant and should be considered by the Department prior to finalizing the EIS, and prior to the Department selecting its preferred site for the SSC.

This is a record proceeding, that is to say, everything that is being said at this, as well as the other draft EIS hearing held in other states still under consideration, are being recorded by court reporters. And we obviously have a court reporter here. The court reporter will make a verbatim transcript of all comments received and submit that transcript to the Department of Energy for inclusion in the final record of the proceeding. The Secretary of Energy's decision will be based upon the information contained in that record.

At this time I would like to tell you what procedures we have been following, and will follow today, in the conduct of this, as well as other hearings in this proceeding. I will announce speakers working from a list provided to me by the Department of Energy personnel, located at the registration table out in the lobby. I will call speakers in the order in which they signed up in advance. If you have pre-registered to speak, but have not checked in at the registration table, we'd ask you to do that. Every individual who was commenting will have up to five minutes with which to make that comment. At the end of five minutes I will signal individual speakers that their time has elapsed. As stated earlier, the purpose of this hearing is to receive comments on the draft EIS. Accordingly your comments should be focused on the issues that are addressed in the draft document. I do reserve the right to ask individuals to focus on issues contained in the draft EIS, if they wander from the topic of the session. It's not my intention to limit remarks, but rather to assure that what comments you do provide are effective in achieving the objectives of this hearing as outlined by Dr. Temple. Written comment and oral comment will receive the same weight in the record of the proceeding. Therefore we will encourage you to submit written comment as well as any written questions you may have about the project, either before the presentation or after your presentation, or any time prior to October 17, which is the close of the record in this proceeding. There is, at the registration table, a business card such as this, that will give you the address where you will send your written questions or comment.

There's also a toll-free number listed on there where you can call for additional information. This session will run from 7:00 and continue on until approximately 10:00 p.m. Throughout the course of the hearing, in order to allow the court reporter to change tapes as well as allow members of the audience to take a rest, we'll have brief recesses throughout the course of the hearings. Approximately 30 minutes before the scheduled end of this session, I will call any speakers who registered at the door to testify; given the fact that we have such a relatively small number of pre-registered commenters, I will be calling individuals who registered to comment at the door earlier than that. Again, the same rules would apply to them. That is to say when it comes your turn to speak, after your name has been called, we would ask you to step forward to the microphone here in the front, give us your name and address, and give us the name of any organization that you might be speaking on behalf of, and then go ahead and proceed into your oral comment.

I will begin timing you for your five-minute limitation after you've made your brief introduction. Finally, I'd like to indicate that the members of the panel who were here with me in the front of the room are here for the express purpose of listening to your comments, and as appropriate, asking clarifying questions on your [copy missing].

The purpose of your doing that is to help assure that we build a complete and full record of your concerns relative to the environmental issues associated with the SSC project. With me on the panel is Dr. Temple, who is a presiding official. He is the Executive Director of the SSC Site Selection Task Force for the Department of Energy. To my left and your right are Dr. Roger Mase and Dr. Jerry Nelsen who are environmental specialists with the Department of Energy, who were senior environmental specialists assigned to this particular project. (Technical difficulty)

MR. EIGUREN: We have resolved our technical difficulties, and we are able now to resume the hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Our first scheduled commenter is Chris Trask.

665 STATEMENT OF CHRIS TRASK

MR. TRASK: My name is Chris Trask, and I am here representing the Sierra Club, the Grand Canyon Chapter. The address is Post Office Box 25240, Tempe, Arizona 85285.

MR. EIGUREN: Mr. Trask, we are having difficulty hearing you. (Pause.)

1 MR. TRASK: Gentlemen, on behalf of the Sierra Vista Sierra Club, I wish to express our appreciation in having the opportunity to participate in the Department of Energy's review of the draft Environmental Impact Statement of the Superconducting Super Collider. We have the reviewed the DEIS in its entirety with respect to the Maricopa site, and we have prepared the following comments for your consideration. We will cover four of the five issues that were commented on previously at the scoping hearing of 9 February as one well as one additional. These issues are water, wildlife, vegetation, sewage management and archaeological. We shall address each of these issues in turn.

We would like to make it clear that the Sierra Club has not yet taken a final position on this proposed project. We are, however, eager to see additional information regarding the environmental concerns that we will mention herein. First off, water issues. We noticed immediately that the allocation of the central Arizona project water has been dropped from consideration, and it is now proposed that the project's water requirements will be brought entirely from the North Valley. Although it is stated
2 that the use of this water represents the major impact to natural resources at the Maricopa site, very little in the line of estimates for the impact of the depth of water presently estimated at over 350 feet are presented. The continued operation of range improvements such as stock tanks serviced by windmill driven pumps would be affected should the water table be lowered by any appreciable amount.

This is an impact to the local economic community that does not appear to have been taken into consideration. The amount of water to be used by SSC, estimated to be from 1,350 gallons per minute over the life of the project to 2,450 gallons per minute during the operations phase, is of some concern.
3 Although the statement uses the former figure in comparison with the estimated annual recharge rate of 1,200 to 2,200 acre feet per year, it mentions only briefly the fact that the withdrawal rate during the operational phase is nearly double that of the lifetime rate. The possibility of an overdraft of the aquifer is well advised. Such an accelerated discharge rate will certainly result in a significant although localized lowering of the water table.

We highly encourage the recycling of water for nonpotable uses as a means of reducing the demands on the aquifer. The reuse of cooler blowdown plus brine concentrators and sewage treatment are all in
4 good order. But it is very discouraging to find that the DEIS only casually mentions these conservation measures. We fully expect to see a more detailed disclosure of the practice to be used when and if a final EIS is published. In addressing the issue of water quality, we are greatly concerned that the following statement would even exist. From page 5.1.2-26, "At the Arizona site, lack of service water and the great depth to the water table would effectively prevent transport of contaminants into the groundwater." Recent history has proven that even in an arid climate such as ours, such a statement can only be considered as being highly questionable. We only need to consider the recent dis-
5 coveries of trichlorethylene effluents in the communities of Tucson, Phoenix and Scottsdale as well as other industrial and agricultural contaminants in domestic water supplies to realize that such a guarantee is unrealistic. We most certainly hope that this sort of attitude will not prevail, and that the final EIS will contain more suitable strategies for the proper containment and management of such materials that would threaten the quality of a now pristine natural resource. In terms of wildlife issues, we readily note that the forms of impact upon the desert bighorn sheep has been discussed, such as noise, increased human presence, and encroachment in general. It was also mentioned that the sheep population has in general been declining in the State over the last decade. Although the statement does mention the possibilities of mitigating the noise in this area, there seems to be a lack of
6 importance of this matter. Given that this statement recognizes that the noise and other effects of increased human presence will probably have a negative effect upon the already declining sheep population, we can only express disappointment at the apparent lack of concern in this area. We do, however, recognize that some effort can be made to offset the impact on this species as mentioned by way of the placement of water sources and the alteration of fences during the design phase. Inasmuch as protection is not mandated by the Endangered Species Act, the mitigation of negative impacts to this and

other species in the vicinity of SSC are certainly of positive benefit to the biological community in the area. The matter of the desert tortoise appears to be well addressed, being that the Bureau of Land Management has developed guidelines for the mitigation of impacts to this species. It seems to be
7 stated in that statement that the populations are considerably higher in the northern Maricopa Mountains than in the lowlands where the majority of the project activity will be located.

It appears that the impacts are not as great as those to the desert bighorn sheep. However, we expect that a more thorough study of population densities throughout the site will be conducted prior to the
8 initiation of construction. In like manner, it still requires that more information be developed in order to properly estimate the impact to this species. Physical removal and relocation to equally suitable habitats such as with the desert tortoise should be considered as a viable measure.

On the vegetation, we are pleased to note that the statement mentions that the 570 acres not currently disturbed in the construction will be restored and revegetated, and that the dry wash as disturbed by cut-and-fill construction will be restored to their original topography. The use of native plants and the application of nitrogen to plants and algae will greatly enhance and recover these disturbed areas, as well as the stockpiling and restoration of the veneer of top soil at the spoils disposal site. We
9 would like to see that this latter practice be extended to the cut-and-fill areas in general. The statement correctly recognizes the need for these measures by having noted the low productivity of the desert scrub systems in the three subdrainage basins and heavy reliance of these systems on bacterial nitrogen fixation. It is essential to the successful restoration of the impacted communities that these factors continue to be taken into account. We will await the final EIS to review the situation as yet to be determined with respect to the protection of the nightblooming cereus. We expect that this will take the form of collection as subsequent restoration and/or relocation of the affected
10 specimens. In addition, it will be prudent that a more thorough study be made concerning the presence or lack thereof of the tumamoc globeberry.

MR. EIGUREN: Mr. Trask, let me indicate that your time has elapsed. And as we do not have a lot of time this evening, to keep it within the time frames.

MR. TRASK: How much time do I have left?

MR. EIGUREN: Actually, it is fully elapsed, so if I could have you bring it to a conclusion.

MR. TRASK: Okay. There are some comments on surface management, which I will allow to be just in the record. And in closing, we respectfully submit these comments for the proposed site for the Super
12 Collider of the Department of Energy for your consideration. We again appreciate the opportunity to participate in this process. And we feel that continued cooperation between the State of Arizona, the Department of Energy, and concerned citizens will reduce the project's impact on the environment.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. There may be some clarifying questions here. Are there any questions from the panel? (No response.)

MR. EIGUREN: You are submitting the written comments?

MR. TRASK: Yes.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. We appreciate it. We will next call Brad Gallman.

835 STATEMENT OF BRAD GALLMAN

MR. GALLMAN: Members of the Board and interested parties, my name is Brad Gallman, and I am speaking as a private citizen. My address is 855 North Gray Street, Scottsdale. I am a real estate appraiser by profession, and I am currently involved in many aspects of real estate. I am strongly in favor of locating the Super Collider site in Arizona. The future benefits to physics and medicine seem obvious, as much of our country's benefits came from our space travel. Looking forward into the future, our
1 Arizona site provides a hub, a central focus, and destination point for the Southwest. As dynamic as growth has been for the metropolitan Phoenix area in the last ten years, so many of us believe that growth will be that dynamic in the 1990's. I also believe that the Mobile site offers the best future opportunity to fully employ and enjoy the use of photovoltaics by converting sunlight into electrical energy. Our summer days are only surpassed by those in the Sierra Desert. Our site will benefit surrounding states, our Federal Government and our allies. Surely as Phoenix will grow, so may the SSC site in a generally unspoiled setting with abundant sunlight resources. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. David Harbster.

836 STATEMENT OF DAVID HARBSTER

MR. HARBSTER: I would like to welcome the members of the Department of Energy to Arizona. The tem-
1 perature is about 102 today, and it probably will get higher. I support the Super Collider project for many reasons. The environment is important to me, and I find that the impact upon the proposed site to

be minimal. With regard to the geology of the region, we have the best available geology for constructing the SSC. It just makes sense to build it there. As a taxpayer, I find the proposed site to be the most practical. I believe the project would enrich our social and academic climate in the valley and for the entire Southwest as well. The locale of the SSC is ideal geographically. We are so close to the science centers along the coast and the Midwest. In addition, there seems to be a trend that academia is migrating more to the West now after years of Eastern dominance. The project site in Arizona seems quite suitable then to what already is naturally occurring in shifts in population. And finally, I support the project as a science educator, not so much for the content of my subject matter, but for the surprises that projects such as the SSC bring to our understanding of nature. For students of science, this project stands for wonder and discovery, and it creates an optimism for the future. Frankly, Arizona deserves the Super Collider. Would you like my address?

MR. EIGUREN: Yes, please.

MR. HARBSTER: It is Dave Harbster, 6222 West Del Rio Street, and that is in Chandler 85226-1707. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Next is Richard Scanlon.

837 STATEMENT OF RICHARD SCANLON

MR. SCANLON: Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here. My name is Richard C. Scanlon from Sierra Vista, Arizona, 832 Lang Avenue. A major concern with projects of this magnitude should be equality in sharing within all of the 50 states in terms of benefits, technological and long-range economical and cultural benefits. Needless to say that the location of the Superconducting Super Collider here in Arizona could well lead to Phoenix rivaling Gottingen University in Germany, which as we all know it is at the top of the list in terms of nuclear physics and atomic research. My comment and strong feeling is that considering this that Texas should be disqualified as a contender for the location of the Superconducting Super Collider. I am sure that many of us will recall that in the early days of the Kennedy Administration that was one of the major programs that was to use the term up for grabs was NASA. And it appeared that a tradeoff in terms of President Johnson at that time accepting the vice presidency was that NASA would go to Houston. Certainly, NASA going to Houston had an impact that the people in Houston probably did not envision, and it has certainly enhanced the reputation of Houston and Texas again in terms of its ability to move in a strong contesting technical environment, oil, space and whatever it might be. So I say that Texas should be disqualified on that basis. And the main reason is that everyone knows that as one of the 50 states that Texas can still secede from the Union. It is a strong point. Because I never really envisioned that Hawaii would be a member of the Union, and I never really envisioned that Alaska would become of the 50 states. So I say that Texas has had enough of it in terms of bennies, and should be disqualified or should be seriously considered as being disqualified on that basis. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Our last scheduled commenter at this time is Gary S. Maskarinec.

838 STATEMENT OF GARY S. MASKARINEC

MR. MASKARINEC: Hi. I did not intend to speak this evening frankly until I found how little interest there was in the meeting. And my own position as a Tempe businessman during the past six years has taken me on numerous occasions into the Maricopa Mountains, through the mountains and into the mountains for work there. I have spent many hours there walking, exploring and camping. And what has struck me primarily has been the lack of visitors in that place. It is a very harsh site. When I think of the area surrounding Phoenix, it impresses me that this is the beginning of the lower Colorado Desert which extends from Phoenix to the Colorado River, and as such contains most of the most fabulously scenic land in the state. Because it is such a harsh environment with temperatures often reaching over 115 degrees Fahrenheit in the summer, I think that that has kept some people from visiting there. I notice in the Environmental Impact Statement that this is noted, Section 5.3.1, that the Arizona site is the least developed of the seven site alternatives. That makes me wonder, is that a positive factor or a negative factor? As a businessman here, I have been impressed by the growth in the business climate of Phoenix, and I am impressed by the fact that we are the fastest growing city in the nation. And I cannot help but be impressed that the closest site near this city that has been relatively undisturbed, and in fact extraordinarily undisturbed during the development of this city, is about to be turned into a site which is thoroughly disturbed, and that there is no interest in this fact. It would be hard for me to describe the scenic beauty of the area. It is a picture postcard type of beauty. Unless you have been there, it is difficult to convey. It did occur to me though that something that you would all be familiar with is the Joshua Tree National Monument which, compared to the Maricopa Mountains, is a scruffy, scruffy ugly desert. The flora and the fauna in the Maricopa Mountains which are briefly touched upon in this statement are some of the most extraordinary in the state and within the American Southwest. As far as the value of the Super Collider, it is impossible to argue against it, other than to point out that it was our own Reagan Administration last year that questioned it, and that extraordinary move impresses it. I would question it as well. But seeing that I am in such a minority, I would not try to impress upon others that the value of this land lies primarily in its recreational value, but that is the way that I see it. The other sites nearby that are popular and are used heavily for recreation sites, such as the Picacho Peak, really do not compare in scope or value to the Maricopa Mountains. And it occurred to me as I was sitting here, facetiously of course though,

that right now the Maricopa Mountains provide a greater scenic value than the Yellowstone Park, and hopefully that will be temporary for as to how long the fires are there. As I say, I did not come prepared to speak, and I am not prepared to end. I really do not have anything else to say other than within a hundred miles or so from Phoenix that this is the most extraordinary undisturbed site that I have seen, and I have spent days and days and weeks and weeks driving around that area that I have described. So I would simply ask that it be noted that at one point in the development of this project, that it was pointed out that perhaps the recreational value would one day become more apparently greater than the value of this project.

MR. EIGUREN: Your name and address for the record.

MR. MASKARINEC. Gary Maskarinec, 1412 South Bonarden in Tempe.

MR. EIGUREN: Are there any questions from the panel?

(No response.)

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes our list of commenters for this evening's hearing. If there is anyone in the audience who would like to comment, we would be glad to have you step forward at this point and to register you here. If there is not, we will go ahead and recess until the hour of 10:00 or until we have some other individuals to come in who would like to comment. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. EIGUREN: The hour is 9:58 p.m. This is the moderator once again reopening the hearing record in this the hearing held in Tempe, Arizona on October 3, 1986 on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC project. We have received comment from five individuals this evening. The hearing panel has been here from 7:00 p.m. this evening. And I have by my watch 9:59 p.m. So as required by the Federal Register notice, we have been here until the hour of 10:00 and will be here for one additional minute to make sure that we have covered everybody. But with that, I will go ahead and formally close the record of the DEIS hearing in Tempe, Arizona on October 3rd. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 9:59 p.m., the hearing was closed.)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Public Hearing on the Matter of:

SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

Fort Morgan High School
709 East Riverview Avenue
Fort Morgan, Colorado

Thursday, September 29, 1988

APPEARANCES

PRESIDING

DR. ED TEMPLE
Executive Director, SSC Site Task Force

MODERATOR:

ROY EIGUREN
Lindsay, Hart, Neil & Weigler

PANEL:

DR. ED TEMPLE
DR. JERRY NELSEN
DR. ROGER MAYES
U.S. Department of Energy

PUBLIC SPEAKERS:

First Session:

TIM SCHULTZ
SEAN CONWAY
ELENI SARRIS
GARY HICKMON
CHRIS SHELTON
ALAN EDWARDS
HON. TED STRICKLAND
HON. DON AMENT
HON. TONY HERNANDEZ
DAVID THOMPSON
HON. ROY ROMER
DR. THOMAS VERNON
PETER DECKER
MARCELLUS JACKSON
RAY CHAMBERLAIN
DAN RODRIGUEZ
HON. BRUCE BASS
DR. SUSAN COLLINS
DR. GEORGE MORGENTHALER
JEROME WARTGOW
HAMLET J. BARRY
DR. BIL TUCKER
DR. DORA LODWICK
DR. BILL O'SULLIVAN
STEVE BAKER
BILL WEATHERILL
DAVID GRAFF
GLENN CALVERT
HAROLD DAVISSON
BARBARA SCHMIDT
DR. FRANK SHOWENGERDT

Second Session:

JOHN HAMLIN
CANDACE N. STOWELL
URIEL NAUENBERG
DR. JACK GECKLER
ELDA LOUSBERG
PHIL DAVEY
KEITH MESMER
HON. RON EDWARDS
HON. LARRY COUGLIN
KEN McCLOUD
MIKE BERRYHILL
HON. JAMES W. READ
HON. THOMAS A. SMITH
HAROLD DESELMS
HON. PHYLISS FORSHA
JAMES A. KADLECEK
SAM SASAKI
HON. EDITH EVANS
JOE KARBAN
MAGGIE GOODWIN
JIM COLLARD
STAN SAILSBERY

FIRST SESSION

(September 29, 1988: 2:00 p.m.)

DR. TEMPLE: Good afternoon. I want to welcome you to the Department of Energy's public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, EIS, for the Superconducting Super Collider, SSC. My name is Ed Temple, and I'm Executive Director of the SSC Site Task Force. I'm also the presiding officer for this hearing.

The purpose of my brief remarks is to tell you why we're all here. After my remarks, I will ask our session moderator, Mr. Eiguren, to outline how we will conduct our meeting this afternoon.

The purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens an opportunity to comment in person on the department's draft EIS on the SSC. This hearing is not your only opportunity, you may also send us your written comments which should be postmarked by October 17, 1988.

We want you to know that we are sincerely interested in hearing your comments on this document, and that each of your comments will be considered and responded to in the final EIS. Let me refresh your memories regarding the SSC site selection process. In January, 1987, President Reagan's decision to proceed with the SSC was announced and construction funds were requested from Congress. In April, 1987, the department issued an invitation for site proposals. We subsequently received 43 proposals, and 36 of these were found to be qualified.

The proposals were forwarded to a joint committee of the National Academy of Science and the National Academy of Engineering for further evaluation. Based on the criteria on the invitation, the Academies recommended a best qualified list, BQL, of eight sites to the department. One of these proposals was later withdrawn by the proposer. Following a review and verification of the Academy's recommendations, Secretary Herrington announced the best qualified list, including the Colorado proposal proposed site on January 19, 1988. On January 22, the DOE formally announced that it would develop an EIS on the SSC. This formal announcement followed an advanced notice of intent which was issued in May of 1987. In February of 1988 we held scoping meetings in each of the seven states to obtain public comment on the nature and scope of the environmental issues which should be considered in the EIS. Scoping meetings were held on February 12, here in Colorado at this auditorium, the Fort Morgan High School auditorium. The DOE received approximately 2,100 comments on the scope of the EIS. These comments were considered in the preparation of the draft EIS.

Following public hearings here and in the other BQL states, we will develop a final EIS to be issued in December of 1988. The draft EIS evaluates and compares four types of alternatives. Site alternatives, technical alternatives, programmatic alternatives, and the no-action alternative. Site alternatives address the seven locations identified on the BQL. Technical alternatives apply to different technology, different equipment, or facility configurations. Programmatic alternatives address the concept of using other accelerators, international collaboration, or project delay. The no-action alternative was the option not to construct the SSC.

This draft EIS identifies and analyzes the potential environmental consequences expected to occur from siting, construction and operation of the SSC at any one of the seven site alternatives. These sites are located in Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee and Texas. The draft EIS provides as much information as possible at this stage of the project regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed construction and operation of the SSC at each of the alternative sites. However, the DOE recognizes that further review under NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, is appropriate prior to actual construction and operation of the proposed SSC. Accordingly, following the selection of a site to proposed SSC, the DOE will prepare a supplement to this EIS to address in more detail the impacts of constructing and operating a proposed SSC at the selected site, and identify, where possible, alternatives for mitigating these impacts.

Let me tell you a little bit about the draft EIS. This is a large document containing more than 4,000 pages. It is organized in four volumes. Volume I is entitled Environmental Impact Statement, Volume II is the Comment Resolution Document and is reserved for our response to the public's comments and for publication in the final EIS only. Volume III describes the methodology for site selection, and Volume IV contains 16 appendixes providing detailed presentations of technical information, which back up to conclusions in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Comments received at this hearing will be used by the DOE to prepare a final EIS to be issued in December. This document will identify the department's preferred site. No sooner than 30 days after the final EIS is distributed the department will publish its record of decision, which will include the final site selection and the complete site selection process.

This afternoon we will use a professional moderator to assure a fair and orderly proceeding. Measures have been taken to permit the maximum opportunity for interested citizens to utilize this session for expressing their comments. We urge that all participants in today's meeting focus their comments on the draft EIS, and avoid statements aimed solely -- we urge all participants in today's meeting to focus their comments on the draft EIS and to avoid or minimize statements solely at expressing opposition or support for the state's proposal.

While all comments will become part of the formal record of this proceeding, those specifically addressing the draft EIS will be most useful to DOE in preparing the final document.

As I noted earlier, in addition to this opportunity for oral comments, individuals may also provide written comments to the DOE. These should be postmarked by October 17, 1988, the end of the formal 45-day comment period, to ensure that they will be considered in the preparation of the final EIS. We will, however, consider comments received after that date, to the extent possible.

One final word on the role of the EIS in the site selection process. The National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, requires that environmental impacts be considered by federal decision makers in taking major federal actions with potential environmental consequences. EIS is one of the methods used to do this analysis, provide for public comment and participation, and to make a final decision that meets the NEPA requirements. The EIS will be considered by the Secretary in making the site selection.

Thank you for your interest and participation.

Let me now introduce Mr. Eiguren, who will describe how we will conduct today's session. Roy.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you Dr. Temple. Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. My name is Roy Eiguren, I'm an attorney in private practice with the law firm of Lindsay Hart, Neil & Weigler, with offices in Seattle, Washington; Portland, Oregon; San Francisco, California; and Boise, Idaho. My practice in our law firm has a very heavy concentration in the area of environmental and energy law. Both in private practice as well as in prior government service, I've had over a decade's worth of experience in either conducting or participating in a significant number of national environmental policy act hearings such as the one we're conducting here today. I have been retained by the Department of Energy as a moderator for this and other hearings on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC project. Accordingly I'm not an employee of the Department, nor am I an advocate for or against the Department's proposed action in this proceeding. Rather, my single expressed purpose is to serve as an independent, unbiased, objective individual to moderate this series of hearings. My job is to help the Department fully comply with the letter and spirit of the Federal National Environmental Policy Act so as to allow all individuals and organizations a fair and equal opportunity to comment on the record to the Department's proposed action.

As stated earlier by Dr. Temple, the purpose of this hearing is to give all interested citizens an opportunity to comment on the record relative to the Department of Energy's draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed SSC project.

In February the Department conducted, and I moderated, a scoping meeting here in Fort Morgan to hear comments from individuals and organizations on what issues they felt should be considered in preparation of the draft EIS. Now the department has completed the preparation of that draft EIS, it seeks comment from the public on it. In particular, we're seeking specific comment on issues that you, the members of the public, feel are relevant and should be considered by the Department of Energy prior to finalizing the Environmental Impact Statement and selecting its preferred site for the SSC project.

I'd like to note at the outset that this is a record proceeding. That is to say, everything that is being said at this as well as the other hearings on the draft Environmental Impact Statement is being recorded by the court reporter who is here with us today. The court reporter will make a verbatim transcript of all comments received and submit that transcript to the Department of Energy for inclusion in final record of this proceeding. The Secretary of Energy's decision will be based upon the information contained in the record that we develop.

At this time I would like to tell you what procedures we're going to follow, and the conduct of this, as well as all of the other hearings, on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, that are being conducted in the other states under consideration. We will announce each speaker who is pre-registered to comment from a list provided to me by the Department of Energy personnel who are located at the registra tion table at the back of the room. I will call speakers in the order in which they signed up in advance

If you have pre-registered to speak but have not checked in at the registration table in the lobby outside, we would ask you to do that so that we know you are here. Every individual who wishes to comment will have five minutes within which to do so. At the end of five minutes I will signal each individual speaker that their time has run. As stated earlier, the purpose of this hearing is to receive comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Accordingly your comments should be focused on the issues that are addressed in the draft document. I do reserve the right to ask individuals to focus on issues contained in the draft Environmental Impact Statement if they wander from the topic of this session.

I do not intend to limit your remarks, but rather my purpose is to assure what comments you do provide are effective in achieving the objective of this hearing as outlined by Dr. Temple.

Written comment and oral comment receive the same weight in the record at this proceeding, so accordingly we would encourage you to submit written comments for the record if you aren't able to make all of your comments within the five minutes allotted to you. And we also encourage the submission of written questions. If you do have written questions or written comments, you may present them to the court reporter here at the front of the room, or you may give them to the Department of Energy personnel registration table in the lobby. As indicated earlier by Dr. Temple, written comments must be postmarked no later than October 17 in event that you should send them after the hearing today. There is a business card at the registration table with the address where you can send your comments. This session will run from 2:00 until 5:00 p.m. this afternoon, and reconvene at 7:00 this evening and will continue approximately through 10:00 tonight. To allow the court reporter a few minutes rest, and also to change the recording tapes, we will take brief recesses throughout the course of the hearing. On the average we've been taking recess of five minutes or so, every hour to hour and a half.

Approximately 30 minutes before the scheduled end of this afternoon's session as well as this evening, I will call any speakers who register at the door to testify. So if you happen to be in the audience, you have not pre-registered to comment but you feel as though you would like to, we will take those comments as time allows, but you first need to register at the registration table in the lobby. And we will take those walk-in registered commenters later in the program.

We would ask that when your turn comes to speak, that you would step forward to the front of the room to the podium here where the microphone's located. We would ask that you give us your name and address, and if you're speaking on behalf of an organization, give us your organization on behalf of your presenting comment. I will begin in the timing of your allotted five minutes after you've made your introductions.

I would like to indicate that the members of the hearing panel who are here with me at the front of the room, Dr. Ed Temple, who is the Executive Director of the SSC Site Selection Task Force, and Doctors Roger Mayes and Jerry Nelsen, who are senior environmental specialists with the Department of Energy are here for the express purpose of listening to your comments and assisting and developing the record. Now, they may from time to time ask clarifying questions of our commenters. The reason for that is it's very important that they understand fully and completely the nature of your comment. So as we complete a comprehensive record of your concerns in this particular proceeding.

At this time I've been asked to also announce that pursuant to the law of the state, there is no smoking allowed in the building at any time.

At this point we will now begin with our list of pre-registered commenters, and go from there. Our first scheduled commenter this afternoon is Mr. Tim Schultz, who is Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Local Affairs who is here on behalf of Governor Romer. Mr. Schultz.

571 STATEMENT OF TIM SCHULTZ, ON BEHALF OF HON. ROY ROMER

MR. SCHULTZ: Thank you very much. Dr. Temple, members of the SSC staff, welcome to Colorado. Under Governor Roy Romer I have been assigned the responsibility of implementing Colorado's proposal to site the Superconducting Super Collider in the State of Colorado. As the governor's SSC representative, I have supervised Colorado's review of the draft Environmental Impact Statement by agencies, I've encouraged our local governments and citizens to advise the SSC project staff and the Department of Energy of our views and concerns to be officially registered during this process.

I can assure the Department of Energy of two very important points. Number one, Colorado is united in its support of constructing the SSC by this nation to renew our commitment to science and technology.

Number two, Colorado is unanimous in support of bringing the SSC to the Rocky Mountain high plains region of this nation. I think those are two things that I very much want to stress for the record. That this State is very supportive of the process, very supportive of the SSC where ever it goes, but also very supportive of the location here in Colorado.

As I looked through the EIS there were a couple of comments that I felt compelled to make to you today in my reading and my interpretation of the impression I received from the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The first one is, concerns the socio-economic impacts. Colorado will accommodate the socio-economic impacts from siting the SSC in Northeastern Colorado, and will benefit from its construction operation. Colorado SSC staff will prepare detailed comments and recommend corrections to the draft Environmental Impact Statement. One of the major issues that we will address is, later today as well as in writing, is the misinterpretation within the socio-economic impact analysis incorrectly suggesting that significant impacts may occur similar to previous boom bust cycles of the past.

We propose that all references to this interpretation be eliminated, and that language in the text be revised to properly effect that there will be much lower socio-economic impacts in siting the SSC in Colorado than currently is written in the text.

We have no objection to the socio-economic impact methodology or the population and employment projections and distributions within the analysis. However, when the existing capacity of local communities near the site and in the region of influence are considered using these projections, only one conclusion follows. The impact of this project can be handled with existing resources, facilities, and services. The State of Colorado as well as the local communities have formed a partnership on this, and we can assure you that we will handle the socio-economic problems that come with this project in a very evenhanded manner and we will not have problems.

Even where variations in demographics or actual demand occur in northeastern Colorado, adjustments can be made quickly and effectively in supplying services and community facilities. This is precisely why we have assured the Department of Energy and local officials that the State of Colorado through the Department of Local Affairs will mitigate the environmental and socio-economic impacts of this project.

Before I became Executive Director of the Department of Agriculture, and subsequently, that of my current position of local affairs, I served as a county commissioner on the western slope of Colorado when the energy boom occurred in the 1970's. I know first hand what boom bust cycle means. As the county commissioner of Rio Blanco county, that was the site of the CA track and CB tracks, as well as the Rio Blanco project. And we faced real boom bust problems in those days. And we were able to work through those in this state, as well as local officials throughout the state learned very positive lessons from that, and are able to translate that today into a situation where we can handle that type of growth that would come with the SSC project.

My second point: Colorado has designed a land acquisition program for the siting of the SSC that is flexible and recognizes the importance of preserving the existing economic use of the land and of the local lifestyle. Colorado has designed a local, a land acquisition package which transfers the necessary lands to the U.S. Department of Energy for siting the SSC project according to DOE's land acquisition schedule. Colorado's plan grants DOE maximum flexibility in terms of siting opportunities for fine tuning the final position of the collider ring and the SSC facilities. The plan not only gives DOE opportunities for avoiding natural and man-made features during initial siting, but also offers long-term land use controls and flexibility, including the potential for design changes and future retrofits of new technology.

Colorado's plan is designed to accommodate the long-term operational needs of DOE and the SSC laboratory, but also recognizes the importance of existing agricultural economy. Current land use and local lifestyles -- Colorado has offered 20 to 25 percent more land to DOE in its initial proposal than is required within the DOE invitation for site proposals as an envelope for siting opportunity. Once DOE, the Central Design Group and DOE's contractors determine the final layout of the facilities, Colorado will transfer the minimal amount of land required by DOE. For example, if DOE can suffice with having portions of the northern or southern acres transferred in stratifies fee, rather than fee simple, Colorado will retain control of the surface land use activity in these areas. This arrangement would make DOE's actual fee simple taking less than the ISP required 15,880 acres and would allow Colorado an opportunity to lease back surface land to current land users with appropriate controls retained for laboratory operations.

There is also an inaccurate perception of the Colorado SSC land use impacts made within the draft EIS. Colorado's conversion from agriculture production to the SSC laboratory represents a minor change from existing land use because less than one percent of the prime agricultural land within the three county site area is affected.

State economic development policies stress diversifying the economy and lessening dependence on resource-based or agricultural industries, and it is seen as a positive land use impact in northeastern Colorado for the SSC to be located there.

I want to thank you again for the time and effort that you put in to what we are convinced is a very thorough and very fair process. And Colorado stands ready to assist the DOE in the construction of the SSC, the Superconducting Super Collider, in northeastern Colorado. Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Our next commenter this afternoon will be representing the Honorable William Armstrong from United States Senate from the State of Colorado, on his staff, Sean Conway.

560 STATEMENT OF SEAN CONWAY, ON BEHALF OF HON. WILLIAM ARMSTRONG

MR. CONWAY: Good afternoon, thank you. Welcome to Colorado. Senator Armstrong very much wanted to be here today, but with Congress being in session he was unable to be here personally. But he has telecopied me a statement which I will read to you very briefly.

The statement is from Senator Armstrong to the United States Department of Energy public hearing on Superconducting Super Collider, September 29, 1988.

I appreciate the opportunity to address the Department of Energy's SSC Site Selection Task Force final hearing concerning the Colorado SSC site. I want to commend the Colorado SSC project for its commitment to this important project. Their determination to clearly and distinctly highlight the unique benefits the State of Colorado has to offer this project has been outstanding.

It was no small task to gather the vibrant spirit of our great State. Coloradans not only rallied around their work, but were also intrigued by the process and the project. One of the most interesting and disturbing things we have learned is that the United States has fallen behind the rest of the world in basic science research. We are now all aware that as a percentage of the GNP, federal funding for basic science is about half of 1958 outlays. The United States is graduating half as many PhD's in the physical sciences as it did in the 1970's. Today 50 percent of those PhD's are foreign students compared to 10 percent in the 1970's. The key to unlock the secrets of the atoms, the basics of our world and universe, may very well be the SSC.

I am told that the SSC may be essential to ensure America's world leadership and competitiveness in science, technology and commerce into the 21st century. The State of Colorado would have such an instrument with pride. Colorado was a proud State. We are proud of our wild west heritage, of the beauty of our mountains and plains and of the standard of living that our State has achieved. We have a pioneering spirit, one which brought us strong men and women who homesteaded and built boom mining towns. Their spirit tamed the West, and that fever for excitement still burns deep inside the western soil.

Unfortunately for our great State, spirit cannot be rated on an environmental impact statement. The Department of Energy does not have the tools to chart the positive impact that civic, community and State pride will have on a project like the SSC, but Coloradans know. And I believe they have shown the Department of Energy that western hospitality is a strong force, one which I believe they would be foolish to pass up.

Experts will stand before you and discuss the technological merits of the Colorado site and the draft EIS. They will tell you that Colorado is a home of several nationally renowned universities and will soon construct a new international airport. Experts will tell you about the superb Colorado site from a geographical and economic standpoint. They are the experts and I can only agree when they state that the Colorado site is superior geographically and geographical, and I can also attest to the spirit and pride which is imbedded deep in the hearts and minds of Coloradans.

I believe it is important to keep in mind Colorado's lifestyle and spirit. I know how strong it is and the positive impact it can have on the SSC. I agree with those Colorado businessmen, local and national scientists, and government officials who have come together to attract national attention to the Colorado site. Colorado has a lot to offer and I hope the SSC will soon call Colorado home. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Representing United States Senator Tim Wirth is Eleni Sarris.

561 STATEMENT OF ELENI SARRIS, ON BEHALF OF HON. TIM WIRTH

MS. SARRIS: Good afternoon, I'm representing Senator Wirth. As you know he's in Washington, D.C. because the Senate is in session. I would like to read a brief statement from the Senator dated September 29th to the U.S. Department of Energy SSC Site Selection Task Force.

Welcome once again to Fort Morgan, Colorado. The selection of Colorado as one of the seven best qualifies sites for the Superconducting Super Collider, SSC, has generated a great deal of excitement among the people of our State. I trust that public comments you will hear this afternoon will confirm that the community of Fort Morgan and Coloradans as a whole are very interested in supporting the Department of Energy's SSC program.

Colorado offers many unique advantages as the host State for this project. In addition to a stable and predictable geology, studies also show that Colorado offers an excellent location for the construction of the SSC, with only minimal environmental impacts. Colorado is also strengthened by its role as a regional leader with resources that include more than 1,200 companies involved in advanced technology.

Plans for a new international airport that promises to be one of the world's busiest hubs, a strong university system that makes Colorado a leader in high technology and an environment that blends the best of urban living with recreational opportunities that are simply unparalleled through out the Nation.

Most important of all, our State offers a highly educated work force and a community of people who look forward to working with the Department of Energy to ensure that Colorado is the future home for the SSC.

As a member of the Senate Energy and National Resources Committee I was pleased to play a role in securing appropriates for the SSC. The SSC represents an important investment in the basic research our nation needs to ensure American leadership and competitiveness in science, education, technology and commerce into the 21st century.

I will certainly continue to do what I can in Congress to fight for this important project. Sincerely yours, Senator Timothy Wirth. Thank you for your consideration.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Representing Congressman Hank Brown is a member of his staff, Gary Hickmon.

572 STATEMENT OF GARY HICKMON, ON BEHALF OF HON. HANK BROWN

MR. HICKMON: I would like to invite or welcome the panel to the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado. I also have a statement to read from Congressman Brown.

Dr. Temple, members of the panel, while legislative business in Washington prevents me from testifying personally today, I appreciate this opportunity to submit a statement on the draft Environmental Impact Report on Colorado's proposal for the Superconducting Super Collider. As you know, if our State is selected, the SSC could become reality 30 feet under Colorado's eastern plains. This hearing is one of the final steps in that selection process.

I commend Energy Secretary Herrington and the DOE staff for their leadership on this project, and all the local officials and individuals for taking the time to appear here today.

The SSC is one of the biggest research tools ever imagined. A giant atom smasher, the SSC will be the world's most advanced particle accelerator. At least 20 times as powerful as anything now in operation, it will be to physics what a telescope is to astronomy and a microscope is to biology.

By virtue of its accessible central location, superb geographic conditions and a technically superior proposal, complemented by first rate scientific and academic communities, Colorado deserves to be selected as the SSC site. The draft EIS makes it clear there is no reason not to do so. The report points out that Colorado's proposed site is rural in character, and lacks some of the infrastructure of the other sites. This is to our advantage. Colorado can offer DOE a custom design without the problem of a mismatch with existing infrastructure.

We can start from scratch and build it right. How many existing structures would have to be moved to build the SSC? The draft EIS says in Colorado, four homes and one business would be displaced. Compare that with Illinois, for example, where the SSC would displace 160 homes and 59 businesses.

Some might argue that being 65 miles from Denver is a disadvantage for the Colorado site. Those that do not understand the west, where driving long distances across open country is not unusual. In fact, you easily can commute 65 miles in Colorado in less time and with less stress than you can drive from the Capital Beltway to downtown Washington, D.C.

Few places can compete with Colorado for pure quality of life, a fact that has drawn companies and individuals to our State from throughout the Nation. From any point of view, Colorado is the logical location for the SSC. And I strongly urge you to recommend it as the preferred site.

The SSC is essential to assuring America's world leadership and competitiveness in science, technology and commerce into the 21st century. Without it, the U.S. could well fall to third place, behind Europe and the Soviet Union in high energy physics by the end of the next decade. On behalf of the residents of the Fourth Congressional District, I wish to thank the members of the SSC panel for coming to Fort Morgan today to conduct this hearing. I look forward to continuing to work with the Department of Energy, to ensure the success of the SSC project. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. The next commenter this afternoon is representing Congressman Joel Hefly, a member of his staff, Ruth Eck.

673 STATEMENT OF CHRIS SHELTON, ON BEHALF OF HON. JOEL HEFLEY AND HON. DAN SCHAEFER

MR. SHELTON: Obviously I'm not Ruth Eck. She couldn't attend today, so I'm here in my capacity to represent Congressman Schaefer. I'm here also to read Congressman Hefley's statement if that's all right. Statement by Congressman Joel Hefley.

It is a great pleasure to have the Department of Energy here at Fort Morgan. The draft Environmental Impact Statement is an important part of the process in considering the location of the SSC. I know a lot of work has gone into the draft EIS that is before us today. The DOE held public hearings and accepted numerous comments for the preparation of the document.

The environmental and ecological impacts of the statement are included, and the statement is a product of many months of composing information on each site. DOE did a fantastic job in getting it all

together. Although I do not have the time to discuss the technological data, I can tell the Department of Energy how great the State of Colorado is and that it is the very best site for the SSC.

Colorado is a unique state full of natural wonder, vitality and potential for economic growth. Colorado's public officials, businesses, schools and citizens welcome the opportunity for expansion and growth and Colorado has the room and the resources for this growth. Both the backing of the people and Colorado's ability to support positive development are significant pluses for the SSC project.

Another asset to the SSC is Denver's Stapleton International Airport. The SSC in Colorado would have a reliable mode of transportation to bring in the experts and scientists from all of over the world. In fact Denver's proposal for a new airport, the largest in the country, is planned to come on line in the 1990's around the same time the SSC would be ready for operation.

Universities and schools throughout Colorado have been more than supportive of the SSC project. Their excitement and involvement in the SSC has been outstanding and they are expected to be an integral addition to the SSC. I believe the Superconducting Super Collider is the doorway for change and progress for science and for our economy. Every time somebody uses a desk computer, makes a phone call or plays a video game, that amazing world of physics is being plugged in.

As a leading nation in science and technology, building the world's largest particle accelerator is a visible symbol of our determination to stay in front. I am convinced Colorado is the very best place for this progress. Now I will read the statement from Congressman Dan Schaefer in support of the Superconducting Super Collider.

674 Statement of Congressman Dan Schaefer: Recognizing the need for a strong commitment to the SSC to help maintain our nation's dominance in science, technology and commerce into the 21st century, I am happy to join with the members of the Colorado congressional delegation in promoting Colorado's Superconducting Super Collider site and supporting continued authorization in appropriation of Federal funding for this project.

Colorado is one of seven sites selected by the Department of Energy to be included in the best qualified list. As you complete the site selection process, let me reiterate the particularly attractive aspects of Colorado's location.

Situated in the state's eastern plains, Colorado's site offers an ideal topographical and geologic setting. In addition to its excellent geology, the site offers easy access to an international airport, whose proximity to major research universities and a high quality of life including numerous recreational and cultural opportunities.

The Colorado site would be further enhanced by the State's plans to improve the highway system and to create housing and recreational opportunities in the area surrounding the site.

This project has the support of Colorado's scientific, business and education leaders, State officials as well as the surrounding communities. Along with my fellow Coloradans, I am convinced that this involvement in high energy physics is essential, and that Colorado is the ideal location.

The competition for the SSC site will soon be history. However the valve for funding is just beginning. Let me assure you of my continued support for the SSC and for securing the necessary financial resources to construct this vital project. Thank you gentlemen.

MR. FIGURES: Thank you. Sir, for the record, your name is Chris Shelton?

MR. SHELTON: Chris Shelton, yes.

MR. FIGURES: Thank you Mr. Shelton. On behalf of the hearing panel we would like to thank all of the members of the congressional delegation of Colorado for your statements for the record here today. Next on the list of commenters representing Governor Mike Sullivan from the State of Wyoming is Alan [illegible].

[illegible] MIKE SULLIVAN

[illegible] the opportunity to be here today. My name is Alan [illegible], resource analyst with the state planning coordinator's office for the State of Wyoming. I'm here today to give some partial comments on behalf of Governor Sullivan. We are going [illegible] the Environmental Impact Statement and will be submitting a formal written [illegible] the sixth hearing process.

[illegible] project and program. As you may know, [illegible] by the early site selection process. The

proposal was submitted with the full and unequivocal belief that this region has an excellent environment, both the natural environment and the human environment and a work climate that is conducive to successfully achieving the project and scientific goals of this project.

We're here to address two specific elements within the EIS in regards to the regional impacts that may be perceived by the preparers of the document. The first deals with the employment figures. According to Table 1-1 the employment projections for the construction is anticipated to exceed 9,000 people. This is a significant employment force for any of the site alternatives under consideration in the EIS.
2 The State of Wyoming has been working with Colorado to address these employment impacts. This includes work to allow a regional jobs pool to be created to help provide these employment requirements. This jobs pool would help identify the work force that would be available to meet these long-term work force needs. This coordination will help Colorado address these needs in great detail.

The second we would like to address is the university systems. Colorado has numerous university and college resources that can provide a significant support role to the scientific research on the SSC. The University of Wyoming is also another regional resource that is available for this project. Not only can our regional institutions of higher learning be a beneficiary of knowledge to be gained from
3 this project but they can also provide a real and very valuable viable support resource. Wyoming recognizes not only the regional impacts but also the regional benefits that will result from this project. We see this project as no short term project; rather, we see the SSC as a long term neighbor in our regional economy in our regional community, which we are fully prepared to work with Colorado to address. Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. We appreciate you being here. We would now like to call on several legislators from the State of Colorado who are here to make presentations. First is the Honorable Ted Strickland who is the President of the State Senate for the State of Colorado.

543 STATEMENT OF HON. TED STRICKLAND

MR. STRICKLAND: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Members, it's a real pleasure for me to have the opportunity to be with you this afternoon. Obviously we're here in support of the SSC, and that surprises all of you, I'm sure. I am, in addition to being President of the Senate, privileged to be the President of the National Conference of State Legislatures. Elected by my colleagues from 50 states, we have an organization representing the legislatures and the legislators across the country. And in that capacity I have expressed to Secretary Herrington and others in the Department of Energy my
1 unqualified support of the Superconducting Super Collider regardless of its location. And we stand full square behind that support. It's essential to our country's well-being that we move forward vigorously to construct this facility. Let me be specific into a couple of the issues dealing with the draft and environmental impact statement concerning the Colorado site. And in order to focus upon just the two issues that I think are most important, I wanted to depart from my prepared text, copies of which we have left with you, and refer to those two areas of concern in language that I think all of us are comfortable with.

First off was the reference to the site of Fort Morgan/Brush as being remote. In the West we prefer to measure distance in terms of time for travel as opposed to miles. Comparing the time and distance with the Fermilab, if you will, in Batavia, Illinois, and the distance and travel time to Chicago's O'Hare Airport, while the distance may be less than half of that of our proposed site, the travel time is
2 extremely more difficult and time-consuming. All of us would like to have a serene pastoral setting for such a site to be located in a metropolis. Well, gentlemen, we all know that that's impossible. So in the terms of remoteness, as we refer to it here in the West, I'd like to have you reexamine that conclusion if you would, in terms of being able to negotiate that distance in terms of time, and in terms of the quality of travel.

Secondly is the issue of the inability of the area of Fort Morgan/Brush to be able to respond to the infrastructural needs, the service areas. In Colorado we're not only a "can do" state, we're a "have done" state. We have dealt with explosive growth as it has related to the expansion, boom expansion in the energy business, to the boom expansion in the entertainment and recreational businesses, and have accommodated that growth in what John Naisbitt considered in his book, Megatrends, as one of the five leading states. We've done that. We're accustomed to handling those kinds of needs and accustomed to handling those kinds of growth demands in an environmentally and aesthetic pleasing way.

3 It is not something that is just an occasional occurrence for us, it's part of our lifestyle. The kinds of expansion that would be accompanying such a location of the Super Collider in our part of the state is one that fails to take into full consideration in the draft statement of what the new highway structure will be, E-470, the airport facilities, and how essential those two infrastructural requirements are going to be, not just to the Super Collider, but to the future of the State of Colorado. And we are full time in support and agreement with the accomplishment of those two things.

4 Gentlemen, we feel those two areas in specific are things that need to be re-examined and readdressed in the environmental draft statement. As you reconsider those in light of the community support, the

availability of the work force, the kinds of opportunities available to the support staff for the construction and the operation of the Superconducting Super Collider, we think that you will find that remoteness is an asset as it's described in the dictionary. That those kinds of things that are going to be supplying that quality of life to the employees for the operation of the Super Collider are those things that have been identified in an environmental draft statement as concerns. We're proud of our state, we're proud of our accomplishments, and we're proud our ability to accommodate the Superconducting Super Collider. We don't want to influence you at all, we just want you to locate in Colorado. Thank you very very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Senator. Ladies and gentlemen, we're having a bit of a problem with the public address system, so I've been asked to step to this microphone to see if I can be heard a little bit better out there. The next commenter again, another member of the legislature, is the Honorable Don Ament who is a State Representative from the 65th District of Colorado.

562 STATEMENT OF HON. DON AMENT

MR. AMENT: Thank you Mr. Chairman, State Representative Don Ament, Route 1, Iliff, Colorado. Let me on behalf of the citizens of northeastern Colorado welcome you to Fort Morgan. I welcome this opportunity to comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Superconducting Super Collider. I am pleased with the reports, analysis of potential impacts of the Super Collider on the community and the natural resources in Colorado. The EIS confirms that the Department of Energy can construct the Superconducting Super Collider here with a minimum of disruption to, and for mutual benefit, to the State and the laboratory.

As a farmer and rancher and as the state representative for thousands of people in this area, I'm concerned about some portions of the draft statement which seem to me to be inaccurately characterizing our region and this State.

In the interest of time I will focus on two points which especially concern me; water, and the local capacity to deal with Superconducting Super Collider-related growth. Water is an important issue in the West and one which is most often understood by those familiar with the less complex appropriation laws of other regions. Although the sections in the draft statement which discuss water issues are generally accurate, there are some inconsistencies. I want to clarify and emphasize that our commitment is to provide a water supply to the Superconducting Super Collider which does not entail any new depletions from either the Colorado or the South Platte basin.

There are two main reasons for the State's ability to make this firm commitment. One because water out here is bought and sold like any commodity. We will buy the commodity that does not interfere with stream floats. Two, Colorado has an impressive body of specialized laws that protect the interest of water right holders. That's the priority system water law. State water law says that if we acquire water out of a stream or well, our use of that water cannot result in net loss to downstream users. The final Environmental Impact Statement should therefore consistently state that our water supply proposal by law will not result in Colorado or South Platte water depletions.

Regarding the impact statements to succession of local capacity to deal with Superconducting Super Collider-related impact, this part of the state is no stranger to economic growth cycles. Having successfully managed the oil boom of the 1950's and more recently rapid growth from the construction of the Pawnee Power Plant, we are familiar with these kinds of problems. To illustrate our familiarity with the ability to deal with growth and point specifically to three critical growth areas referenced in the statement, eduction, public services and housing, having served as a member of the local school board and as a state board member I can assure you that school systems successfully manage an increase in student enrollment on the order of 10 percent. In the high schools alone we went from 496 students in 1952 to 934 students in 1963, increases which were significantly above the base rate, amounting to about two new classrooms a year. And to those new students, the existing capacity was accommodated and the lessening of quality of education was not found to be true.

In the case of the Pawnee Power plant, construction of generating stations created a peak job total of 2,239, yet the local police departments in Brush and Fort Morgan added no new people and accommodated no new problems. Neither community really experienced the kind of boom town problems outlined in the Environmental Impact Statement.

The final EIS should reflect that having learned and benefitted from past booms, our local governments have the capability and the capacity to provide services in a growth environment. The draft statement also expresses reservation about this area's ability to meet SSC required housing demands, particularly in the cities of Fort Morgan and Brush. At this time in Morgan county, however, there are 855 available single family and multifamily housing units. In addition there are currently 603 vacant lots with utilities included ready to build. And in Morgan county alone there are 24 home builders. A modular home manufacturer and numerous contracts who, to correct the EIS characterization of this local industry, as a historically small scale, not only do business statewide but also do business in other western states.

Although overlooked in the EIS, Logan County will also absorb Super Collider-related growth, again, based on our past experience in northeast Colorado. There are currently about 200 homes for sale in Logan County, in and around Sterling, not including townhomes and condominiums, as well as a large number of buildable sites. I am challenged to understand the EIA's conclusion that we would unlikely readily be able to meet such a growth in housing demands.

The final EIS should accurately reflect Morgan County's and the region's capacity. We are ready and able to accommodate SSC-related housing demands. Finally I want to emphasize that the State of Colorado, the legislature, and the executive jointly are full partner with local communities in this endeavor. As described fully in our proposal to DOE we are committed to providing support and assistance where needed. As partners the State and northeastern Colorado have the expertise, the capacity and the tested institutional tools to effectively manage rapid growth and large scale development.

Accordingly I strongly encourage the DOE to re-evaluate statements in the draft EIS which portray otherwise and to ensure that finally the EIS, the final EIS accurately reflects the capacity and the ability of Morgan county and northeastern Colorado region. Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Sir. We have a clarifying question for you.

DR. NELSEN: Do you have a written submission?

MR. AMENT: I certainly do. I would be glad to submit that.

DR. NELSEN: Make sure that's submitted.

MR. EIGUREN: Once again, to remind our audience, if you do have written comments for us, that's very helpful for us to receive those for the written record. You may leave them either with the court reporter here in the front of the room or with the DOE staff back at the registration table.

I would finally like to introduce the Honorable Tony Hernandez, a member of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado.

580 STATEMENT OF HON. TONY HERNANDEZ

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. Welcome to Fort Morgan, Colorado. I would like to read a statement.

As a member of the SSC Steering Committee, and a member of the SSC Minority Advisory Committee, I fully support the need to build the Super Collider.

The development of this project will be a significant first step towards creating new generations of science-oriented talent in the United States. And it will provide an opportunity to restructure education using basic science as a focal point.

This is particularly important, especially for Hispanics and Blacks who are underrepresented in science, mathematics and engineering.

Our review of the EIS indicates that the analysis of the socio-economic impact is a reasonable projection of the jobs and population distribution that will occur in Colorado when the SSC comes to our State.

However the description unfairly concludes that it is unlikely that the area would be unable to absorb and to adjust to SSC-related impacts in housing, employment and education. The draft EIS recognizes that the regional resources are available to help build the SSC and support the construction and the operating work force.

It does not recognize how close the site is to the metropolitan area, or how easy it is to commute from Denver to the laboratory. The laboratory and the benefits it generates will be easily accessed by the state's minority population.

More than that, Colorado has a broad plan to make those benefits available to the ethnic minorities. I will give you an example. The advisory committee has put together a six-part plan. I would like to read you the recommendations from that plan that we have put together.

First, there was a special advisory committee put together with a membership of six members which could be increased as time goes on. Those include State representatives, a person from the Hispanic Chamber and the Black Chamber, and some people that involve in those two chambers.

Second, the SSC Steering Committee reaffirmed the goal of a 17 percent financial participation in the SSC project by ethnic minorities as added in Governor Romer's executive order. This goal has not been achieved in the proposal phase of the project.

Budget and personnel decisions have been made to correct this situation in the proposal phase and the implementation phase of the SSC. Immediate attention was given to the lack of financial participation of Black personnel and businesses, taking advantage of the businesses we have in the area, in the metropolitan area and throughout Colorado.

Three: The proposal blueprint phase two, Project Request for Proposal, is being expedited under the supervision of the Minority Advisory Committee, again trying to enhance participation of minorities.

A nice partnership has been created between Blacks, Hispanics and minorities to insure that everybody participates in this important endeavor.

Four: The Colorado SSC project has established a minority intern project in plan to broaden the program in a spin-off program impacting Colorado State Government, which is critically important.

Five: The Colorado SSC project -- (School bell rings) -- We weren't saved by the bell. (Laughter)

Number five: The Colorado SSC project is developing a science education and minority education program as submitted to the Department of Energy on July 15, 1988.

And six: The SCC's public education program has been revised to include joint Black and Hispanic Chambers of Commerce program involvement, which has broadened the communication and public information program to include minority participation. The partnership is critically important. And I think it will result in a better SCC than ever before.

With regard to the minority science education program, as part of the SSC project, Colorado proposes a National Research Center for Science Education. The Center will serve not only Colorado, but it will actively reach out to become an integral part of a multistate region, surrounding the state. And it will act as a catalyst for improving science education throughout the nation. It is exciting.

One of the key characteristics of this proposed center will be a Minority Science Education Program for the kindergarten to twelfth grade program. This choice of focus is based on evidence and research that it is important to start this education both in the primary grades in middle schools, and also results in more blacks and hispanics being involved in engineering, computers and other high tech technology.

Programs in research science projects and demonstrations, computer technology and instruction in physics of the SCC laboratory would enrich the science background of the minority students, and provide them with a unique opportunity to become exposed and involved in the unlimited quality of the science experience.

It is imperative that the education concentrate its efforts on preparing minority students to become competent in mathematics, science and computers to qualify for high technology employment and research to keep the U.S. competitive and to support the economy of our Nation.

I will attach to my comments a copy of the blueprint that indicates how the minorities are working collectively, hand in hand to insure the SCC is not only successful, but that it reach the further dreams that people aspire to. Thank you very much for your time.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. On behalf of the hearing panel we would like to thank all the legislators for their participation today. It is greatly appreciated.

At this point ladies and gentlemen we are going to take a brief recess, and reconvene at 3:15.

(Whereupon at 3:05 p.m., the hearing recessed, to reconvene at 3:20 p.m.)

MR. EIGUREN: Ladies and gentlemen, we are ready to resume our public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC Program.

We would ask if you would please take your seats and have the doors in the back of the room closed so we can hear up here.

Once again I would like to remind you of our procedures which are all pre-registered commenters have [illegible] minutes in which to give their oral comment. We would ask that you state your name and address for the record.

If you do have written comments we would very much appreciate receiving those. You can turn them in either to the court reporter here in the front of the building or to the Department of Energy personnel at the registration table out in the lobby.

We will now resume and we have our list of pre-registered commenters for this of-record session. Our first commenter is Mr. David Thompson.

590 STATEMENT OF DAVID THOMPSON

MR. THOMPSON: Good afternoon, and thanks for being here in Colorado and considering us for the Super Collider project.

I have some comments that have been predrafted.

Insuring that the Colorado SSC would economically benefit minorities, the draft EIS, Economic Impact Analysis makes clear that the project will generate economic benefits to all of the seven best qualified sites.

What is not clear is how minorities will be involved in the process and the benefits of building and operating the laboratory.

As Representative Hernandez testified earlier, Colorado has developed a blueprint outline for minority participation integrating ethnic and women minorities into the planning and decision-making process. In addition the SSC project would develop an implementation plan from the blueprint. And the reason that this is important is due to the fact that oftentimes people of color are excluded, not so much intentionally but as a result of systemic types of things that have been implemented, and are in place historically.

What we have done, we have superseded across the board by implementing and designing a plan which will allow that 17 percent participation that the Governor has implemented so minority people can have an opportunity to be equal participants in the SSC process.

This plan includes goals implementation, programs and proposals, a management financial plan, and a schedule for implementation. This plan will be completed in November.

We currently have a bid out for the implementation portion of the plan. We will have that submitted during the month of November as I indicated earlier.

As part of the Colorado SSC effort, we will emphasize the promotion of business development and opportunities for minority business. Using innovative business development initiatives like joint ventures, strategic alliances and triads we hope to join with groups like the Black Chamber, the Hispanic Chamber, and those things that have already been done, along with the Colorado Black Realty and other ethnic business leaders and associations to make sure this project helps build the economic base and well-being of the minority communities of the State and the Nation.

We see the SSC as a true symbol of national competitiveness. Colorado's ethnic minorities hope to move forward in making the social and economic benefits of the SSC a sound foundation of economic growth for all segments of the community and the economy.

We hope all seven BQL sites would demonstrate the same level of leadership, commitment and participation. As a member of the black business community, we feel the potential business opportunities realized as a result of the SSC project will have a vast and direct positive benefit to our communities.

Every effort has been made from the Governor and his staff, the SSC staff to include minorities in the process. It is our contention that the high technological nature of the SSC project will spur our entrepreneurs to create significant opportunities in the high tech manufacturing business arena, as well as the service support and professional services arenas.

We feel that it would generate jobs, and it is easily accessible for high quality jobs. Furthermore, the positive role models that will be established as a result of the project are needed, and will act as an impetus to encourage our minority youth to seek the development of a strong entrepreneurial spirit, which is consistent with the spirit of Colorado.

With the State of Colorado's success at winning the Superconducting Super Collider project it will provide a positive impact for all segments of the entire minority community by exposing the communities to scientific technologies that under normal circumstances would not have been available.

With this newly exposed information and opportunity, it will strengthen the economic and academic health and vitality of the minority community. In turn the minority community will be properly postured to innovate and make great contributions to the society, which also contributes to making the State of Colorado great, the Country great, and the Superconducting Super Collider project great.

I thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you Mr. Thompson. On behalf of the hearing panel and the Department of Energy, it is our pleasure to introduce to you the Governor of the great State of Colorado, the Honorable Roy Romer.

(Applause)

568 STATEMENT OF HON. ROY ROMER

GOVERNOR ROMER: Thank you very much. I really want to commend the Department of Energy for a thorough study in a very short time. You have done a very good job.

I will submit some detailed comments by October 17.

First, I want to say we reaffirm our commitment to the SSC project. It is a good one for the Nation.

Secondly, our review of the EIS confirms the fact that here in Colorado we would have a low environmental and low socio-economic impact if we would build it here.

The third thing that I would like to say is that I think that the draft EIS should be revised to present a more balanced evaluation of the Colorado site in regard to quality of life and remoteness.

I think that our quality of life here is a significant inducement, quite frankly, to such an enterprise being located here. Because some portion, by implication of the EIS, referred to remoteness, I would like to speak to that.

It seems to me that the Colorado site gives us, really, the best of both worlds. You have a site which will not disturb an urban area by its construction. At the same time you have a site that would give anybody who works there or is associated with it an option in terms of lifestyle: a small community and all that goes with it in terms of knowing where your child is on Friday night, or a larger urban area which is sufficiently close that one can commute.

And if you look at distances in the West, you measure them not in miles, but in minutes. The site is 40 minutes from the new airport. And as we grow around that airport, that urban area will reach out toward the actual physical location of the site.

I therefore feel that if you are talking about culture, athletic events, participation in the community life off an urban area, or the community life of a small city, you have both available. And therefore I do not feel that remoteness is a negative; rather I feel that there is a balance here, on location, which is positive.

I would also comment that the draft EIS, in its attention to Colorado, gives a great attention to detail. It acknowledges the full scope of Colorado's direct and indirect impacts.

And it covers a substantial geographic area and a lot of infrastructure, such as roads, not just at the initiation of the project, but during its life. And I find that detail not available in all the EIS studies of all the other sites. And I would encourage the Department of Energy to add it. Because when you do that I think you will have a very much more comprehensive comparison.

In conclusion, we still feel that Colorado has the best technical aspects of the sites. We believe that we add a lifestyle that is very attractive, a place that you can recruit in.

And we just submit to you that we would like to have it located here. We think that that location would be the best, not just for Colorado but for the nation. And I think that you will find more scientists wanting to relate to this location than any of the others that are before you.

Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Governor.

(Applause)

MR. EIGUREN: The next commenter is Dr. Thomas Vernon of the Colorado Department of Health.

563 STATEMENT OF DR. THOMAS VERNON

DR. VERNON: Thank you gentlemen. I am Dr. Tom Vernon, Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Health. We too, are pleased to participate in this hearing.

Our Department is the Environmental Protection Agency within the government of the State of Colorado. Thus we are deeply involved in protecting and improving the quality of life to which the Governor refers.

Our Department's environmental programs include air pollution, water quality, hazardous materials and waste management, and radiation control. We are in the process of offering some more detailed comment on the draft EIS as part of our statement to you. Many of those comments will be editorial. And we will be offering more current and relevant information.

I would like to highlight several more substantive issues which are related to waste, to water and to air.

I will not speak to radiation. We are convinced that the project would not pose any health or disposal problems from radioactive emissions or materials.

Concerning waste materials, we believe that the small amount of waste materials that would be disposed of in this project can be safely disposed at a licenced site. We believe that the spoil materials from construction, the rock and soil which do not fall under our regulatory program can be readily and adequately disposed of at appropriate disposal sites.

And with proper construction practices those wastes would not pose a problem. We are ready to work with you and of course with local officials on the details of designs of such sites. Concerning water quality we do not believe that any significant water quality problems, either surface or groundwater, will occur during construction or operation of the project. Any construction and related impacts can be controlled with commonly used management practices. And of course waste water can be readily treated to meet State and local requirements with conventional treatment systems or septic systems.

Our air pollution program has identified several potential concerns associated with compliance with the national ambient standards for particulates during construction. The draft report is projecting possible violations of such particulate standards.

And we, of course, would want to deal with those. We do not believe that those particulate issues will be any different in Colorado from any other site, and we are confident that the standards can be met at this site, as well as at any other. In that regard we look forward to working with your representatives on more detail and site specific control measures within the supplemental EIS.

In addition the report needs to identify and analyze the secondary impacts of vehicular activity on air quality. And we will offer a suggested approach based on data already developed by our Department of Highways. In summary we believe that the draft EIS, with some modest changes, comprehensively identified the environmental effect of the proposed project.

We believe that reasonable design and management measures will fully conform with whatever effects may be created in terms of our regulatory requirements, and will not significantly impact the natural environ ment or Colorado's public health.

And we look forward to working further with you and your representatives on those issues.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you Dr. Vernon.

Our next scheduled commenter is Mr. Peter Decker from the Colorado Department of Agriculture.

565 STATEMENT OF PETER DECKER

MR. DECKER: My name is Peter Decker, Commissioner of Agriculture for the State of Colorado. And I will address very briefly four aspects of the project pertinent to agriculture in Colorado; the project's impact on agricultural land, agricultural water, rural families and rural economic development in this portion of the state.

With regard to the impact on agricultural land, for the project site itself, approximately 15,500 acres are needed, nearly all of which is range land or crop land. We note favorably that approximately half of that, or 7,500 acres, will be available for lease back to agricultural producers in the area.

The draft EIS estimates that approximately 2,000 acres of the 7,500 acres proposed for the fee simple purchase of the project site is prime farmland. We dispute this estimate.

The soils information provided by the Colorado SSC team to the U.S. Department of Energy with the assistance of the United States Soil Conservation Service shows only one acre of prime irrigated land in the fee simple portion of the project site.

The draft EIS estimate of 2,000 acres of the fee simple prime land assumes that these acres could be irrigated. Without irrigation the land is simply not productive enough to be classified as prime.

Again, according to the Soil Conservation Service it is extremely unlikely in our judgment that additional irrigation water will become available in the area.

Beyond the project site 2,100 acres will be dedicated to construct 58 miles of new roads. And the U.S. Soil Conservation Service and the Colorado Department of Highways estimate that only 209 of these

acres are prime irrigated land. In considering the benefit that improved transportation in the area would have on agriculture in improved market access, the loss of these prime farm lands is justified.

In addition, officials of the Colorado Department of Highways have assured me that they will work with the affected landowners to insure that the highway location and design will not hamper reasonable access to farmlands for livestock and machinery to accommodate agricultural operations.

I am aware that additional land impacts will result from the construction of a number of miles of power lines. I would expect, however, that the utilities involved would negotiate with the affected landowners in good faith, and that the landowners will be fairly compensated for the impacts.

With regard to agricultural water, in the semiarid West, any potential impacts on precious water supplies to agriculture, industry, municipalities and the environment must be carefully considered. The State of Colorado has given careful consideration to this issue. And I am convinced that Colorado's water resources can accommodate the water needs of the SSC project without discernible impacts to agriculture.

More than half of the 2,200 acre-feet of water needed annually for the project has been already secured. And the remainder will be purchased from existing sources. Some of the remaining water will possibly come from irrigation sources. Supplies are adequate and readily available. And given the magnitude of the SSC project we do not believe the water demands are excessive.

With regard to agricultural families and labor, five families who live within the project site, four of whom are farm families, would be relocated. In addition we understand other relocations may be necessary because of the new highway required.

While relocation will be a hardship on the families affected, I expect they will be compensated adequately and other assistance will be provided to them. The site was well chosen in my opinion to minimize the relocation of the families.

One of the most important aspects of the project will be the influence on the labor in the area. Agriculture being the predominant industry will naturally feel the labor effects. And these effects will be both positive and negative.

During construction, the project no doubt will increase labor costs for farmers and ranchers as the SSC project will most likely pay higher wages than the prevailing agricultural wage. However the project will also provide off-farm job opportunities for some agricultural families, enabling them to supplement farm income.

In my opinion the benefits of increased rural job opportunities for agricultural families will more than offset the temporary drawbacks of higher labor costs.

With regard to rural economic development, Colorado's agricultural industry and rural communities are intertwined. What affects one, affects the other. Rural economic development is crucial for the future of agriculture in this State.

The SSC project will undoubtedly promote the redevelopment of the rural community in the area. And by contributing to a more diverse and stronger infrastructure, the region will gain improved health care and educational facilities and services.

In summary Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the Colorado site is where the SSC should be located. The impacts on the land and the water will not be significant. The site will relocate very few families.

The beneficial impacts on agriculture resulting from off-farm job opportunities will far exceed the drawbacks. The rural economy and the social fabric it supports will be strengthened and diversified by the project.

Thank you very much.

[illegible]

[illegible] Chamber of [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] the hearing briefly recessed to effect sound system adjustments, to reconvene at [illegible]

[illegible] Colorado and are present at the afternoon session of our hearing to discuss the merits [illegible] of the SSC project.

We had just called Marcellus Jackson when we had a problem.

Mr. Jackson could we get your name and address for the record, sir. You have five minutes in which to comment.

679 STATEMENT OF MARCELLUS JACKSON

MR. JACKSON: Good afternoon, my name is Marcellus Jackson. I reside at 11233 East Harvard Drive, Aurora, Colorado. I am here today to speak briefly in support of the Superconductor Super Collider project for Colorado. And I am here to speak particularly to speak in my capacity as Chairman of the Board of the Colorado Black Chamber of Commerce.

Our Board met and unanimously adopted a resolution in support of what we believe to be an extremely important project, particularly for Colorado and certainly for the Nation. We support this project because we think that this project has the capacity to restore the country back to its rightful position in a leadership capacity in science and technology.

We believe in some ways that Colorado is ideal for this project. And we hate to elevate it to that level, but I think were we to say, in terms of how Colorado is situated, that in the beginning God created heaven, earth and Colorado as the ideal site for the Super Collider project.

The reason I believe that it is ideal is based on our geography. We have the ideal geology to support this project. We have the infrastructure that exists in education and work force within the state to support this project.

/ And we have on the drawing board a first class international airport to provide direct access for the scientific community to come in and out of Colorado as a base for the project.

And while certainly we see this as an important project for Colorado, we view it as a national and regional project as well. We have managed just by virtue of our location to secure pretty unanimous support from adjoining states in the Rocky Mountain region in support of Colorado's selection for the project.

I am especially excited about the extent to which this project will involve the full participation of the minority community in respect to business development opportunities, as well as educational opportunities. We certainly would encourage the selection committee to look at that issue, and to scrutinize that issue in a very judicious way, as you start to interview the other competitors for this important project. In conclusion, I would just like to say that the Black Chamber is not only, in representing the Black business community, and the larger Black community, it is not only involved in supporting the project. We kind of see ourselves as not just behind the project, we see ourselves as being in front of the project.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Mr. Jackson.

Our next commenter will be Ray Chamberlain representing the Colorado Department of Highways.

567 STATEMENT OF RAY CHAMBERLAIN

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, My name is Ray Chamberlain. I am Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Highways. I reside at 4200 West Shore Way, Fort Collins, Colorado.

The Colorado Department of Highways stands ready to construct the roadway system described as necessary in the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Colorado Super Collider facility. The construction of the proposed highways, as well as the improvement of existing roadways, will reflect extensive planning and sensitivity to the social, economic and environmental needs of the nation, state and eastern Colorado.

The Department of Highways has reinforced its commitment to the Department of Energy by conducting comprehensive site surveys, research and analysis of the effect on the environment and potential impacts.

The results and findings of these supplemental studies are included in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. As these studies have shown, there will be no significant impact associated with the roadway construction.

The Department of Highways will employ all measures necessary to mitigate any residual impact which might result from the highway construction.

A review of our studies has identified the presence of cultural resources which, however, can either be avoided or mitigated. Further, wetlands are present within the proposed highway corridor.

The potential wetland impacts identified are considered minimal, however. We are certain that the negative impacts can be reduced substantially further. For example the surveys point out that the East-West Parkway crosses a quality wetland north of Barr Lake. Adjustment of the alignment along with appropriate design techniques will minimize impact to the wetlands complex.

We are exploring methods and have identified an alternative which may avoid impacts at the Barr Lake location. While avoidance is the preferred wetland mitigation, the Department has had success with wetland creation and enhancement.

Other measures to create, enhance and preserve existing wetlands will be employed, should total avoidance not be possible.

Prior to conducting the onsite environmental surveys, permission to trespass was obtained from the properties' owners along the proposed East-West Parkway Corridor. Following this, agents from the Department of Highways were sent out to make personal contact with the landowners to further explain the project, and to obtain written information to trespass.

These contacts did not elicit any significant opposition to the SSC project or the proposed highway construction. While it is always the case that no one wants a highway project to take their property, concerns about environment, social and economic impacts were not received through this process.

As stated in the draft Environmental Impact Statement approximately 94 miles of new roadway and approximately 91 miles of improvements to existing roadways will need to be constructed.

It is our considered opinion that since all of these new miles of roadway are to be two-lane facilities initially, they will not spark new uncontrolled or unwanted development. All roadways will be planned and constructed with the cooperation of the local entities and their planning agencies.

Measures to plan new access and to maintain existing access will proceed with full consideration of the local needs for transportation and their agricultural activity. All proposed roadway construction will fall into areas comprised of open farmland and sparse development.

Most of the ownerships to be intersected by proposed roadways are large parcels made up of several sections of land. For this reason it appears that impacts to local residents and communities will be minor. Our review of the draft Environmental Impact Statement indicates that Colorado and the Department of Highways have provided considerably more detail and environmental survey and analysis than many of the other Best Qualified List of states.

We are certain that the Department of Energy, in recognition of this, will render this data into account in their decision.

In summary, the Department of Highways has complete confidence that all of the roadways will be provided as needed for construction and operation of the Colorado Super Collider project.

Further we have also determined that the resulting roadway system will provide a high level of service with minimal impacts on the surrounding communities for the life of the project. The Department of Highways will rely on its considerable technical and professional resources, along with the efforts of Colorado's private construction and engineering industry, to meet our commitments.

All impacts potentially resulting from the highway construction will either be avoided or mitigated satisfactorily with the measures developed from our experience and the cooperation of the appropriate Federal, State and local agencies.

Colorado is a recognized national leader in environmental preservation. Following the state's example, the Colorado Department of Highways has long applied the full EPA process to all state funded, as well as federally funded, Colorado highway projects.

Gentlemen, I thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Mr. Chamberlain.

Our next commenter is Mr. Dan Rodriguez of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

680 STATEMENT OF DAN RODRIGUEZ

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Good afternoon, gentlemen. My name is Dan Rodriguez. I reside at 6745 West Nevada Place in Lakewood, Colorado. I am the executive director for the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, which is a state organization. The Superconducting Super Collider project is very important for the Hispanic and minority communities. There are three areas of importance that we are looking at. One is education. The education aspect: kindergarten through 12 and higher education opportunities will be offered to train Hispanic and minority scientists that would be utilized in the SSC project.

Employment: Employment of Hispanic and minorities would be beneficial and would increase employability of minorities. The construction phase of the project would greatly enhance the employment of minority contractors and would therefore create employment opportunities for minorities.

2 The item is business. The minority business community would have, through the State minority participation, bills at 17 percent, and for Federal guidelines, minority participation which would greatly enhance the opportunities for minority-owned firms. The SSC projects has produced the blueprint outline for minority inclusion in all aspects for education, employment and businesses.

We, as the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, are committed to work with the State and Federal Government for these goals and objectives.

Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

Next commenter is the Honorable Bruce Bass, Commissioner of Morgan County.

573 STATEMENT OF HON. BRUCE BASS

MR. BASS: Good afternoon, gentlemen. I am Morgan County Commissioner Bruce Bass. My address is 30621 County Road Inn, Brush, Colorado. I am here representing the Board of Morgan County Commissioners.

I am pleased to welcome you back to Morgan County and to have the opportunity to provide comment to you in person. We disagree with the statement that Colorado communities of Fort Morgan, Brush and Morgan County could experience population impacts to lead to a boomtown conditions.

In the past, Morgan County has been able to handle large influxes of population. We met the needs of the oil boom in the early '50s, and again with the construction of the Pawnee Power Plant in 1978 and '79. We are certain that we can meet the needs of the SSC without any problems.

Let me state our concerns and reasons why we feel this way.

Morgan County administrative impact will be at a very minimum as we know that Morgan County's population has been at a steady state for the past years while our assessed valuation has arisen from 201,961,000 in 1985, to 239,414,000 in 1988. Morgan County historically has not taken its legal statutory increases in budgets. Morgan County's planning budget has steadily increased since 1985. Morgan County's first ever comprehensive plan was completed and approved last April, which provides an orderly growth for the future of Morgan County while preserving our rural lifestyle.

We see the SSC project as being compatible to our plan. And in the education department, Morgan County has four excellent school districts with several private schools. Our schools can handle the projected increases of 700 students easily within their existing facilities, and would totally concur with the statement in Volume IV, Appendix 5(A) that these communities are already currently regional centers and could serve a much larger population if experienced by rapid growth of the development of the SSC. And the public education levels and services in our four school districts within our county are better than those of the national averages. Morgan County is also fortunate, we are the home of the Morgan Community College.

In the area of housing, Morgan County is also fortunate because in our county we already have in operation a modular manufacturing home plant, and with our local builders we estimate that we can produce five housing units per day.

For the early stages of the SSC, we have an excess of already platted lots for regular housing as well as mobile home lots. We also have available numerous rural acreages, approximately 40 acres or less, so that people can enjoy our rural lifestyle.

We estimate that we have enough houses, plus the ability to produce the housing, to accommodate the SSC families, plus have enough housing available for the projected 1,000 workers to build the Pawnee II power plant at the very same time.

Public safety has been another concern in several paragraphs. Since 1985, Morgan County has spent $5.7 million of capital funds for public safety with the construction of a new jail, court system and a new state-of-the-art communication center. Morgan County is unique in that Morgan County does all the dispatching for all the law enforcement agencies, the fire departments and all other emergency medical services in Morgan County. Our county's communications has approximately a budget of $400,000 annually.

We could at this very moment expand our communication services and our emergency services to the SSC site through an intergovernmental agreement with Adams and Washington Counties.

Concerns of transportation in the EIS: Morgan County has already dealt with the road issue for the early stages of the SSC by the utilization of existing roads, of County Road 19 and F. Through the Colorado Bridge Fund, Morgan County has plans to replace a $1.2 million bridge across the bayou on County Road F, which leads to the SSC site.

Also, the State of Colorado has committed to build County Road 20 as well as upgrade other county roads in the early stages of construction for the future use to the SSC site.

For public transportation, Morgan County is a part of the Northeast Colorado Transportation Authority. This bus is for everyone to use, and just not the elderly and the handicapped.

There has been some concern that the State of Colorado doesn't have enough aggregate to build the SSC, to upgrade the roads and possibly build the Pawnee II Power Plant all at the same time without going out of the state for additional aggregate.

As being the former deputy assessor, let me explain briefly to you why there aren't more permitted acres of aggregate than there are. There is simply the Colorado property tax laws. Once a gravel pit is permitted, the owner is immediately taxed upon the reserve within that permit.

Finally, Morgan County fully supports the State of Colorado mitigation plan.

So you see, gentlemen, if Colorado is chosen as the site of the SSC, Morgan County won't be in a boom town condition as portrayed in the EIS, but is ready, willing and well capable of accepting the challenge. Thank you.

DR. TEMPLE: Commissioner Bass, is there something that you can provide for us on estimated reserves of aggregate that could be available if they really wanted to exploit them?

MR. BASS: Yes, there is. Yesterday, we spent all day trying to get those figures so that we could have it in here, and we will make them --

DR. TEMPLE: Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Commissioner.

Next scheduled commenter is Susan Collins on behalf of the Colorado State Historical Society.

579 STATEMENT OF DR. SUSAN COLLINS

DR. COLLINS: Good afternoon. My name is Dr. Susan Collins, and I am the acting state archaeologist of Colorado. My working address is the Colorado Historical Societies, Colorado History Museum, 1300 Broadway, Denver 80203.

Today I would like to speak about our concern for the protection and preservation of historic and archaeologic sites, and about what progress has already been achieved in attaining compliance with the various federal and state laws that mandate that the project effect upon such cultural resources be taken into account.

First, the Department of Energy did conduct a search of the site files that are maintained by my office, and this file search revealed that there were 38 recorded cultural research properties within what we have called the region of influence. Two of these 38 sites are on the National Register of Historic Places. These are the Fort Morgan Post Office and the Rainbow Arch Bridge, a very lovely bridge over the South Platte River. The SSC project will not affect either of these sites.

Secondly, the Colorado Department of Highways has performed cultural resources survey of 63 miles of proposed access roads, and I might point out that this survey has taken place since the draft EIS went to press, and so we can report some progress.

The Department of Highways conducted a 20 percent sample survey for archaeological sites and identified seven sites, five of which were determined to be ineligible for the national register, and two of which required some test excavation to determine their importance.

A 100 percent historical survey of the 63 miles of proposed access roads identified ten historic sites, four of which were determined not to be eligible, and six of which were determined eligible for the National Register.

Thirdly, I would like to point out that the Colorado Historical Society back in 1984 published a series of regional overview documents that summarized the history and archaeology of our state. Two of these 12 volumes, the Plains Prehistorical Context and the Plains Historical Context, are relevant to this project.

In order to aid in our evaluation of sites which may be discovered by future project-related surveys, the Colorado Historical Society is planning to further develop a context statement on the Plains Paleo-Indian culture. This context statement will specify research questions, predict site types, and define criteria for site significance. This project will be conducted in the coming Fiscal Year 1989, starting October 1st, regardless of whether or not we do receive the Superconducting Super Collider. However, we have targeted this project with the SSC in mind. So we are getting ready.

Where would we go next assuming award of the project?

First, the State Historic Preservation Officer, which is my supervisor, would pursue with the Department of Energy to develop a programmatic agreement. This programmatic agreement, which would be signed by the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, would outline the strategies that would be followed to achieve full compliance with the various laws. It would outline also avenues for resolution of any disputes or conflicts that might arise.

Therefore, we would not have to face emergency discoveries as if they were disasters. We would have avenues already in place.

We would, of course, want to see surveys of the areas of direct impact completed. But I might add that in the Colorado case, as I understand it, surface disturbance will be minimal due to the technology involved of tunneling through bedrock rather than pursuing cut and fill. Therefore, we would not have as much surface disturbance of archaeological or historic sites as other states might.

We would, of course, want to consider potential indirect impact resulting from not only the ring itself and roads, but also other facilities that might be developed to accommodate the new population. And, of course, we would develop plans for mitigating any adverse effect.

In closing, let me outline a few of the Colorado's strengths for achieving cultural resource compliance. I do believe that our State is in a very good position in that the State Historical Preservation Officer and the State archaeologist are located together organizationally within the Colorado Historical Society, and this is the organization that administers the Colorado History Museum.

Therefore, compliance with cultural resource mandates is centralized, and we have ready access to a wide range of preservation specialists.

A representation of the State Historic Preservation Officer has worked closely with the staff of the Colorado joint review process since the earliest stages of this project, and we will continue that close coordination.

Furthermore, the State archaeologist works closely with the Colorado Native American Heritage Council, which is an American Indian advocacy group. We have negotiated a policy for reburial of skeletons that might be uncovered by construction projects, and procedures have already been implemented. Again, should the situation arise, we already have avenues for handling it.

Colorado also has a very active statewide Amateur Archaeological Society that aids in the identification and advises on the preservation of sites. The Colorado Archaeological Society has chapters both in Denver and in Fort Morgan.

And finally, the State of Colorado has State preservation laws in place, including the Historical, Prehistorical and Archaeological Resources Act and the State Register Act. These laws supplement and parallel Federal legislation, making the State and Federal compliance processes uniform.

In summary, I believe that Colorado has already made a significant commitment toward achieving compliance with cultural resources and historic preservation laws in regard to this project. I would like again to emphasize the commitment that the Colorado Department of Highways has made in already initiating survey and the commitment that the Colorado Historical Society has made to develop a document that will enable us to evaluate any sites that might be newly discovered by survey.

Thank you.

DR. NELSEN: Ms. Collins.

DR. COLLINS: Yes.

DR. NELSEN: That survey that was completed on the road, is that information -- do you intend to submit that to us at this time for the record?

DR. COLLINS: I have submitted the notes from which I spoke. I do not have specific site descriptions, but these totals have been provided to the court reporter.

DR. NELSEN: Okay. Was there anything specifically directed to the EIS with regard to your statement about the programmatic agreements, or was that just a general statement?

DR. COLLINS: That was a general statement of our plans for proceeding to develop compliance for this project.

DR. NELSEN: Fine. Then one final thing with regard to Colorado Native American Council was that the --

DR. COLLINS: Native American Heritage Council, yes

DR. NELSEN: Native American Heritage Counc

DR. COLLINS: Yes

DR. NELSEN: Is there a contact person or leader in --

DR. COLLINS: I attend their meetings. The contact office is the Colorado Commission on Indian Affairs which is located in the Lieutenant Governor's Office in the capitol.

DR. NELSEN: Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Dr. Collins.

DR. COLLINS: Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: At this time we would like to call the science and technology advisor for Colorado's SSC project proposal, and that's Dr. George Morgenthaler.

578 STATEMENT OF DR. GEORGE MORGENTHALER

DR. MORGENTHALER: Thank you very much, Dr. Temple and the other members of the panel. First of all, I would like to commend the Department of Energy on the monumental task that you did in getting out the draft Environmental Impact Statement as rapidly as you did. Seeing all those volumes and remembering our own experience with a similar chore for the proposal, I compliment you.

I have heard that you said that this was done largely by computer, so the area in which I want to disagree, I will attribute to the unfeeling habits of the computer.

On balance, it is an excellent effort. It does lack in one discernment, however, and I have a number of examples that I would like to bring to your attention and I have this documented and will submit it to the court reporter. I have about nine or ten examples, of which I will give two or three.

The point I am trying to make is that in a number of instances, particularly in respect to land and water and the usage of these, you lump Colorado with some of the other best qualified list contenders. Now, the others fall into two categories. They are either basically desert land, which we are not, or they are the more temperate, more humid farmlands of the East, Midwest, Eastern Sea Board, and Colorado's high plains. And that's a very subtle distinction and it's very profound. It has to do with why we have water laws as we have them, and why our farming practices and our water usage is the way it is.

So my first point has to do with prime important farmlands that are converted, and I know that other speakers have addressed this, or will address it. I want to address it from a slightly different viewpoint.

In the first place, throughout the EIS it is treated as though an acre that is removed from farmland, or one that is potentially removed, is necessarily a negative feature. We point out, and I think your own volume points out, that this is temporary. If indeed the site is available for 30 years, it will come back into activity after the decommissioning. And except for the actual location of buildings, which is only several acres at different points, the land would be and can be used again for farming.

But suppose one says, well, that's negative. We have in the State of Colorado and throughout the high plain the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, ASCS. The office is here in Fort Morgan, which is carrying out a far-reaching government farm program which is trying at this time to retire acres because there is a national surplus of most of the feed grain crops. And what the result of that is that the prices on the world scene and in the United States have been reduced to the point where farmers who produce an abundant crop cannot look forward to prices that can return a profit and allow them to economically farm this ground.

In fact, the national bill for these subsidies is on the order of $25 billion, which is about five times the cost of the entire SSC.

So to say that we bank or lose four or five hundred acres of prime farm ground might under some circumstances be construed as going along with national policy and not going against it.

And, indeed, in this state we even have a so-called CRP programs which will pay you up to $45 or $50 an acre for a ten-year period to set aside your farm ground.

So my first point is it's a very bad measure. It ought to be removed from the volume.

On the other hand, if you leave it in the volume, I would dispute your numbers of 4,700 acres of potentially usable farm ground, prime farm ground removed from Colorado's site by the SSC. The statement was made that in the event there was irrigation water, this would occur. This is precisely the point.

Where our ring is located, we are the drainage of the Badger Creek and the Beaver Creek. They do not have the direct benefit of the mountain snows and ice that melt each year and go along the South Platte and tributary water basins. Therefore, they depend on their limited basins, and those are pointed out in our proposal and in your own volume as to the square miles of basin.

The water that is available, therefore, is not enough for additional irrigation. This is why Colorado's irrigation law prevents you from putting down another well for an irrigation system without going through an extensive permitting project and having augmentation coverage. And augmentation at this time is not available there, and therefore it has gone about as far as it can go at this point in time.

So I think that one should look at this and you will come to the conclusion that no more can be irrigated at this time economically. The soil is indeed good, and with Colorado's sunshine if you had fertilizer and irrigation water, you could grow many crops. But the water is not there.

Now you will say, but you're bringing water in for the SSC. We pointed out elsewhere this is between 2,000 and 2,500 gallons per minute. It is economically justifiable for the SSC. Our prime proposal is to bring it in through the Morgan County Quality Water District pipeline, and it comes from tributary and other water supplies that are hooked to the mountain melt, and therefore is adjudicated water and not in doubt or in question.

So while that's economically beneficial and will be sustained by the SSC, that's not true at this time for additional farm crops.

So I think that distinction is not true in Michigan. It's not true in North Carolina. It's not true in Texas, but it's true here. So therefore we should not have a number like 4,700 acres given that you used to measure.

I would like to move to a different kind of --

MR. EIGUREN: Dr. Morgenthaler, I'm sorry, your time has elapsed. Could I ask you to bring it to a close?

DR. MORGENTHALER: All right, fine. The threatened and endangered species I'm sure has been mentioned. We do not depend on Western Slope CPT water, and the water we would use, if it's beneficial to use it, has already been adjudicated and long ago mitigated. It is not a new take. It is an old take.

And the last point has to do with oil and gas wells. There are only four in the way of the project. The oil and gas would be below 4 or 5,000 feet in the Dakota Formation. There is either two dangers that you are concerned about. One is hitting a pocket of gas. You will not do that at 300 feet in the shale. That's our maximum depth. And the other one would be you would run into some old well pipes. There is only four in the way. Magnetic technique, ultrasonic techniques, could detect those pipes and they could be removed.

So the rest of my testimony is here. I would like to add it for the record.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, sir.

Are there any questions?

Our next scheduled commenter is Jerry Wartgow.

594 STATEMENT OF JEROME WARTGOW

MR. WARTGOW: Thank you for providing the opportunity. My name is Jerome Wartgow. I am president of the Colorado Community College and Occupational Education System. My address is 1391 Speer Boulevard, Suite 600, in Denver.

I'm pleased to be here this afternoon to comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement. As System President, I am directly responsible for the 11 community colleges in the State System, and we have

general responsibility for program approval and funding for four additional community colleges, seven area vocational schools and secondary school vocational programs in 168 school districts.

We also serve as a regulatory agency for all proprietary schools operating in Colorado, and are the certifying agent for all agency -- for all apprenticeship training programs in Colorado.

The Environmental Impact Statement gave general consideration to education in the State of Colorado, but did not focus specifically on higher education. Higher education, the community college system, and more specifically, Morgan Community College, would be directly impacted by the selection of the Brush/Fort Morgan area as a site for the SSC project.

We believe that the impact on the community colleges would be positive, and that the community colleges would be an asset to the SSC project. Morgan Community College is an integral part of the Colorado community college and occupational education system, and will serve as the lead institution in higher education efforts to meet the training needs resulting from the SSC project.

However, the instructional programs of the entire community college and occupational education system are available to be drawn upon for needed technical training during both the construction and the operational phases of the Superconducting Super Collider project. The entire system will, therefore, assist in meeting these training needs to alleviate any severe impacts upon a single community college.

Morgan Community College is also prepared to assist the four-year colleges and universities in delivering upper division classes and graduate programs to employees of the Super Collider project and their dependents in Fort Morgan.

Morgan Community College has already implemented distance learning programs through existing technology and would be expecting to continue development of such delivery methods.

So the impact upon higher education in the construction and operation of the SSC in Colorado would be considerable, but we believe Colorado is in a good position to meet the challenges. Through a statewide community college and occupational education system operated by a single governing board, resources and expertise can be shared to efficiently and effectively meet the instructional needs for the project. Colorado is the only State in the nation that has all community colleges, vocational education programs and proprietary schools at all levels governed and operated by a single board. And we believe that gives us tremendous flexibility to adapt to the needs without any undue impact on any one of our institutions. So the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education and the system is very supportive of this project. We will make every effort to assist Morgan Community College in assuring the delivery of the appropriate and quality programs, apprenticeship training programs and other support needed for the Super Collider project in Colorado.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

Next commenter will be speaking on behalf of the Department of Natural Resources of the State of Colorado, Chips Barry.

577 STATEMENT OF HAMLET J. BARRY

MR. BARRY: Thank you. My name is Hamlet J. Barry. I am Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Natural Resources. My address is 1313 Sherman Street, Denver, Colorado.

For your information, the Department of Natural Resources covers the area of water supply, wildlife, parks, state land ownership, geology, mining and related topics in the State of Colorado.

First, I want to congratulate the Department of Energy for having completed an EIS in a timely and competent manner. We are in the throes in Colorado of the completion of another EIS. It's cost about $40 million and taken seven years, and we're happy this one didn't take that long, or cost that much money.

I think my comment in support of the Super Collider project and the EIS is consistent with the other cabinet members here today in that it is a good project for Colorado. We don't find anything in the EIS which indicates that building and operating the SSC in Colorado will have any environmental impact that cannot be readily mitigated by reasonable and tested mitigation measurements.

Having said that, I would like to comment briefly on some of the items in the EIS. One of those items concerns the availability of aggregate. The draft EIS is basically incorrect to conclude that there are insufficient construction materials available from within the region. There are ample supplies of sand and gravel of lower grade along the South Platte River, and there is a lot of mining of that. And believe me, I know because we regulate in my department. Adequate supplies of sand are available near Fort Morgan, and they can be readily developed.

Coarser aggregate is available further out toward the mountains; Greeley, Fort Collins, et cetera, all within reasonable hauling distances, and the economics would not prohibit that production.

We will provide you detailed written comments to show that those materials are available throughout the area and available to meet the needs of the SSC.

Even if other major construction projects are going on at the same time, we think there are adequate supplies to take care of the problem. We had a study instituted to look at that problem, assuming we were building an airport and a major highway system, a major dam project and this project at the same time. And that generally showed that even under those circumstances, there were adequate supplies, and our detailed comments will go into that in a little bit more detail.

I heard Dr. Morgenthaler say, and I am changing subjects now, threatened and endangered species. I heard Dr. Morgenthaler mention that briefly. I want to second what he said. We think the draft EIS somewhat exaggerates the impacts to threatened and endangered species, partly because it is inconsistent in its treatment of where water will be developed for this project.

Most of the discussion of threatened and endangered species stems from water supply issues. The fact is that the water supply for the SSC will not cause new depletions to the Colorado River or the South Platte River. Our commitment and that of the water -- people that supply water to the project -- will be to use existing water supplies or acquire additional water supplies from agriculture. We are not talking about any sort of major depletion to either river basin, and it's those depletions that drive the proponents of threatened and endangered species protection to say that there would be effects. There are no depletions. There will not be further effects. And, again, we will give you some written comment on that in specific detail.

I guess my conclusion on that is the Colorado River fish species and bird species in the South Platte River really should not be included in the EIS analysis because we think there is really no effect at all.

If water supply plan changes, you talk about major diversions from the Colorado River, then those are subjects which ought to be added and concluded at that time.

Finally, on threatened and endangered species, there really is no evidence to suggest that Colorado's proposal to extend State Highway 7 north of Barr Lake will disturb bald eagles nesting at or visiting that lake. The road corridor is about two miles north of the previously used nesting site and about the same distance from the artificial nesting site presently being installed. The distance is simply too great to justify a conclusion that the bald eagles will be affected.

Finally, my last topic here is loss of wetlands, floodplains, water wells and oil and gas wells. Again, Dr. Morgenthaler touched on that briefly. I think there is some erroneous data in the EIS about that, particularly as to acreage of wetlands lost with the floodplains and the number of water and oil and gas wells lost.

These are not significant errors, but I want to mention them to you. Wetlands lost or disturbed will account for closer to 10 acres than to 20. We will work closely with the Department of Energy, Highway Department and others to avoid or minimize wetland disturbance throughout the project area, especially in the vicinity of Barr Lake.

The widest floodplain is about 6,000 feet, not 10,000 feet, although there is a 10,000 foot floodplain at the confluences of two meandering streams. The last time I don't think you were the same panel that was here before, but I made an attempt to describe to the panel the different kinds of streams in Colorado, from permanent to ephemeral to occasional, and a 10,000 foot wide floodplain of a meandering occasional stream is of no great significance. The draft EIS correctly concludes that possible work in the floodplains would be limited in scope and would not be considered to cause significant impact.

Finally, several water and oil and gas wells may be displaced by the SSC project. However, it seems to us that those impacts can be completely mitigated. We have pledged to replace water supplies lost because of the SSC construction and to redrill oil and gas wells which may be displaced.

Our record shows that only four oil and gas wells would be affected, and we suggest the EIS tables be changed to reflect that.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Agencies in my department are pleased to continue to work with you. Thank you very much.

Questions?

DR. NELSEN: Yes. Mr. Barry, I have a question about the widest floodplain of 6,000 and not 10,000. Where was that located?

MR. BARRY: I'm sorry, I can't tell you. I don't know. Let me see if any of my staffers are here.

VOICE: I'll get you that information at the next break.

MR. BARRY: Thank you. You can see that I am well prepared, but still semi-ignorant. Thank you.

DR. NELSEN: I just wanted to make sure that it's in the record.

MR. BARRY: I'll see that that's done.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Mr. Barry.

At this time I will call Mr. Bil Tucker, who is Deputy Chairman of the Wyoming Public Service Commission.

682 STATEMENT OF DR. BIL TUCKER

DR. TUCKER: Gentlemen, my name is Dr. Bil Tucker. I am Deputy Chairman of the Wyoming Public Service Commission. My mailing address is Public Service Commission, Hurschler Building, 1 East, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002.

I bring you greetings from Governor Mike Sullivan and the people of Wyoming. With all deference to the good people of Colorado, I would like to extend my welcome to extreme southeastern Wyoming to you today. I make that comment, of course, somewhat in jest, but also to indicate to you the regionality that we in Wyoming and I think the other surrounding states feel about this project.

Of course, it's a Colorado project, but we feel, more than that, it's a very strong and appropriate regional project and Wyoming is pleased to lend its total support to this project.

I would like to just reiterate and expand briefly on a few comments made by Mr. Alan Edwards earlier this afternoon.

Wyoming is totally supportive of siting the SSC in the Fort Morgan, Colorado area. Wyoming, of course, will cooperate fully with identification, description and mitigation of any socio-economic impacts in that portion of southeastern Wyoming that lies within the region of influence.

Wyoming has a great deal of contemporary experience with world class megaprojects similar in size and construction requirements to the SSC, including some of the largest coal mines in the world, the Exxon Lebar Shoot Creek gas plant, and numerous electric generating plants in the State of Wyoming.

This experience has allowed Wyoming to already have in place adequate infrastructure to minimize any potential impacts from this project. Infrastructure in the area of roads, schools, housing, utilities, hospitals, local and state laws and ordinances, and service businesses that are already in place and operating.

Furthermore, Wyoming has a very well-educated work force which is recognized for its strong work ethic. Many members of this work force live within daily commuting distance which will greatly reduce the socio-economic impact during construction of the Superconducting Super Collider. This work force is already trained and attuned to projects of the size and complexity of the SSC.

We believe that the quality of life in Wyoming will be available and we believe sought after by that portion of the work force during the construction phase as well as that portion of the permanent research community during the operating lifetime of the SSC.

For those who choose Wyoming, they will find there clean air, clean water, tremendous outdoor recreational opportunities, quality public education, low taxes and low crime rate.

Again, the State of Wyoming thanks you for this opportunity to voice our very strong support for siting the SSC in northeastern Colorado. My comments will be incorporated into Wyoming's written comments which will be provided to you in the near future.

Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Dr. Tucker.

Our next commenter is Marne Jurgemeyer.

570 STATEMENT OF MARNE JURGEMEYER

MR. JURGEMEYER: My name is Marne Jurgemeyer. I am the director of the Fort Morgan Museum. I live at 323 Maple, Fort Morgan 80702.

I am speaking for the Fort Morgan Heritage Foundation and the Fort Morgan Museum, and I would like to address two areas of concern. The first area pertains to the impact of the Super Collider on the cultural and historical sites in the collider area.

By Federal statute, an archaeological survey must be conducted before the project can be constructed. Although preliminary reports have shown a scant list of sites, it is without a doubt new discoveries will be made and will range from paleontological specimens to evidence of Paleo-Indian to contemporary man.

Confirmation of these possibilities can be found in the diverse collections of the Fort Morgan Museum, which contains examples of the Pleistocene horse, clothes, and other Native American lithic and cultural artifacts to historic material culture. Some of these items come from the area being discussed. The Fort Morgan Museum is able and willing to participate in the archaeological survey. The museum is especially suited to becoming a repository for the artifacts that will be found.

The Fort Morgan Museum is an accredited museum by the American Association of Museums, one of 600 nationally out of a total of 5,000 museums, and one of the seven in the State of Colorado.

What this means is the Fort Morgan Museum exceeds the stringent standards of the AAM in collection care, management, exhibition and museum administration.

The Fort Morgan Museum has sponsored two archaeological excavations: the Caylor site and the Freehoff site located in Morgan County. The latter was cosponsored with the University of Colorado, Department of Anthropology. We have also worked with the Colorado Archaeological Society and the State archaeologists.

Presently, the storage facilities of the museum would suffice for the items found in initial investigations. If large amounts of artifacts were found, additional space would have to be found. The long-range committee of the Fort Morgan Heritage Foundation has addressed the problem of additional storage in its long-range plan, and which would be implemented if the situation demands.

A second point of concern is the impact of the Superconducting Super Collider on the operation of the Fort Morgan Museum. We expect to see a greater utilization by the public because of an increase in population and by demographic changes in the population.

Initially, the greatest impact will be the educational programming done by the local schools because of increased enrollment. There would also be a need for further exhibition space as well as the aforementioned need for storage space. The long-range plan drawn up by the Heritage Foundation has addressed these areas as well as an increase of paid professional staff.

Capital improvements would be financed through public and private monies, and must be added to the Fort Morgan Heritage Foundation raise the funds to renovate and construct the present museum and the collections facility. The expertise to handle the impact brought on by the changes caused by the SSC which will affect the Fort Morgan Museum can be addressed by the staff of the museum, the trustees of the foundation as well as expertise recruited from the outside area within the state.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

The next commenter is Dora Lodwick of the University of Denver.

683 STATEMENT OF DR. DORA LODWICK

DR. LODWICK: I am Dr. Dora Lodwick from the Department of Sociology at the University of Denver, a private institution. And my working address is the Department of Sociology, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado 80208-0209.

I have been associated with the substantive task force for the Governor's NFC project since 1984, and as part of the Board of Scientists who review the State's proposal the department submitted to the Department of Energy in 1987.

I have chosen to testify before you today because of some of the inaccuracies which I felt you had in your summary of Colorado's proposal, particularly in two areas. One, the community values and attitudes as reflected in Section 5.2.10.2; and two, in your assessment of the boom-town effect as presented in Sections 4.1.2.1 and in Section 4.1.3.2, especially No. 2 and 4.

First, I would like to comment on the community values and attitudes. As you know, this topic was highlighted by the members of the Super Collider site evaluation committee of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering, which questioned the validity and reliability of letters and newspaper reports received and private documentation of local and regional cooperation.

They agreed not to use that information in their deliberations, and concluded the committee strongly believes, however, the community acceptability, support and cooperation will be important factors that must be considered carefully by DOE as it examined the best qualified sites in the next stage of the site selection process. I'm sure you know this.

However, the DEIS uses a mix of the evaluation criteria. For example, in Colorado, in Sections 5.2.10.2, it states that community values and attitudes toward the SSC project are generally positive as evidenced by the relative dearth of letters received from the public as part of the DOE public scoping process.

Colorado had, however, presented more documentation in Volume IV, Section 4.9.1, in its scoping study of 93 community leaders in 1985, who represented the principal opinion sectors of the communities. The sample included business and political leaders, social service sector and education, ranchers and farmers and others who in this case were primarily the elderly. Seventy-seven percent of those were strongly in favor of building the SSC in the region.

The Colorado proposal also reports on a statewide telephone survey conducted in 1987 of 306 randomly selected registered voters. Seventy-four percent of those who had read or heard about the SSC favored building it in eastern Colorado.

Neither of these studies were reflected in Section 5.2.10.1 of the DEIS Volume IV, Appendix 5. Yet, the draft environmental statement reports surveys supportive of the SSC in the States of Illinois and in Michigan.

I propose that you also report those which were conducted in the State of Colorado.

Additional evidence of community support is totally ignored in this draft statement. The people in the communities of the region of influence as well as those throughout the state not only expressed positive attitudes towards the project, but also have involuntarily been involved in developing the planning for the project since 1985. This is documented in the Colorado SSC site proposal update, Section 429.

Colorado has creatively involved community and statewide members in small groups, as well as in larger, massive scale involvement and information programs suggested as the best processes of citizen involvement since 1984, for example.

The details of the process have been repeatedly presented to you, but I would simply note that the involvement started very early, almost as soon as the State began to get actively involved in the process itself. And this has been, I believe, a key factor in the tremendous support which the citizens of Colorado have given or will continue to give to this project.

They have had time to examine it. They have had time to examine its implications for their own lives. They have had their concerns addressed, and they have then participated in helping to bring it to their communities, and to continue through the proposed mitigation project as Colorado has developed for you.

The second point, the boom town effects. You have presented the classic research on boom town effects, or the impact of rapid growth on the quality of life of people in rapidly growing communities as referenced in 14.1.2.1, Volume IV, Appendix 14, team. These are classic research articles. Some recent work further developing that knowledge base published in a book that I will refer to you later on, in 1986, suggests that perhaps the early predictions of doomsday or of economic well-being were both too extreme. We need to guard against assuming undifferentiated impacts on all people in all communities. It is critical to assess the past experience of particular communities and particular social groups and to assess their attitudes and the resources and their behaviors in order to assess their ability to mitigate and monitor change.

2 The communities of Brush and Fort Morgan have both experienced rapid growth as has been testified today. Furthermore, they are supported by a state which has experienced the boom-bust cycle of mineral based economy. Colorado has historically been a national leader with innovative ways of meeting this challenge, particularly with the development of the Western Slope energy developments, which I am sure you are acquainted with.

The State knows how to handle rapid growth. It has institutionalized a realistic process which deals not only with the fiscal and infrastructural support for rapid growth, but also its social and cultural aspects through its community liaison center, for example. It has involved the people in a cooperative effort to develop flexible and realistic support systems to meet both the expected and the unexpected social changes.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

Any questions?

Next commenter is Uriel Nauenberg from the University of Colorado.

581 STATEMENT OF DR. BILL O'SULLIVAN

DR. O'SULLIVAN: There was an exchange. Uriel and I have exchanged times.

I am Bill O'Sullivan. I am chairman of the Department of Physics of the University of Colorado. My working address is the University of Colorado, Department of Physics, Campus Box 390, 80309 zip code.

I want to cover three points which relate to the potential impact of the SSC on and from the higher education environment in Colorado.

First, the Department of Physics at UCB Boulder, is entering a period of rapid recruiting for outstanding new faculty, with a goal which we believe is practical, of attaining a position among the top five physics departments located in public institutions within the next decade.

We have strong programs now in atomic and optical physics, high energy physics, geophysics, condensed matter physics and nuclear physics. We have a large and successful graduate program involving graduate research in education and physics, with over 165 students working toward their doctorates.

The high energy program in our department is the largest in the Rocky Mountain area. It comprises presently 30 people, including eight rostered physics faculty, and that's a number that will rise to nine within the arrival next fall of a new theoretical high energy physicist. The program receives its major funding from the Department of Energy, and its members participate in forefront research activities at SLAC and Fermilab.

Now if the SSC is placed in Colorado, in addition to similar positions at Colorado State University, the University of Colorado at Boulder will commit ten new positions for high energy physics faculty. These would be rostered in the Department of Physics, and clearly would have a profound impact on the direction and emphasis placed on research by us.

I want to assure you of two things in particular. First, that our faculty, recognizing the extent of this impact, nevertheless voted its unanimous support for the university's pledge to greatly expand the role of high energy physics within the department.

And second, the Department of Physics at UCB will work to ensure that, to the extent they desire, staff scientists at the SSC site will have the opportunity to interact closely with our programs. Adjunct professor positions will be opened, and opportunities to direct the thesis research of UCB doctoral students made readily available to them.

And next, I want to remind you of the commitment made by the State of Colorado, the State's research universities, along with the neighboring western states and their institutions of higher education, to create a Western States High Energy Physics and Education Institute located at the SSC site.

Now this will include funds for 20 endowed professorships, and a detector research and development laboratory for state of the art R&D in detector instrumentation and high capacity data analysis would take place.

But, in addition, the institute will serve as a stimulus and source of educational enhancements for all the participating states. It will actively promote better science and math education among our region's public schools, college and university students, and teachers. And as other speakers have mentioned, it will focus on attempts to provide educational experience in science and mathematics for minority students in the K through 12 time range.

Now, repeat -- this is a regional enterprise. Many of our neighboring states have expressed a high level of interest in joining this cooperative regional science and educational institute.

Finally, I am sure that the case has been well made that Colorado's research universities, the four branches of the University of Colorado, Colorado State University and the Colorado School of Mines, are a primary resource which will benefit all aspects of the SSC, should it find its way to Colorado. Nevertheless, despite what's been said by others before me, some of you still probably have the picture of SSC/university relations which feature dependence on long commutes from the site to the universities, and from the universities to the site.

Now, if the DOE desires it, there is another option which we think can greatly facilitate information exchange between the SSC and the University of Colorado, in particular, enhancing that institution's value to the SSC laboratory and its personnel.

Now the University of Colorado has completed a fiber optic network linking the media centers, telephone networks and data centers at each of its four campuses. This system enables the university to transmit two-way commercial-quality video and audio from any campus to any or all of the other campuses. Access

to the system is 24 hours per day, seven days a week, 365 days a year. When fully operational, the system will give all four campuses of the university the ability to use cable, microwave and satellite communications for instruction, professional development, teleconferencing and high speed data exchange.

If the Colorado site is eventually selected, the university's fiber optic communication network can be extended to include the SSC laboratory. This would provide facilities for teleconferencing between university and SSC personnel. It would enable SSC staff and their families to enroll at the university, and to take undergraduate and graduate courses on site from a broad selection of those given across the entire University of Colorado system.

SSC staff and their families would be able to view special events and lectures given on any of the university campuses. Data and other non-video information of value could be exchanged readily between the SSC site and the four campuses. Interactive video and audio exchange would be carried out routinely between researchers on site and their colleagues elsewhere in the University of Colorado system.

We mention this as an option to be considered by the Department of Energy which would promote exchange of information between the SSC laboratory, the institutes associated with it, the University of Colorado, and the associated regional research universities, and would enable the University of Colorado system to better serve the entire SSC community as an educational resource.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Dr. O'Sullivan.

Next commenter is Mr. Steve Baker.

684 STATEMENT OF STEVE BAKER

MR. BAKER: Thanks for providing the opportunity to comment on the DEIS. My name is Steve Baker. I farm a ranch near Last Chance, Colorado. And what I am going to speak on and for is a group called Concerned Citizens of Eastern Colorado. Pam Wellen, our spokesperson, could not attend tonight because of a death in her family a few days ago.

So I am not really that much prepared. I will, or the group will be following up with more additional information. The CCEC stands for an organization that was formed in 1980 to oppose the hazardous waste site as built in the Last Chance area. We still believe that ferrous industries hazardous waste site is detrimental to the SSC project.

This belief is based on fact and knowledge of the area. A BFI hazardous waste dump was permitted by CDH, Colorado Department of Health, as a result of industrial and political pressure and not on the merits of the application nor the site characteristic, and I'll just give a couple of examples to reinforce our feeling.

As an example on the site characteristics, the study by the Colorado SSC project report, reports that the groundwater resource characteristics are in a fracture flow up to 70 feet of where they have placed it. The BFI application states that the water is below 4,000 foot. And yet, in the background information authored by CDH, BFI will initially have 75 wells at different depth, of which 15 contain water to monitor on site.

The application and the permit are just full of inadequacies and problems that we feel should be addressed at some point in time.

Another point in fact is that at the time of permit issuance, CDH required additional information of the application such as burial cell design, cap design, meteorological study, run-off control, QA/QC plan, hydrologic investigation, and the list goes on. It was two pages long. All this information was -- is to be submitted after permit issuance.

The citizens of CCEC and the six counties of northeast Colorado strongly believe the BFI hazardous waste site is detrimental to our environment. Therefore, CCEC believes that the SSC is also -- that the BFI is detrimental to the SSC project.

Opposition to the BFI dump has cost the area citizens over $250,000, with many donated hours. This fight against the hazardous waste site has been since 1980, as I mentioned earlier, and with several hearings and the like, it has always been -- the cards have always been stacked against the citizens and our area.

We believe also, by definition and by the current Colorado regulations that stipulate -- that designate sparse population for siting of hazardous waste, we believe that the impact of the SSC, with influx of people, it does not coincide with the Colorado waste regulations.

Currently, there is one appeal against the CDH by the CCEC, and the City of Brush, Fort Morgan County commissioners and the Washington County commissioners against the CDH decision. To date, CCEC has been gaining ground, and before the judicial judge, all the motions that have been filed, all motions have

been on behalf of CC -- in favor of CCEC. And so we feel our appeal is very good and warrants a further consideration by the DOE. We do not like the idea that in DEIS Volume IV, Appendix 10, where hazardous waste that is associated with the SSC is already considered to be entombed into the Last Chance facility.

We think it's presumptuous on their part to say they will use the facility when in fact the appeals are still pending.

I would like -- we brought that up at the scoping hearing, and I would like to bring it up now because I see it hasn't been changed, and I think it's very important.

Another thing that's -- just to add to our testimony -- It's the Fort Morgan Times, there is an article. You might have some time to read it tonight. Front page. Study shows contaminants would move quickly in water if the BFI dump leaks.

Now, instead of taking time here and going into detail, I wish you would read that. We will send you a copy of that later in case you fail to get a copy here. It's a study that just supports our contentions since 1980. We are sparsely settled. True, we don't have very many people in the area. And until now when the state officials are finally listening, and so I believe since the SSC site sits within six miles of the hazardous waste site, that it could cause real problems in the future.

We cannot figure out how Colorado could be chosen if the site is already operational. I mean you just don't put $4.4 billion project downstream from a site, and especially after you read what the water results are, and the water flow and such.

So, are there any questions?

DR. NELSEN: Yes, Mr. Baker. We appreciate your bringing this stuff in. And I want to clarify and not try and put words in your mouth. But essentially the contents and extent of your comment is to the effect the BFI hazardous waste facility would have on the SSC; is that correct?

MR. BAKER: That's right.

DR. NELSEN: Where you are really focusing is in Chapter 10 where we are sort of accepting the fact, if that's the case, we are accepting the fact that the hazardous waste facility is there and necessarily so.

MR. BAKER: Correct. Because really it is -- they are doing construction, but that's at their own cost and their own gamble, so to speak. Now the appeal could be completely reversed, and there is another appeal with the county, at the county level. The county commissioners, we felt back in 1984, were wrong in issuing a CD to this company, because it did not meet the regulation at the time. That's in the appellate court.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Mr. Baker.

MR. BAKER: Thank you.

DR. NELSEN: Oh, one more -- if it's necessary, where could we get more information on any aspects of this?

MR. BAKER: If you contact me, I will give you all the information I can.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

Next commenter is Bill Weatherill, who is the Superintendent of Schools for Brush.

582 STATEMENT OF BILL WEATHERILL

MR. WEATHERILL: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Weatherill. I am the Superintendent of Brush Public Schools. My mailing address is Post Office Box 585, Brush, Colorado 80723.

On behalf of the board of directors of Brush Public Schools, our staff, students and the entire Brush community, may we express our most sincere gratitude for the opportunity to appear before you this afternoon, and express our thanks for allowing us to tell the Colorado story.

Those of us in the Brush school system, made up of communities of Synder, Hillrose, Gary and Brush, are extremely proud and appreciative of the opportunity we have in working in such a fine school system and with such a progressive and open community.

From our enterprising city councils to our forward-looking fire departments and hospital districts, our community is comprised of genuine western hospitality and spirited with the attitude of doers and goers.

This attitude and environment has allowed Brush Public Schools to be heralded as one of Colorado's premier small school district, and has afforded the youth of our district to be highly competitive in a complex society.

With a diverse and comprehensive well rounded curriculum, Brush handily scores at or above the national and state norms in nationally recognized student assessments with particular emphasis stressed in mathematics and science.

The future of our community will be in the hands of our graduates where traditionally 50 to 60 percent move on to higher education. And it is with this spot of the future that we offer testimony this afternoon in strong support of the Superconducting Super Collider for making Colorado its home.

Brush Public Schools embraces a K through 12 student body of 1,256 students who are housed in two elementaries, a middle school and one senior high school. It employs a staff of 87 teachers, seven administrators and 59 full-time or part-time classified employees. The 1,256 students are the lowest number the district has experienced since reorganization of Colorado school districts in the 1970s.

In the draft of the Environmental Impact Statement, it projects that 700 people ages 5 through 17 will choose to, with their families, live in Morgan County if the SSC locates in Colorado. Approximately 35 percent of the students attending public and elementary secondary schools in Morgan County have chosen Brush to further their education.

If this 35 percent figure is consistent, and we feel that it is, then the SSC project will impact the Brush district with 245 additional students, pushing our enrollment to 1,501 students. In Volume IV, Appendix 14, 14.1.2 - 3.2, on page 58, it states, "The need for provision of expanded local public services during the construction and operational phases would substantially impact existing services within the communities neighboring the SSC site.".

Gentlemen, we strongly feel that the SSC site would not substantially impact the Brush public school district. In 1972, the district housed 1,628 students in approximately 25,000 less square footage of classroom space than we today house with 1,256 students.

As you can see, it would be fairly credible to say we can accommodate an additional 245 students with only reasonable difficulty.

We do not feel, as stated in Volume IV, Appendix 14.1.3.2, it is unlikely that in this predominantly rural county would be able to absorb such growth without substantial focused effort.

Well, gentlemen, in Brush Public Schools, we always focus on kids. However, it would not take a substantial effort to accommodate the SSC project.

I can assure you we in the eastern sector of Morgan County are elated with the thought and sincerely welcome the opportunity of the SSC coming to our community. We, in Colorado, if afforded the opportunity, can and will produce. We in the Brush Public School System are very similar to the Union Pacific Railroad when we are approached on the impact of the SSC. We can handle it.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to appear before you this afternoon.

DR. NELSEN: Mr. Weatherill, would you submit those figures for the record?

MR. WEATHERILL: Certainly.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Mr. Weatherill.

Our next commenter is David Graff on behalf of the local housing commission.

598 STATEMENT OF DAVID GRAFF

MR. GRAFF: I'm David Graff. I live at 18 Nancy Street here in Fort Morgan. I am a homebuilder, land development. I spent my last 32 years doing that. I've done a few projects here in Fort Morgan, and I'll tell you we did about a 190-unit mobile park. It's called Landmark. It's on the south side of town that we still have. We've built about 270 houses over in the northeast corner of town. Did another 185-unit mobile part, mobile subdivision which they all have garages and complete setups that way.

And what I wanted to address you about --

MR. EIGUREN: Mr. Graff, excuse me, sir. Could you speak a bit more into the microphone. We can't record it over here. Thank you.

MR. GRAFF: The ability of the impact, or that we think we can handle the impact of needing to build 400 houses or 900 houses.

I'll give you four examples of what we did during the early 1950's. We had the oil boom that came to town. We had about 500 workers came into that thing. And by the time we got drilling pretty good, then of course we started in on production. We had work over unit people, and in fact we still have these today.

Fort Morgan is sort of a hub between Oklahoma and Montana. It goes all the way through. It's quite a loop that goes through here, and so consequently when that impact came, we didn't have any problem taking care of that.

Then in the late '60s, we had a beef plant come to town, which we still have. Started out with about 200 people. Now the employment is up in the 1,100 category and they have one of the newest breaking plant systems probably than any packing house in the state.

In the 1970's Century Housing came to town, which is a manufactured house builder. They started out with mobiles. Now they are doing mostly factory built stuff. They employed about 275 people when they're running pretty full capacity. They can produce about four houses a day on a eight-hour shift. And so that gives you an idea of what we did up to the time.

Then in 1977 and '78, here come the Pawnee Power Plant, public service built a 500-megawatt electric power plant in Brush which you know about. But anyway, the work force there got up as Don Ament said, around 2,239 people. I talked to -- as a matter of fact, I sold some houses to -- the prime contractor, Ebasco Construction, and they were in -- those numbers are pretty near right, or even maybe on it, to 2,500, and we didn't have any trouble accommodating those.

Then we have -- one of the things, we have a lot of lots available in Fort Morgan, or Brush, Wiggins, Log Lane, that are developed to the point of where we have approximately 600 lots that you could go down tomorrow and get building permits on. They are that far along. I mean, they have water, sewer, gas, electric on them. We have another 600 lots that are platted. According to the county assessor, I might -- it's about 1,187 lots. But anyway, these lots are in different stages of development, and they are all platted to where probably if you had four working months of good weather, you could complete those lots and have them ready to build on. And with the factory housing today, it's not hard for a four-man crew to take a factory house and put it together and have it ready to go in five working days. It works that fast.

So as far as handling the impact of being able to develop housing fast enough, along with the mobile parks, I think we can do it.

We even did a little temporary RV park for the Pawnee Power Plant. We had -- when the gentleman from Wyoming was saying that they could help us out on the thing. They were here during Pawnee. They would bring their little RVs down and park them, and go home on weekends, and Colorado Springs, Pueblo. We had those -- you know, you can do a lot of things if you have to during a work construction phase. Then when you get into the long-term thing, you're going to have a lot more time to get all that stuff ready, and I'm sure there will be a lot more land available too.

Thanks for your time.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

Next commenter is the City Manager of Fort Morgan, Glenn Calvert.

564 STATEMENT OF GLENN CALVERT

MR. CALVERT: Thank you for this opportunity and welcome to Fort Morgan. I am Glenn Calvert. My mailing (copy missing) 80701. I have submitted copies of these statements and the references for your availability up at the front desk.

Fort Morgan is an all service city supplying electricity, natural gas, water, sanitation, solid waste collection both inside and outside the corporate boundaries of the city. The infrastructure within the city and on the fringe areas is in excellent condition serving the present population and prepared to serve any future growth that would occur from Colorado being selected as the site for the SSC project, in EIS 495185212, excuse me.

The electric system, the distribution and transmission system leading into and within the City of Fort Morgan is in A-one condition. Our substation capacity in place will accommodate 37.5 megawatts. Our present peak loading is 22 megawatts. The power supply is available from six generator suppliers with all having excess generation for sale at reasonable rates. Fort Morgan has the lowest electric rates in the State of Colorado.

Our natural gas system: Fort Morgan is a gas distributor purchasing natural gas from the Colorado Interstate Gas Company. The distribution system, again, is in excellent condition and serves gas both inside and outside the corporate boundaries in a certificated area proved by the Public Utilities Commission, State of Colorado. We can accommodate an immediate growth and future growth without any problems. Our gas costs are competitive with other suppliers in the area.

Our wastewater treatment plant and our collection system: Fort Morgan does own and operate the sewage treatment facilities and the collection system. Our wastewater treatment plant has a capacity of 3.6 million gal/d, and the present loading is 2.4 mgd. We have consistently met the NPDES permit requirements as required by the permit and administered by the State of Colorado Health Department.

Fort Morgan's sewage fees are reasonable and generally less than comparable other city charges. The solid waste: Fort Morgan operates and owns the equipment for solid waste collection, the fees being reasonable and generally less than comparable cities.

The solid waste is delivered to the Morgan County Landfill which has a projected life of 25 to 50 years. The city would and does work very well with Morgan County. Fort Morgan would have no problem with immediate or future growth.

Our water supply and the quality of the water at Fort Morgan: Fort Morgan has an ample supply of potable water for the present population and future anticipated growth that may come from the SSC proposed project and other growth that we anticipate. The water has a hardness of 47 grains. It is healthful for drinking and suitable for household use.

The water system is in excellent condition due to an ongoing upgrade of groundwater wells, control system, hydrants, water mains, and standby power units in an effort to obtain an IOS rating for insurance purposes.

Fort Morgan also has purchased 3,806 units of Colorado Big Thompson water to begin upgrading the quality of water. This is enough water to supply the consumptive use at the present time in Fort Morgan and also will take care of some anticipated growth.

We will also continue to purchase more units of CBT water or other water units for ample water reserves for future growth.

In our streets, contrary to the statement made in Section EIS Volume IV, Appendix 14, page 27, addressing Colorado, Fort Morgan streets will not decrease to unacceptable levels. The city is in its fifth year of a seven-year major street rehabilitation program. The major rehabilitation is designed to handle future growth and impacts capable of accommodating a 25,000 population. Under no circumstances would the City allow the streets to fall apart with or without the SSC.

In closing, Fort Morgan has the staff, equipment and financial ability to handle any growth, immediate or future, that would come from the siting of the SSC in Colorado.

With that, I thank you, gentlemen.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

Our next commenteor is Harold Davisson, Chief of Police of Fort Morgan.

576 STATEMENT OF HAROLD DAVISSON

MR. DAVISSON: Gentlemen, good afternoon.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to testify, and I have written statements I will present. My name is Harold Davisson. I'm Chief of Police of Fort Morgan Police Department. I reside at 426 Dahlia Street, Fort Morgan, Colorado. I started working for the Police Department in May of 1959.

In reviewing the draft of the environmental impact statement, I would like to expand on 14.1.3.8, second paragraph, section D, DEIS, Volume 14, Appendix 4 [sic]. I'm paraphrasing the following: At the local level, however, adverse impacts in some of the small communities close to the site could be exacerbated by the combined impacts of other projects. For example, if the proposed postponed expansion of the Pawnee Power Plant between Fort Morgan and Brush were to occur during the construction of the SSC, these small towns would experience even greater difficulty absorbing the substantial impacts expected.

During my employment with the Police Department, I have experienced several community impacts including the Pawnee construction. We handled that impact without major difficulty and did not add personnel. We realize there will be impact but we can handle that impact.

The city of Fort Morgan and the Police Department for future and growth and modernization. In March 1986, the city completed a new police administration building at a cost of $1,015,000. First of all, the Fort Morgan City Council had very wisely set aside capital improvement monies and the building was

paid for on completion. There was a lot of planning and study done before this construction to make sure that the building could handle future needs for the Department. The building has approximately 16,654 square feet; 8,878 square feet is developed and used. Seven thousand six hundred and fifty-four square feet is in the unfinished basement for expansion, so 46 percent of the building is unfinished for growth.

The building is designed to allow much growth without expanding into the unfinished area, and it is so designed to give a lot of flexibility of expansion when needed.

The city of Fort Morgan became involved in formatting the Morgan County Communications Center which is state of the art in communications. The system includes computerized dispatch and police management records. Morgan County Community College is a satellite for the Colorado Law Enforcement Training Academy. This gives us the opportunity to train officers and get them certified within the mandatory 334 hours.

Having this capability is a very strong asset in the event that we would need to train additional personnel. In-service training could also be expanded to handle additional training. The International Association of Chiefs of Police has also available many programs and a continuous training program that we utilize and will continue to use as the department grows. The Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police has a technical committee that is available to the Police Department and assisting agencies with any types of problems that occur. The expertise that is available is tremendous.

The Fort Morgan Police Department has experienced growth over the years and continues to plan for future growth. The employees of the Fort Morgan Police Department are excited about the Super Collider and are ready for the Superconducting Super Collider project.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

That completes our list of pre-registered commenters. But we have two individuals who registered at the door when they came in this afternoon that would like to comment.

The first is Barbara Schmidt.

686 STATEMENT OF BARBARA SCHMIDT

MS. SCHMIDT: Gentlemen, I thank you. I'm glad to be here. I'm Mrs. Ray Schmidt. I live on a farm in Adams County on Route 43, Section 6, Township 1, Range 61 West.

My address is Route 1, Box 38, Strassburg, Colorado.

1 We are one of the few in the minority here. As farmers in mid-Northern Adams County, a county only 18 miles wide with the area that Denver is annexing for the airport and with the dump that they're having out here in Adams County and for several other things, and the Collider, we feel that this will be a burden on the agriculture that is left.

2 There are existing roads that could be used. Colorado 52 is only 7.5 miles north of the proposed road and runs almost direct to the Collider site. Also, U.S. Highway 36 on the South could have an access road to the site. We feel this would be better than building a road through this small, 18 mile wide county. Water for the Collider will take water that is now providing domestic water and water for agriculture. Any time that you buy water or purchase it from another source, someone has to give up their water. We feel that the collider should be placed where it will not conflict with agriculture and where roads could be built that will not be cutting up one small area.

3

4

5 I don't know if anyone has thought about this, but we live out in the middle of nowhere, and I know that when we have these Colorado blizzards, you're going to have people stranded along this road because it will be not near any towns. You'll find the small towns along Highway 70, we'll find 40 to 50 people stranded sometimes in a snow storm. Along this new road proposed you will have people stranded in a bad storm. Should the days of the old dust storms come back, you will also have people stranded and you will not be able to see where you're going. With all the things now in Adams County, we feel that this is too much for one small county. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Mrs. Schmidt.

Our final commenter for this afternoon's hearing is Frank Showengerdt.

687 STATEMENT OF DR. FRANK SHOWENGERDT

DR. SHOWENGERDT: Good afternoon. I'm Frank Showengerdt, Chairman of the Physics Department of the Colorado School of Mines. That's Golden, Colorado 80401. In case you don't already know it, the

1 Colorado School of Mines is one of the leading institutions in the United States in education and

research in minerals, energy and materials. All of these major thrust areas of the school are very germane and can contribute greatly and benefit greatly from the SSC.

Colorado School of Mines has participated fully in the proposal for the SSC from its inception, primarily through our geotechnical expertise but we also have a strong physics department with major thrusts in materials research, optics and nuclear physics. So we stand to both be able to contribute and to benefit from the SSC in that regard.

But my comments this afternoon are more of a personal nature. I would like to make a couple comments about environmentalism in Colorado from my perspective, and the broader environment, including the higher educational infrastructure, also from my perspective.

I have personal experience with environmentalism in Colorado, having fought for the last ten years against a number of onerous developments near the Golden area. I'm knowledgeable in dust control and radioactivity. I've testified in many cases before the Jefferson County Commissioners.

I've read this Environmental Impact Statement and I have found essentially no impacts on the environment compared to most of the issues that I've been involved with. As you probably already know, Colorado is indeed a hot bed of environmental activism from the early days when this State rejected the Winter Olympics in the early 70's to the current battles over Rocky Flats and Two Forks Dam. Whenever there is an environmental issue of any kind, auditoriums like this are generally filled to capacity in this State.

The fact that there's almost no one here and practically no negative comments I think pretty well lays to rest at least the physical environmental concern. From a broader perspective, the broader environment, others have addressed this officially but I'd like to give you an insider's perspective about the higher education infrastructure in this state and the cooperation between the institutions of higher education.

Besides being Chairman of the Physics Department of the Colorado School of Mines, I'm also a Chairman of the State's Advanced Materials Institute, Chairman of the Board of Directors. That Institute consists of a consortium of four universities in the State led by the Colorado School of Mines, also including Colorado State University, University of Colorado at Boulder, and the University of Denver.

We list as contributing members some of the State's largest corporations including Amex, Boeing Aerospace,
2 Adolph Coors, Visual Equipment, IBM, Mansville, Martin Marietta, and others.

In our five-year existence, we have taken a small amount of money from the State and from local industry, invested that in advanced materials research throughout these four universities in Colorado, and we have been able to leverage that to generate a total research volume now which is over $20 million in advanced materials research.

Superconductivity, high temperature superconductivity represents a very major fraction of that materials research, both within the Institute and at the Colorado School of Mines. In fact, one member of our Department, John Krefney, evaluated the impact of high temperature superconductor developments on the SSC a couple of years ago for the Governors' Task Force.

3 So the Advanced Materials Institute is only one example in this State of how the four universities cooperate. Others are in biotechnology, artificial intelligence, telecommunications, and many other areas. I think AMI shows the kind of cooperation that universities would bring to bear on the SSC. And speaking for the Physics Department at the Colorado School of Mines and the Advanced Materials Institute, we are ready, willing and able to help out with the SSC.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes the afternoon hearing on the DEIS for the Superconductor Super Collider project.

We will resume with the evening hearing in this auditorium at 7:00 p.m. this evening.

And before we formally close, I've been asked to announce that if you would like to have dinner here at the school, it is available out in the commons area just outside the door for a cost of three dollars.

With that, we're formally adjourned until 7:00 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 5:34 p.m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene the same day, Thursday, September 29 1988, at 7:00 p.m., in the same place.)

SECOND SESSION

(September 29, 1988: 7:00 p.m.)

DR. TEMPLE: Good evening. I want to welcome you to the Department of Energy's public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, the EIS, for the Superconducting Super Collider, the SSC. My name is Ed Temple, and I am the Executive Director of the SSC Site Task Force. I am also the presiding official for this hearing.

The purpose of my brief remarks is to tell you why we are all here. After my remarks, I will ask our session moderator, Mr. Eiguren, to outline how we will conduct our meeting this evening.

The purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens an opportunity to comment in person on the Department's draft EIS on the SSC. This hearing is not your only opportunity. You may also send us your written comments, which must be postmarked by October 17, 1988.

We want you to know that we are sincerely interested in hearing your comments on this document, and that each of your comments will be considered and responded to in the final EIS.

Let me refresh your memories regarding the SSC site selection process. In January 1987, President Reagan's decision to proceed with the SSC was announced, and construction funds were requested from Congress. In April 1987, the Department issued an invitation for site proposals. We subsequently received 43 proposals and 36 of those were found to be qualified.

The proposals were forwarded to a Joint Committee of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering for further evaluation. Based on the criteria in the invitation, the Academies recommended a best qualified list, BQL, of eight sites to the Department. One of these proposals was later withdrawn by the proposer.

Following the review and verification of the Academies' recommendations, Secretary Herrington announced the best qualified list including the Colorado site proposal on January 19, 1988. Three days later on January 22nd, the DOE formally announced that it would develop an EIS on the proposed SSC. This followed an advance notice of intent which had been issued in May of 1987.

In February 1988, we held scoping meetings in each of the seven states to obtain public comment on the nature and scope of the environmental issues to be considered in the EIS. Scoping meetings were held here in Colorado on February 12th at this Fort Morgan High School auditorium.

The DOE received some 2,100 comments on the scope of the EIS. These comments were considered in the preparation of the draft EIS. And now following public hearings here and in the other BQL states, we will develop the final EIS to be issued in December of this year.

The draft EIS evaluates and compares four types of alternatives, site alternatives, technical alternatives, programmatic alternatives, and the no action alternative. In this event, site alternatives meant the seven locations identified on the BQL. Technical alternatives were the possibility of using different technology, different equipment, or different facility configurations. Programmatic alternatives considered the use of other accelerators, international corroboration, or project delay. The no-action alternative meant the option not to construct the SSC.

The draft EIS identifies and analyzes the potential environmental consequences expected to occur from siting, constructing and operating the SSC at any one of the seven site alternatives. These sites are located in Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas.

The draft EIS provides as much information as possible at this stage of the project development regarding the potential environmental impacts of construction and operation of the SSC at each of the alternative sites. However, the DOE recognizes that further review under NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, is appropriate prior to beginning the actual construction or operation of the proposed SSC.

Accordingly, following selection of a site of a proposed SSC, the DOE will prepare a supplement to this EIS to address in more detail the impacts of constructing and operating the proposed SSC at the selected site. We will also identify alternatives where possible for mitigating those environmental impacts.

Let me tell you a little bit about the draft EIS. This is a large document containing more than 4,000 pages. It is organized into four volumes. Volume I is entitled Environmental Impact Statement. Volume II is the comment resolution document, and is reserved for our response to public comments, and is for publication in the final EIS only.

Volume III describes the methodology for site selection. And Volume IV contains sixteen appendices providing detailed presentations of technical information which back up the conclusions in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Comments received at this hearing will be used by the DOE to prepare a final EIS to be issued in December. This document will identify the Department's preferred sites. No sooner than 30 days after the final EIS is distributed, the Department will publish its record of decision which will include the final site selection and complete the site selection process.

Tonight we will use a professional moderator to ensure a fair and orderly proceeding. Measures have been taken to permit the maximum opportunity for interested citizens to utilize this session for expressing their comments. We urge all participants in tonight's meeting to focus their comments on the draft EIS and avoid or minimize statements aimed solely at expressing opposition or support for the proposal.

While all comments will become part of the formal record of this proceeding, those specifically addressing the draft EIS will be most useful to the DOE in preparing the final document.

As I noted earlier, in addition to this opportunity for all comments, individuals may also provide written comments to the DOE. These should be postmarked by October 17, 1988, the end of the formal 45-day comment period, to ensure that they will be considered in the preparation of the final EIS. We will, however, consider comments received after that date to the extent possible.

One final word on the role of the EIS in the site selection process. The National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, requires that environmental impacts be considered by Federal decision makers in taking major Federal actions with potential environmental consequences. An EIS is one of the methods used to do this analysis, providing for public comment and participation and to make a final decision that meets the NEPA requirements. The EIS will be considered by the Secretary in making the site selection.

Thank you in advance for your interest and participation. Let me now introduce Mr. Eiguren who will describe how we will conduct tonight's session.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Dr. Temple.

My name is Roy Eiguren, and I am an attorney in private practice with the law firm of Lindsay, Hart, Neil & Weigler. And we have offices in Seattle, Washington; Portland, Oregon; San Francisco, California; and Boise, Idaho.

My practice and that of our law firm is heavily concentrated in the area of energy and environmental law. Both in private practice as well as in prior governmental service, I have had over a decade's worth of experience on either conducting or participating in a significant number of National Environmental Policy Act hearings such as the one that we are conducting here today.

I have been retained by the Department of Energy as a moderator for this and the other hearings on the draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Superconducting Super Collider project. I am not an employee of the Department, nor am I an advocate for or against the Department's proposed action in this proceeding. Rather my single express purpose is to serve as an independent, unbiased and objective individual to moderate the hearings.

My primary role is to help assure that the Department of Energy fully complies with the letter and spirit of NEPA, so as to allow all individuals and organizations a fair and equal opportunity to comment on the record relative to the Department's proposed action.

As Dr. Temple stated, the purpose of this hearing is to give all interested citizens an opportunity to comment on the record relative to the Department of Energy's draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC project.

In February, the Department of Energy conducted and I moderated a scoping meeting here in this auditorium to hear comment from individuals and organizations on what issues they felt should be considered in the preparation of the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Now that the Department has prepared that draft EIS, it seeks comment once again on it. In particular, we are seeking specific comment on issues that members of the public feel are relevant and should be considered by the Department of Energy prior to finalizing the environmental impact statement and selecting its preferred site for the SSC project.

This is a record proceeding. That is to say that everything that is being said at this as well as the other draft EIS hearings held in other states is being recorded by a court reporter who is here in the front of the room. The court reporter will make a verbatim transcript of all comments received and submit the same to the Department of Energy for inclusion in the final record of this proceeding. The Secretary of Energy's decision relative to this matter will be based in large part upon the information contained in that record.

At this time, I would like to tell you what procedures we are following this evening as well as at all of the other hearings in this series concerning the receipt of public comment. I will announce the speaker list or I will announce speakers from a list that has been provided to me earlier by the Department of Energy.

I will call speakers in the order in which they have signed up in advance to make their presentations. In addition to that, anyone who would like to speak who has not yet registered may do so provided that you do register at the registration table out in the lobby. Every individual will have up to five minutes within which to make comment. At the end of five minutes, I will signal individual speakers that their time has elapsed.

As Dr. Temple stated, the purpose of this hearing is to receive comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Accordingly, what comments you do make should be focused on the issues that are addressed in the draft EIS. We do reserve the right to ask individuals to focus on issues contained in the draft EIS, if they wander from the topic of the session.

Our intent is not to limit your remarks, but rather to assure that what comments you do provide are effective in achieving the objectives of the hearing. Written comment and oral comment receive the same weight in the record of this proceeding. Therefore, if you do have written comment, we would urge you to submit it for the record as well as any written questions that you may have. You may submit written comment to the court reporter here at the front of the room, or to the Department of Energy personnel at the registration table in the lobby, or you may mail it to the Department of Energy by no later than October 17, 1988, at an address that can be provided to you at the registration table.

There was a hearing here this afternoon that ran from 2:00 until 5:00, or actually 5:30. This session will run from 7:00 this evening until approximately 10:00 p.m. Currently, we do have twenty individuals who have preregistered to speak this evening. Allowing five minutes per individual, that would put us up sometime through the hour of 9:00. But we will be here until 10:00 in the event that anyone else shows up that would like to testify.

Throughout the course of the hearing tonight, we will take a few brief recesses to allow the court reporter to change tapes and to have the panel take a rest. Approximately thirty minutes before the scheduled end of the session, if we do have any speakers who have registered at the door to testify and want to do so, we will take their comments.

If you are speaking this evening, when it comes your turn to speak, we would ask that you would step forward to the podium here in the front of the room. We would ask that you give us your name and address. And if you are speaking on behalf of any organization, please tell us what that organization is. And then after you have given your introduction, I will start timing your presentation.

The members of the panel who are at the front of the room with me are Dr. Ed Temple, who is the Executive Director of the SSC Site Selection Task Force, and Dr. Roger Mayes and Dr. Jerry Nelson, both of whom are environmental specialists with the Department of Energy, who are here for the express purpose of hearing your comments on the draft EIS.

It has been necessary and appropriate throughout the course of these hearings for them to ask from time to time clarifying questions of individual commenters. Their purpose in doing that is to make sure that they develop a complete record for whatever concerns you have about the particular project that we are reviewing.

At this time, we are ready to begin our receipt of public comment. As I mentioned, we will be working off of a list of commenters who preregistered to speak tonight. The first individual on our preregistered list is John Hamlin.

997 STATEMENT OF JOHN HAMLIN

MR. HAMLIN: Good evening, Dr. Temple and members of the crew that is here today. I am John Hamlin, a businessman from Fort Morgan, and a former state representative for this area. I live at 815 Diana Street, Fort Morgan, Colorado. And if your evening went, Dr. Temple, took you far enough this evening, you might [illegible] [illegible] I hope that you enjoyed the cool [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] opportunity to comment on the draft EIS for the SSC. It is an [illegible] and your staff for the overall quality of this draft. I am [illegible] report's analysis of the impacts on Colorado. And I agree that the SSC [illegible] [illegible] and the natural environment.

Tonight though, I want to correct what I find to be a serious error in conclusions drawn about this area's ability to handle SSC-related growth. Morgan County in northeast Colorado has the ability and the capacity to accommodate SSC-related population growth with little difficulty.

This area has experienced a proven successful track record in dealing with the effects of rapid population growth. We mentioned both the oil boom in the 1950's and the Pawnee Power Plant in 1978-1979, the modular housing factory in the 1970's, the meat packing industry that moved into Morgan County both pork and beef in the 1960's, and we were able to take care of the impact of that growth. In part as a result of past booms, there is plenty of capacity in Morgan County communities to meet SSC's related housing and public service needs.

The report's conclusions about our ability to meet SSC housing needs are based in part upon an assumption that we have a small scale county construction industry. That assumption is simply not true.

First, the county construction industry does not limit its business only to Morgan County. It bids jobs throughout the northeast Colorado region, the Front Range, and in surrounding states. I, as a contractor on electrical distribution lines, do bid on service work in Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, and Kansas.

Second, that contractors from other towns in northeast Colorado, from Denver and from other states, even including California, bid for jobs in the county. We have had on our courthouse expansion and judicial complex out-of-county contractors that did that with subcontractors from the metropolitan area. I assure you that contractors up and down the Front Range and throughout the nation are ready to jump if Colorado wins the project.

Our past experience has also taught us that the effects of a boom will disperse throughout the region. There are some very basic differences between the West and other parts of the country. One difference is that we are not relatively isolated, that we are part of a regional network. We have a home in Fort Morgan, and many of them do. Some of them have a job in Sterling, some have a job in Denver. Some have a dentist in Greeley, and some have a hospital in Greeley. Some of them have a doctor in Brush. So we do have that ability and mobility.

Second, we are a highly mobile group of people, and we know that what counts out here is not how far but how long. People who live in this area drive as a normal every day practice from 40 to 60 miles to their job site. And as a man who has spent much of the last fifteen years commuting between Fort Morgan and Denver, I can tell you that it takes at most half as much time to cover the same distance out here as it does in some urban areas. The final EIS should report distances and average driving time rather than miles.

Third, commuting 65 miles on the open road is not stressful. It gives you time to think. In fact, it may be the most peaceful time and the least stressful part of your day. And surely, I know about that in my fifteen years that I drove to Denver for the legislative. It gave me time to think before I got there.

To summarize, the draft EIS inaccurately portrays communities in this area as remote and isolated small towns that lack the capability and the capacity to deal with SSC related growth. The final EIS should show correctly and state that we are a part of a web of communities that extends to the metro area and also across the state lines. That there is an interdependency of the infrastructure and the services in the region, and that we have both the capacity and the proven track record to manage SSC-related growth with minimum disruption to our communities or to SSC personnel.

I thank you for the opportunity to appear.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

Our next commenter is Candace N. Stowell.

688 STATEMENT OF CANDACE N. STOWELL

MS. STOWELL: Thank you. My name is Candace Stowell. I'm here on behalf of the Adams County Planning and Development Services Department. The address is 4955 East 74th Avenue, Commerce City.

1 First, we'd like to say that Adams County is very much in support of the SSC project, but because of the nature of the hearing tonight we'll make some comments specific to the draft EIS.

2 First, we are concerned that the socio-economic impact of the SSC and related development has been portrayed as negative upon Adams County. It is assumed that the county will be negatively impacted financially because of the cost of constructing "infrastructure improvements required to accommodate SSC related growths."

Though it is true that infrastructure needs to be constructed to accommodate this adduced development secondary to the development of the SSC itself, the county would not bear these costs. Development is required to "pay its own way." It would be the developer who would make the vast majority of the road and utility improvements.

Secondly, we are concerned with the statement that "aggregate resources in the Denver area are not abundant." It is incorrect to infer that the currently permitted mining operations represent the
3 entire supply of aggregate resources in the area. Locations of additional aggregate materials have been identified by the Colorado Geological Survey throughout the metro region.

Another point we'd like to bring up. The draft EIS refers to a construction schedule for the Two Forks Water Supply project, beginning between 1990 and 1995. That schedule has been brought into question, and therefore any human and aggregate resources previously allocated for the Two Forks project would be available for the SSC.

The third point we'd like to mention is that the population forecasts tend to place a very heavy emphasis
4 on workers locating in Morgan County. Many more workers than projected in this table may chose to reside in approximate portions of the Denver metropolitan area, where the school facilities and a sufficient housing supply already exist, and commute, of course, to the SSC site.

If this is true, the negative impacts on the Morgan County are assumed in the draft EIS, such as shortages of housing and educational facilities, could be significantly less than anticipated.

In relation to the Adams County comprehensive plan, we would like to point out that even though the SSC project area is designated as agricultural production in our comprehensive plan, the county understands that certain changes will occur as the SSC is constructed. This is why Adams, Morgan and Washington counties have entered into an intergovernmental agreement to provide current and long-range planning
5 for the SSC area.

This cooperative planning effort, formalized by intergovernmental contract, will allow for and anticipate development while at the same time hope to attain the greatest possible amount of productive agricultural land.

Finally, we are concerned with the SSC decommission plan, which proposes that the facility be closed
6 down and all the constructed facilities to be removed. We think it would be prudent to investigate alternative uses for the buildings and other facilities after the SSC project is completed. It is recommended that over the life of the SSC project future uses for the SSC area be studied and examined.

And that's basically our comments. We have sent a letter to Dr. Hess with these same comments. Thank you.

DR. NELSEN: Candace, I didn't get your last name.

Was it --

MS. STOWELL: Stowell?

DR. NELSEN: S-T-O --

MS. STOWELL: W-E-L-L.

DR. NELSEN: W-E-L-L. Some of your comments seem to be pointed towards specific sections. Do you have those noted so that that would be helpful to us if --

MS. STOWELL: I have a copy of the letter here.

DR. NELSEN: Fine. Okay, thank you.

MS. STOWELL: Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next speaker is Uriel Nauenberg.

593 STATEMENT OF URIEL NAUENBERG

MR. NAUENBERG: My name is Uriel Nauenberg. I'm here to speak as a person that has been involved with the Colorado SSC project since the very beginning, and as a scientist in the field of high energy physics.

It is a pleasure that we are meeting here to continue the dialogue between you, the members of the DOE, the local community, and the state about the possibility of locating the SSC in this area.

The consequences of this laboratory for the region in which its location, we all realize, are major. Hence, it is important in this dialogue that it be thorough and no issues be left out.

I'd like to point out the development of the field of research known as high energy physics in the last 40 years has been, in one simple word, staggering. The present period of development with the concomitant construction of new and better accelerators has occurred under the leadership of the various agencies of the Federal government, which after many changes in name are presently known as the Department of Energy and the National Science Foundation.

You are to be commended for the successful leadership and guidance in this effort.

We are now at the momentous threshold of the government's approval for the construction of the SSC. You, the DOE, have carried out an extremely extensive series of reviews and discussions with the states in which this laboratory may be located, in order to assure the success of every aspect of this work.

I want to congratulate the DOE on how well this process has been progressing. Nevertheless, I must immediately reassure you that I'm not here only to congratulate you, but also to point out, after all Mr. Chairman, in spite of all DOE's successes, it is my duty to point out that both you and the members of this team are human.

And so I must point out some of the incorrectness of some of your concerns relative to the Colorado site as expressed in the EIS report, and to bring up some other points which I and many of my colleagues feel are extremely important and relevant to the successful construction and operation of the SSC laboratory. I want to use this opportunity to bring them to your attention.

The State of Colorado chose to begin the study of the location of a site extremely early in the process, about six years ago. As a result, we had enough time to carefully weigh all the issues that should affect such a site. Our choice of a present site was carefully chosen to maximize the success of the construction of the operation of the SSC.

The reasons for this assertion now follow. It is not accidental that we chose a site so that the detector holes are as close to the surface as possible. The latest design shows that we can have beam tunnel heights at 50 feet below the surface in the region of the collider holes. Many of my research colleagues and I, during the 1988 Snowmass meeting, came to the conclusion that having the detector holes near the surface is very important for the following reasons.

1

Access to the floor of the detector holes is much simpler and therefore faster. For example, it can be accomplished by a simple graded road. Bringing in and putting together the various elements of the detectors should be much simpler and hence cheaper. You must remember that the estimated cost of construction of all the detectors is about one billion dollars. Reducing the cost will be a benefit to all.

Although it is not a pleasant topic to bring up, the possibility of the usual type of accidents that occur in the construction of large structures cannot be dismissed. We cannot eliminate the possibility of accidents, but we can certainly reduce the consequences of such. A shallow location of the detector holes reduces the access time of properly trained personnel and appropriate equipment. Hence, it not only minimizes the risk to the workers in the area, but also reduces the magnitude of damage to the expensive detectors as well.

2

At the risk of being repetitious, the safety aspects of the personnel working in the detector holes cannot be minimized. There is no doubt that their safety is far better if they have a direct exit to the outside through the doors or short stair spans when compared to the problem they face if they are located 200, 300 or even more feet below the surface.

I hope that you, the members of the DOE team, will make your colleagues aware of these concerns. We hope that the DOE during the deliberations that will decide where to locate the site will consider these issues appropriately.

The superb quality of the geology of this site has been recognized by everybody in the scientific and geologic community. I will not belabor this point any further.

The EIS report indicates some flooding concerns, about the presence of Badger Creek near the various booster accelerators which are within about 30 feet of the surface and near the campus. This concern clearly does not reflect the realistic conditions in the area. First, let me point out that the last time there was a major flood in the Badger Creek area was in 1935.

3

Second, the magnitude of that flood was such that the water covered a width of at most one thousand feet and a depth of at most four feet. Third, such a flood occurred because there was no flood mitigating constraints or structures in the area. In our proposal we discussed the design and construction of a large reservoir upstream of the location where the Badger Creek approaches the campus

4 In addition, the flood occurs because of the water collection characteristics of the area far south of the site. Therefore, the construction of a few water retaining ponds or levees, strategically located, would make the chances of a flood negligible and in fact enhance the natural characteristics of the area.

Therefore, we feel that we have addressed this issue with more than an appropriate solution, and we hope that the EIS report should finally point that out.

We have heard a great deal about the importance of locating the laboratory near large habitats to minimize the social impact of the laboratory on the community. Although I agree this is an important point, there is another critical aspect of location that seems to have received little attention, and that I would like to bring out.

5 We have heard continuously that the technological and economic development in our country is lagging behind. The importance of the SSC to the technological and economic development of the United States and the area in which it is located is well recognized. We believe that the location of this laboratory in Colorado, near one of the most beautiful scenic areas of this country, near a new major international airport, near a thriving major educational and technological community, and with enough space available to allow for a healthy and orderly growth, is such as to maximize this development from the mountain range to the eastern plains.

I urge the DOE to include such an important issue as a crucial parameter in its deliberations. Finally, let me present you my view of the Akron, Brush and Fort Morgan communities. I have had the privilege to interact with them for quite a few years in this project. A great number of their members have supported and worked hard on behalf of the state to bring this project to their neighborhood.

This is a remarkable indication of their farsightedness, acceptance of new ideas, and hopes for their future. This support, I can assure the DOE, will continue. It comes because of the recognition that this laboratory will enhance their environment, their educational efforts on behalf of the younger members of their community, and their technologically based industry.

6 Clearly, education is crucial to these communities. This is reflected by the quality of their schools, strong national SAT scores as reported in our proposal. The Fort Morgan and Northern Community Colleges in addition. As you're well aware, both the University of Colorado in Boulder and the State University in Fort Collins have strong collaborative efforts with these schools.

At the same time the state will actively support the location of a high energy physics institute with the dual task of becoming a center for education and detector development. I need to point out though that these communities are concerned that they not lose the pastoral surroundings that they cherish, and will so plan to control the local development.

MR. EIGUREN: Your time's about up, sir.

MR. NAUENBERG: One more minute, 30 seconds. All these issues have been thoroughly discussed and I feel that we can assure the DOE of the utmost support from the local community and the State if the laboratory is located in this region. It's only left for me to express our gratitude for the many hours that you, members of the DOE SSC Task Force have spent with us, and I hope that our hospitality has made this work with us enjoyable. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next commenter is Jack Geckler.

594 STATEMENT OF DR. JACK GECKLER

DR. GECKLER: Good evening. I'm Dr. Jack Geckler, superintendent of schools in District RE3 here in Fort Morgan.

I would like to address my remarks to the statements regarding the impact of the SSC project on public services and particularly on public schools in Volume V, Appendix 14 of the Environmental Impact Statement.

In my opinion, they're overstated. Terms such as "boom town effect", "substantial impact", and "unlikely to absorb" casts unsubstantiated doubt on the ability of various school districts to comfortably accommodate the projected increase in enrollments.

The Environmental Impact Study projects a peak increase of 704 persons in the 5 to 17 year old age range in 1992. The school districts that will be most directly impacted by the SSC have previously accommodated much larger numbers than that with existing facilities. Peak enrollment in the Fort Morgan School District was approximately 3,400 students during the 1970's. Enrollments as of September 1988, that's this month, were 2,730 students. That is, 670 more students than we currently have, the 3,400 figure, and far greater than the increase of 420 students projected for the Fort Morgan School District in 1992.

Core facilities such as libraries, cafeterias and auditoriums will be more than adequate to accommodate the projected increase. Current plans also call for the renovation of one elementary school and construction of new library and media centers at three elementary schools during the summer of 1989, that's next year.

And I want to assure the DOE that we can comfortably accommodate the new students, and that the SSC will not have a boomtown effect on the public schools here in Fort Morgan. In addition to good facilities, we have a comprehensive curriculum. Our instructional staff is prepared to offer an academic program that will challenge the most gifted students of the scientists and technicians who will be working at the SSC site.

Since the hearing last spring, we have begun exploring the use of satellite networks and an early admission program with Morgan Community College, to expand course options for students. This would be in addition to a program that already includes advanced placement English, math through calculus, advanced physics, advanced biological chemistry, four years of Spanish and four years of German, and computer programming.

We feel we're a good school district, but more important we want to get better. Our staff development program is one of the best in the State of Colorado. The DOE committee received a booklet at the last hearing that describes that program in more detail.

We are excited about having the SSC located in northeastern Colorado, and if the DOE committee is looking for a community that provides quality education, Fort Morgan is the place to live, and the best site for the SSC. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. The next commenter is Elda Lousberg.

585 STATEMENT OF ELDA LOUSBERG

MS. LOUSBERG: Good evening. I'm Elda Lousberg and I'm a local county commissioner from Sterling, Colorado, and I'm also president of Colorado Counties, Incorporated. I live at 13701 County Road 37, Route No. 4, Sterling, Colorado.

Gentlemen. It is indeed a pleasure as president of Colorado Counties, Incorporated, to be a part of this gathering this evening in support of Colorado's efforts to locate the Superconducting Super Collider project in this State. From the start of this long and intensive effort, CCI has been a participant supporting the State and local government's efforts to put together a successful submittal that ultimately will ensure that the SSC project will be located in Colorado.

Counties throughout the state recognize the importance of placing the Super Collider on the plains of Colorado. We realize that as the preeminent facility for high energy physics research, Colorado has the potential to become a significant science center for both the nation and the world.

This is important to Colorado in terms of both economic development and the opportunity for educational excellence at our colleges and universities. We agree with Governor Romer that this project is an essential ingredient to building a solid international reputation in the field of science, whose benefits to the state will be great.

1 In support of the project, Colorado Counties, Incorporated submitted a letter of endorsement, which is a part of the Governor's support package sent to the Department of Energy. In addition, CCI lent staff time to work with counties at the proposed site to ensure fail-safe intergovernment agreements with the state for delivering all needed state and local permits, approvals and other authorizing actions needed for the SSC. The bottom line is that we want this effort to succeed.

Due to geography, environment and the rural nature of the proposed site, there are no major costly environment impacts. The lack of negative environmental impacts is one of Colorado proposal's strongest assets. This site is located in an area of rural mid-America communities who have a history of cooperation and community support. The experience and capacity for northeast Colorado communities make them able to handle economic growth cycles, and as a result they can handle the growth impact.

Accordingly, I disagree with the Environmental Impact Statement's assessment that the Brush and Fort Morgan communities couldn't handle growth and boomtown conditions would result. Whatever is the next step, count on the assistance of Colorado Counties, Incorporated as an active partner.

We look forward to the day the announcement is made by the Department of Energy that Colorado is the site selected for the Superconducting Super Collider. We applaud the efforts of the State, Morgan, Adams and Washington Counties and private citizens, who have worked so hard and continue to do so to achieve our common goal. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Our next commenter this evening is Phil Davey.

526 STATEMENT OF PHIL DAVEY

MR. DAVEY: I'm glad I'm so late. I don't have to have the lights. I didn't think I'd be able to see you. My name is Phil Davey. I am the Director of Communications for Morgan County. I work for the government. I also chair the local committee for public safety review of the EIS.

We as a committee and myself have reviewed the draft Environmental Impact Statement, and find that several areas need to be clarified. I have submitted a detailed -- I'm submitting a detailed comment sheet with specific citations. But each of the citations that I've listed refer to the substantial impact statement, referring to substantial impacts to our public safety systems.

Within the past few years, the public safety agencies in Morgan County, in our normal course of doing business, have projected needs for the future, and funded several major capital expense projects. The Morgan County Criminal Justice Center, here in Fort Morgan, a $5.7 million project, was occupied in January of '87. The Fort Morgan Police Department building, a million dollar project, was occupied in March of '86.

The Morgan County Combined Communications System, a million-dollar project, went on line in October of '86. All of our area fire departments enjoy new or recently remodeled structures. The Morgan County Government Criminal Justice Center, as I said, was occupied in January of '87. This facility includes a modern, state-of-the-art detention facility, sheriff's departments, court complex, probation department and district attorney offices. It also houses our modern countywide communications center, with radio, telephone and computer services for our entire public safety system.

The city of Fort Morgan completed their one-million-dollar Police Administration Building in 1986. This building was designed to absorb up to 300 percent growth. Morgan County has a communications system that is on the cutting edge of communications technology, with highly trained communications personnel, modern equipment and a new facility. The system includes a countywide computerized police information system and computer-aided dispatch for police records as well as access to the State computerized criminal justice records and national computer access.

The system includes ten high-power radio channels, situated in three different locations around the county, to supply high quality two-way radio service to all public safety agencies in our system. With this communications system in place and functioning, the public safety services are ready to extend service areas as necessary to accommodate future needs.

Our center supplies 911 emergency telephone service to all of the citizens in the county. Our funding is in place and contracting underway to install an enhanced 911 system within the next 18 months. This includes, of course, the computer enhancements of name, address and response agencies for all 911 telephone calls for service.

Having these major fixed assets in place now will reduce the financial impact drastically should major personnel or departmental expansion be necessary for this SSC project. As you've heard before, this area has experienced several major growth cycles or boom cycles since the 1950's, most recently the Pawnee power generating facility.

Local law enforcement agencies are adequately prepared to deal with this growth environment. During the Pawnee Power Plant peak construction years of 2,200 plus jobs, the city of Brush added one full-time police officer, and the city of Fort Morgan didn't add any full-time police officers. All of the current police administrators were administrators during those boom cycles, most recently the Pawnee boom. They're very well briefed and experienced in handling this kind of growth.

Based on these above factors, the statements concerning substantial impact need to be clarified. We do not believe that these impacts will be any more substantial than the normal impacts we've already planned for with or without the SSC. Our public safety agencies are well prepared to handle the project in-migration of people, and are quite experienced in this type of population boom.

We would like the Environmental Impact Statement to reflect these facts. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Our next scheduled commenter is Keith Mesmer.

569 STATEMENT OF KEITH MESMER

MR. MESMER: Good evening. I'm Keith Mesmer, administrator of the Fort Morgan Community Hospital, and chairperson for the health care committee.

This testimony refers to Volume IV, Appendix 14, page 85, second paragraph, which needs to read health care facilities in Morgan County are currently adequate for in-patient numbers, 70 beds, with occupancy at 35 percent capacity. Our out-patient services are very adequate. They would need to be increased to accommodate on-site medical services at the SSC site.

The hospitals, one located in Brush and the other here in Fort Morgan, are general hospitals, well-equipped, and offer primary and secondary services with linkages for tertiary care. For tertiary care, we have ambulance service with well-trained EMTs and nurses to care for critical patients during transfer. Also, we have air transportation currently available within 45 minutes from the time called.

The hospitals offer an array of services as most general hospitals, even in the cities. We have OB with modern delivery and birthing rooms, four operating room suites equipped for general surgery, dental, endoscopy, chest, urology, orthopedics, heart pacemakers, and then we do out-patient one-day surgeries as well as in-patient. In radiology we have tomography, mammography, ultrasound, echocardiography, C-ARM, CAT scanning and nuclear med. The lab has all of the necessary equipment to have a full-service lab, and we have other major diagnostic capabilities which include echocardiography, treadmill, EKG, fetal heart monitoring and so on.

In Morgan County we have a rehab services including occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech therapy, cardiac rehab, chemical dependency and respiratory therapy. We have 15 doctors on our active medical staff, 24 specialists who provide services here in the community. There are six ambulances, and we have emergency helicopter service, as I mentioned before, that transport people to the front-range hospitals.

I have an attachment here to turn in of more detail, which I won't give you all of this now, but I appreciate the chance to talk about health care here, and thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Mr. Mesmer. We appreciate receiving that information for the record. Next commenter is the Honorable Ron Edwards, Mayor of the city of Fort Morgan.

589 STATEMENT OF HON. RON EDWARDS

MR. EDWARDS: Dr. Temple and panel, welcome to Fort Morgan. I am the Mayor of the city of Fort Morgan. I'm Ron Edwards. I reside at 700 Linda Street here in the city.

I wish to address two points of concern identified in the Superconducting Super Collider impact statement. They are: number one, industrial development capabilities, and number two, housing. As we know, one for sure has been addressed tonight and I'll try to make it brief.

Section 5.2.12.2 of the EIS suggests that these two items, along with other socio-economic factors, may suffer greatly due to the impact of the Superconducting Super Collider construction. I wish to address those concerns in the following statement.

The citizens of Fort Morgan feel that our desire to grow industrially has prepared us for any impacts created by the Superconducting Super Collider. The recognition of our own desires for growth have allowed us to identify those problems addressed in the EIS with respect to the socio-economic fiber of Fort Morgan.

The city of Fort Morgan has been preparing for major industrial impact for several years prior to the Superconducting Super Collider proposed siting in northeastern Colorado. Since the economy has been in a downward spiral due to the fall of agriculture and oil exploration industries, the city has been looking to broaden its industrial base. We realized early on that in order to attract industry, more than just well-paved streets would be needed.

The economic climate needed a push to get off the ground, so Fort Morgan, Brush and the rest of the county governments formed a Morgan County Economic Development Association. Fort Morgan not only funded this organization to the greatest extent of any municipality, it also provided the office space and secretarial staff to handle the work generated by the economic development director.

Also, as pointed out earlier, our city has been continually improving our entire utility and infrastructure to meet any form of sudden impact that may result from possible sudden growth or impact. In 1986, the city decided that in the best interest of planning and zoning and economic development, an industrial park should be purchased and developed.

1987 saw that purchase materialize and 1988 will see its complete development. All utilities and infrastructure will be in place ready for prospective clients. This enthusiastic effort has also been turned toward the rest of the city services. A long-range plan projecting population growth to 25,000 is also in place. Copies of this plan were presented to the DOE at the scoping hearings, and again are being submitted as evidence here today.

This document not only recognizes the utilitarian needs of a community of this size, but also the cultural requirements of the same city. This plan identifies the needs and gives us the road map to ensure their proper implementation.

The second concern is housing. At present the city has approximately 175 homes on the market in the Fort Morgan area. Rental units are somewhat less. We realize that should a Superconducting Super Collider chose northeastern Colorado as a site, a tremendous number of people would move to this area.

This would range from short-term construction people to long-term operational staff. The city has in place annexation, subdivision and zoning laws to promote a quality growth. They require little time to follow and allow building laws to become readily available. We also have filed with Morgan County a master street plan and a master airport plan. Both documents allow for an orderly growth as the boundaries of Fort Morgan expand further into the county.

The master street plan recognizes major traffic patterns. It clearly identifies arterial, excuse me, collector streets as they leave the city limits. Further, it reserves these right-of-ways for future growth of the city while not yet part of the corporate boundaries.

The master airport plan addresses both proposed expansion of the airport services and the surrounding land use. This document allows Fort Morgan to ensure to the city and the county residents that a quality airport facility will always be available.

Lastly, we are very fortunate at Fort Morgan to have a highly skilled group of construction craftsmen capable and willing to answer housing needs as they arise. Further, National Pre-Built Manufacturing Corporation, the Century Division, has located in Fort Morgan Industrial Park. This factory-built housing firm can manufacture every type of home, from mobile homes to custom-built houses, in a very short period of time. The result is always high quality product.

At this time I'd like to thank you for your time today and copies of this statement, as well as our long-term planning document, will be made available to you in hopes of clarifying any points that might be left unclear. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. The next commenter is the Mayor of the city of Brush, the Honorable Larry Coughlin.

574 STATEMENT OF HON. LARRY COUGHLIN

MR. COUGHLIN: Thank you and good evening. My name is Larry Coughlin. I'm the Mayor of the city of Brush. I live at 312 Stanford, Brush, Colorado.

I have submitted a written document which refers to the paragraphs primarily in Appendix 14 on the infrastructure, and I would like to just make some general comments about some of the things that are stated there that I feel are really not completely accurate.

First, I think it says in there several times that the Super Collider site is 60 miles' distance from any large size metropolitan area. I think that Mr. Hamlin, who's talked earlier, stated that the real issue is how long it takes to travel that 60 miles. Usually, an hour and 10 minutes and you're in downtown Denver from Brush. We do not feel that that is a long time to travel for people.

We also feel that a good part of the people who do work either in construction or when the facility is sited, they will live in Morgan County in either Brush or Fort Morgan, and we feel that we do have the housing available or it can soon become available.

I would point out that the section on housing indicates that there will be need of 950 residential units in 1992, and an additional 650 units by the year 2000. At the present time in Morgan County there are over 603 platted lots with utilities already to the curb line. There are also an additional 443 platted lots which have utilities nearby but they are not clear to the curb line.

Brush, Fort Morgan and the Morgan County governments all have comprehensive plans in place which are designed for well-designed growth. Brush and Fort Morgan currently are enforcing the uniform building codes, and one is proposed in the near future for the county.

I think we have talked several times about the intra-county cooperation, the countywide emergency communication system, the countywide Economic Development Association, and we do feel that we will be able to handle this.

One of the reasons we feel that way, as several of the other people have said, is we have had boomtown effects before in both Brush and Fort Morgan. This happened in the '60's with the oil boom and it happened again in the '70's with the Pawnee plant. The city of Brush is currently completing Phase I of an enlargement of our sewer treatment plant, and it has already designed for Phase II which would allow for a significant increase in demand.

In addition Brush has a relatively untapped water supply. The ratio of boom to bust in terms of the number of temporary workers versus permanent residents is much less than that with the Pawnee Power

Plant, ratio-wise, because a lot more of the people -- we will have a lot more jobs after this is built than there was after the Pawnee Power Plant was built.

We feel that the decision-making mechanisms for growth are well established within the county, and that we are more than equal to the task. I thank you for your time, and if you have any other questions I'd be happy to answer them for you. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you Mayor. The next commenter is Mike Berryhill. Mike Berryhill? He's not here, we'll pass him over for the moment and call his name one more time before we adjourn. Ken McCloud?

586 STATEMENT OF KEN McCLOUD

MR. McCLOUD: Thank you for this opportunity, gentlemen. My name is Ken McCloud and I work for the City of Fort Morgan as the Director of Parks and Recreation. I wish to address the impact of the SSC on the quality of life in Fort Morgan.

Section 5.2.11.1 of Volume IV, Appendix 5a, concerns itself with Fort Morgan's capabilities to handle a large population. We feel it necessary to support this statement, especially as it relates to the cultural and recreational climate of Fort Morgan, Morgan County and Colorado.

Fort Morgan should show no adverse effects from the construction and the operation of the Superconducting Super Collider. In fact, any impacts from our view will be of a positive nature, adding to the quality of life and not detracting from it. Fort Morgan has always provided cultural events to its citizens through either its recreation programs or its library and museum functions. We provide on a local level such summer recreational activities as adult softball, a top notch municipal golf course, square dancing, aerobics, tennis, volleyball, and for the youth such events as boys' baseball, both recreational and competitive, girls' softball, Red Cross swimming lessons, tumbling, archery, soccer, tennis lessons, golf lessons and so on.

More importantly, the city of Fort Morgan provides four full-service parks with picnic and playground facilities for the citizens. We have two swimming pools open to the general public, and at the present time there is no charge for the use of this recreation facility. We also maintain and manage eight softball and baseball field complexes. These are also available for public use when scheduled events are not taking place.

The only weakness in the Fort Morgan recreation program at the present time is the lack of an indoor winter facility, primarily gymnasium space. The city works very closely with school district RE-3 to make full use of the available facilities, but we do fall short of the space that could be used for activities of a community nature at this time.

A remedy to this problem, however, does exist and has been under consideration prior to any mention of the SSC siting in northeastern Colorado. An impact by the SSC on our winter program is viewed as an aid to build this indoor winter recreation facility that we need, because it should provide the additional population base to make that project practical.

The city also has a first-rate library to provide some 40,000 volumes of reading and reference materials. A number of youth and adult programs are implemented annually to create its greatest usage. The city museum is operated in conjunction with the Fort Morgan Heritage Foundation. It provides the public an insight to the local history of the area and updated exhibits keep our community abreast of world events.

Local functions occur on an annual basis that add to our community pride. Two functions are the Festival In The Park, which is a local arts and crafts fair, and the second is an annual Bluegrass Festival. The former is a total community involvement program, while the latter is sponsored by the Morgan County Arts Council.

All the programs and facilities that I've just mentioned are in place at present. They are designed to accommodate day citizens with an eye to the future. Expansion or greater utilization of any item has been anticipated long before the SSC became a consideration. An important point, however, to keep in mind is while Fort Morgan provides very well for itself, the public wishes certainly go beyond our local programs.

Fort Morgan is the gateway to the Rocky Mountains. Because Colorado is so wide open, we don't think in terms of numbers of miles but rather in time frame. Within 30 minutes you can use any one of four major reservoirs for both summer and winter recreation. Forty-five minutes will put the resident at the new Denver airport site, and from there the entire world will be available.

Seventy minutes will place people in the metro Denver area, with all its resources. For those wishing symphony or theater, it's available within the hour, both in the Denver metro area and the Union Colony Civic Center in Greeley.

Professional sports are at our fingertips with the Denver Broncos and Nuggets. Ninety to one hundred and twenty minutes will put people in the heart of the most outstanding ski slopes in the United States.

My last point concerning the SSC impact is to stress its positive effect on the children of Fort Morgan. The present economic base of Fort Morgan and Morgan County is agricultural and oil exploration. When the SSC is built, a scientific community will establish itself, offering new opportunities for the use of the area, broadening career fields that at present simply do not exist here.

As you can see, any impact placed on our community by the SSC is more positive than negative. As Section 5.2.11.1 states, these communities, Fort Morgan and Brush, are currently regional centers and could serve a much larger population if they experienced rapid growth with the development of the SSC.

We wholeheartedly support this statement. Thank you for your time and interest, gentlemen.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. I'm informed that Mike Berryhill has arrived. So I'd like to call our next commenter, Mr. Mike Berryhill.

596 STATEMENT OF MIKE BERRYHILL

MR. BERRYHILL: Good evening. My name's Mike Berryhill. I'm president of Morgan County Federal Savings and Loan in Fort Morgan. I would like to review the anticipated housing requirements which will be directly attributable to the SSC project, and then I would like to discuss the availability and adequacy of the financial resources within Morgan County, to accommodate the housing requirements.

According to the Environmental Impact Study, the SSC project is expected to generate an average of 3,500 direct construction jobs during its estimated eight-year construction period, with a peak of about 4,000 jobs in 1992. This is approximately double the peak number of construction jobs which were created during the construction of the Pawnee I Power Plant in Brush, about a decade ago.

The Environmental Impact Study projects that of the 3,500 to 4,000 jobs created, 900 will be held by baseline residents while nearly 1,200 will be held by in-migrant residents during the 1992 peak year. Thus, 900 local residents will become a part of the work force, and 1,200 workers will move into our community on a permanent basis, at least during the construction period.

This further translates into the arrival of about 800 new families and 400 single workers. The study also estimates that some 950 housing units will be needed to accommodate those 1,200 construction workers and their families, either in their capacity as renters or as buyers.

Assuming that the SSC work force will possess socio-economic characteristics similar to the Pawnee project, the majority of the nonresident work force, numbering about 2,000 during the peak period, can be expected to be very transitory. We would expect over 80 percent of these folks to commute on a daily basis, and the remaining 20 percent to commute on a weekly basis.

The weekly commuter will, of course, impact the various forms of rental housing. From these projections we have concluded that the number of construction workers expected to relocate to Fort Morgan or into Morgan County on a permanent basis, and those commuters who will be in need of rental housing on a temporary basis, will produce a very significant but not overwhelming impact on housing demand in our county.

We believe that present and future inventory of housing units for sale and for rent in this county, together with the generous inventory of nearly 1,200 developed and/or platted building sites, most of which are located in Fort Morgan and Brush, will be more than adequate to allow for reasonable, orderly and timely absorption of the new population.

Morgan County's financial resources are assuredly more than adequate to meet any potential increase in housing demand resulting from the SSC project. The county has three local savings and loan institutions and six commercial banks, with combined assets of over $368 million. The primary commercial banks are experienced in land acquisition and development financing, provide the capability of handling major new subdivision development and expansion.

The banks are also experienced in construction lending, with some banks also actively providing permanent home financing. The savings and loan institutions are essentially specialists in the home finance, in home finance, and provide an assortment of home mortgage products in the form of conventional and FHA loans, for single-family dwellings, condominiums, townhomes and multifamily dwellings.

Mortgage banking firms from the front range can also be expected to compete in the local market area. Loan products will include a variety of fixed rate and variable rate loans, and local lenders have actively participated in various housing revenue bond programs, especially with the Colorado Housing and Finance Authority in Denver, in providing specialized below-market home financing for first time home buyers.

The Morgan County financial community welcomes the very meaningful economic impact that will result from the SSC project, and it looks forward to meeting the challenge of accommodating the related housing needs. If the Department of Energy would like any additional, we would certainly be available to provide any necessary assistance. Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, the hour is now 8:15. We're going to take a brief recess and we'll reconvene the final portion of our hearing at 8:25.

(Whereupon a brief recess was taken.)

MR. EIGUREN: We're ready to resume, ladies and gentlemen.

It's now 8:30, and we will formally go back on the record for this, the September 29, 1988 hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement at Fort Morgan, Colorado, for the SSC project. I would like to remind those of you that are commenting that you have five minutes to comment, and we would ask that you would first give your name and address and any organization you represent at the beginning of your comments.

We would also encourage any of you who are here that have not commented or have not signed up to comment, if you would like to do so, please register with the folks at the registration table outside in the lobby, and they will give me your name, and you will be allowed five minutes in which to comment also.

At this point we will continue on down our point of pre-registered commenters, and I would call the name of Honorable Gary Debus, Logan County Commissioner.

575 STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES W. READ

MR. READ: Gentlemen, welcome to northeastern Colorado - we hope, the future site of the Superconducting Super Collider. However, I would report that I am not Gary Debus. I am James W. Read, Chairman of the Logan County Board of Commissioners. Mr. Debus is our administrative assistant, and I am taking his place here tonight. I am also a trustee for Northeastern Junior College. I reside at 806 South 5th Avenue, Sterling, Colorado.

As a commissioner, I represent the 18,800 friendly, cooperative and industrious people who live in Logan County. I also represent a progressive community that is ready and willing to look to the future of the Super Collider.

Logan County is concerned that the resources of the area's surrounding communities, such as the City of Sterling, have not been included in the draft Environmental Statement. Sterling is a pleasant, relaxing, 40-minute drive on Interstate 76 from Fort Morgan, and 30 minutes from Brush.

Logan County has a housing stock and infrastructure to accommodate the peak construction and operational modes for the SSC. At the present, more than 200 homes are on the market at very favorable prices, and more than 100 building lots are ready for construction by regional groups of homebuilders.

The strength of Logan County rests in its people. They are well-educated, industrious and hard working. Because of their farm and oil field backgrounds, they have a variety of skills that would be advantageous to the superconductor construction.

Our school system has the room to accommodate the increased enrollment that would be anticipated. In Sterling, a new $8 million health care facility, the Sterling Regional Med Center, is under construction, and we are operating our airport. We have comprehensive land use and planning ordinance that ensure quality growth. Our recreational facilities and recreational opportunities are excellent.

I would note that, as a trustee of Northeastern Junior College, which was founded in 1941, is a comprehensive community college that enjoys a reputation of excellence in both academic and vocational programs. It has the capacity to provide educational opportunities for many more students.

I have read in the draft Environmental Statement that this region may not be able to accommodate the boom-town conditions created by the SSC project. We would contend, however, that the SSC will provide stable jobs and public service levels which will not create boom and doom conditions, but would instead provide the positive and regulated growth we are ready and willing to undertake.

Thank you for the opportunity to present our views.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Commissioner.

Our next commenter is Thomas A. Smith.

601 STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS A. SMITH

MR. SMITH: Thank you, and good evening. My name is Thomas A. Smith. I am the Mayor of Log Lane Village, a small town of 736, which is located one and one-half miles west of Fort Morgan. I would like to address Volume IV, Appendix 14, Pages 58 through 90, of the EIS.

Log Lane Village has currently 90 to 100 rental properties, with a vacancy rate of 10 to 15 percent. Also available in our village are 114 lots fully developed, including utilities, with streets in place. RV parking could be available on 40 of these lots.

Adjacent to Log Lane Village is an additional nine acres which has 32 lots already preplatted. The town also has immediately available six and a half acres of land that is zoned light commercial.

The town facilities consist of an electric and gas under current contract to the Public Service Company of Colorado. Our telephone service is provided by U.S. West Communications. Our water system is town-owned and town-operated, which could easily accommodate 100 to 150 more households.

Log Lane Village has recently made an application, an impact assistance grant to update our present water system for anticipated future growth and ensure adequate water supply to all of our residents.

Our sanitation system was increased by 33.33 percent in 1987, and again could easily accommodate 100 to 150 additional households.

Our public safety right now is handled by one full-time officer, and one part-time officer. A Vale Grant through the state is now being pursued for an additional full-time officer.

Schooling is provided by District RE3 in Fort Morgan. Busing is provided for grades K through 12, and it also includes the handicapped.

Our fire protection is provided by the Fort Morgan Fire Department, with a five-to-seven-minute response time. Our medical facilities are available through the Fort Morgan Community Hospital, the East Morgan Community Hospital, with easy access to either Denver or Greeley by ambulance or helicopter service.

Our television service is provided by TCI with 26 basic channels and four premium channels. Our trash collection is provided through Morgan County and private trash collectors.

In closing, the town of Log Lane Village recognizes the impact of a boom-town type situation. However, we are willing and able to accept the challenge to not only serve and protect the citizens that already live in our community, but the citizens that may come into our community from the SSC.

We also want it to be known that we are ready to cooperate with and work with all public and private entities involved to accomplish the needs of the Superconducting Super Collider.

Thank you for your attention, gentlemen.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Mayor.

Next commenter is Harold Deselms.

588 STATEMENT OF HAROLD DESELMS

MR. DESELMS: Dr. Temple, panelists. My name is Harold Deselms. I am employed as the President of Morgan Community College, 17800 Road 20, Fort Morgan, Colorado 80701.

The construction and operation of the proposed Superconducting Super Collider in eastern Colorado would have a significant effect and impact upon Morgan Community College's enrollments and programs. I would expect that the college would be called upon to provide training during the construction phase, and help to provide for the educational needs of the SSC employees and their dependents during the operational phases.

Although Morgan Community College is a small institution, it is a part of the Colorado Community College and Occupational Education System, and therefore, can call upon the expertise and the educational resources of the entire system which serves over 51,000 students in credit-generating programs.

In working cooperatively with other community colleges in the State of Colorado where needed, Morgan Community College can answer high technical training needs for the SSC. Morgan Community College has transfer agreements with most four-year institutions in the State of Colorado, and a common core curriculum is in place. Transfer programs and agreement with Regis College to offer upper division courses to lead to a Baccalaureate Degree in northeast Colorado, and telecommunications capabilities would all be beneficial to the SSC personnel and their families.

Those of us at Morgan Community College look forward to the challenge of the SSC locating in eastern Colorado, and we can quickly adjust to the impact that would be created by such a project.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

Next scheduled commenter is the Mayor of the City of Wiggins, the Honorable Phyliss Forsha.

692 STATEMENT OF HON. PHYLISS FORSHA

MS. FORSHA: Good evening, gentlemen. I am Phyliss Forsha, Mayor of the Town of Wiggins, one of the smaller towns in the county, and I would like to address also in regard to the Environmental Impact Statement, Volume IV, Appendix 14, in regard to housing.

Being a small town at the western edge of Morgan County, just 15 miles west of Fort Morgan here, we would expect probably to have some impact in regard to housing, so I would like to address the fact that we feel that we could probably double our population at this time without too much constraint.

We have within our town 75 building lots with sewer, water, telephone, natural gas, cable TV all in place. These lots could be built upon without constraints to the town. Part of these lots are also owned by construction people who had purchased them at one time thinking that there would be some growth in our area, so I'm quite sure they would be anxious to use these lots.

At the present time, since we are highly agricultural, we have experienced some economic downward trend, and so we have quite a few homes for sale in our town at this time. I think at this time I could say at least 12 homes. Our vacancy rate is rather high among our rental properties, too. We do sometimes have summertime influx of rural workers which does fill up our rentals.

Our school has also had a decrease in population, and could probably handle 25 to 30 percent more students at this time without any constraints. We have one of the higher rated high schools for a small school in the state.

1 When we built our water treatment and water plants, we built for a population of 1,000. We have never gained any population over our 500 in the last 10 years.

We lie on the main artery of I-76 into Denver. So we feel like we even have an advantage over Fort Morgan. You can get to a metropolitan area quicker from our area. We do hope that there will be a certain number of people who would come in here that would like a rural atmosphere, and perhaps like to live in our town.

We are a member of the Morgan County Ambulance Service. We have an ambulance located in our town. We have an excellent rural fire department. Just recently we received a lower rating, fire rating. We have senior citizen's program. We have churches, we have summer recreation. We have an excellent small town park, and a baseball program from the summertime. We have a tennis court.

In general, we feel like that we could offer at least a place for at least 200 or so people to live in our town.

We also had some impact during the Pawnee Power Plant, and our experience with that was nothing but good. We have a labor force that is searching for work, you might say, at the present time because of our downward trend in agriculture. Agriculture has been our mainstay in the past.

I believe that's all I have to say, except that we have just recently completed a flood levy which would take us out of a floodplain, and has made it possible for us to look forward to some growth. It has been a limiting factor in the past.

And as a little town, I'm sure that we would appreciate any economic advantage we could gain from the location of the Superconductor Super Collider in our area.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Mayor.

Next commenter is James M. Kadlecek.

600 STATEMENT OF JAMES M. KADLECEK

MR. KADLECEK: Thank you. My name is James M. Kadlecek. I reside in Greeley, Colorado, at 1127 16th Street. I am here representing the Greeley/Weld Economic Development Office, and I am also a chairman of the board of the North Colorado Medical Center, a 326-bed facility located in Greeley, Colorado.

As the executive director for the economic development partnership, I have had the opportunity to discuss locational criteria with any number of prospective business developments interested in Colorado as a potential site to establish a work location. I know how important it is for the success of that new business to find the location which provides a best fit for the long-term future of that operation.

1 The information contained in the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Department of Energy's proposed action to site the Superconducting Super Collider is quite comprehensive. However, relative to the proposed Colorado site, I would like to submit information I believe is pertinent to your consideration of this site, but which is not contained in the DEIS.

The Greeley/Weld County area provides a number of services, service amenities which complement and support those found on a more limited basis in Morgan and Washington Counties. One graphic example of this is medical services. In both counties, physician specialists from North Colorado Medical Center provide clinics on at least a monthly and often weekly basis to serve patients in these rural areas. Both counties also contract with North Colorado Medical Center for bio-med which provides maintenance and upkeep of their high tech hospital equipment, and with Northcare, which provides a network of health care providers to meet patient needs under one insurance umbrella. Through the hospital's
2 residency program, emergency room and weekend coverage is provided to these counties, and the residents also perform a month's rotation in their training program in concert with the rural physicians.

As an example of the Greeley impact and service delivery for the proposed Colorado SSC site, it's interesting to note that in 1987, of the people who left Morgan County to receive medical treatment, 60 percent of them, or 655 patients came to Greeley, while 37 percent went to Denver. Of the patients who left Washington County to receive medical services, 49 percent or 96 came to Greeley, and a like percentage went to Denver.

On the retail level, retail goods sold in Greeley to our eastern county neighbors is significant enough that the Greeley Chamber of Commerce Retail Council devotes at least one major campaign annually to
3 eastern Colorado. Among major retail anchors in Greeley, it has been reported that as much as 48 percent of their charge customer volume comes from eastern Colorado communities. The point being that the Greeley area serves as a substantial market area serving this area.

So while we lie northeasterly of the proposed Colorado site for the SSC, we believe that our area provides essential support services or service delivery to this area.

Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

MR. KADLECEK: Would you like copies of any written material?

MR. EIGUREN: Yes, we would. If you would give it to the court reporter, sure.

MR. KADLECEK: We will include that as part of the official record.
Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Our next scheduled commenter is Leona Graham. Leona Graham.

Okay, we will pass her over for the moment, and call her before we formally close the hearing this evening.

The next scheduled commenter is Sam Sasaki.

602 STATEMENT OF SAM SASAKI

MR. SASAKI: Good evening, gentlemen. I must take the opportunity congratulate you for your fortitude in listening to all of the comments here. I know you've been listening to it all afternoon, so I appreciate the opportunity.

My name is Sam Sasaki. I'm the city manager for the city of Greeley. My address is 1000 10th Street, Greeley. The city of Greeley has taken the opportunity to review the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Department of Energy's proposed action to site the Superconducting Super Collider, and offers the following comments concerning the proposed Colorado site.

First, Greeley's interest in the DEIS stems from the city's close proximity to the proposed Colorado site. Much like our neighboring communities to the east, Greeley's history and a good part of its current base is agricultural. As such, Greeley has a long traditional of serving the northeastern portion of the state as an important base for obtaining goods and services ranging from commercial and industrial outlets to cultural, educational and entertainment centers.

We were somewhat surprised that there was no mention of Greeley as a service center to the proposed Colorado site for the SSC. One of the apparent assumptions in the DEIS is that there is a travel distance threshold that dictates the support service boundary for the proposed Colorado site. While physical proximity to the site is in fact one method of ascertaining area resources, it should not be the controlling factor.

It is typical in western states for population and service centers to be quite dispersed, and as such, the acceptable travel norm may be much higher than the standard distance. Given this factor, it would appear appropriate for the DEIS, particularly within this socio-economic assessment, to fully recognize the ability of the Greeley area to provide or support developments such as housing, hotels, recreation areas, higher education facilities, convention and visitors' opportunities, cultural outlets, medical services and other related functions to help address the demand which would be experienced in the proposed Colorado site.

The DEIS also noted in the review of the affected environments at site alternatives that air access is provided principally to Stapleton International Airport, with general aviation fields also available through Fort Morgan Municipal and Brush Municipal Airports. Though not referenced in the DEIS, the Greeley/Weld County Airport also provides important area air access. In fact, Greeley/Weld is an all weather airport facility and since it is outside the Denver Terminal Control Area, aircraft using this facility are not subject to the air traffic control delays that are possible within a larger metropolitan area.

The accessibility of the Greeley/Weld facility to corporate aircraft in operation today makes it a significant support operation to the proposed Colorado site for the SSC. The city of Greeley's population is approximately 60,000. Our community enjoys an extensive public and social service network, excellent medical care facilities, an ample supply of housing types, a progressive and broad educational system, and a full range of recreation and cultural opportunities, all available to help accommodate SSC newcomers to the area.

One outstanding example of this is the city's recent completion of the Union Colony Civic Center, a 1,700 seat auditorium and a 230-seat small theater facility, which compares favorably with centers located in larger metropolitan areas. Home to the Greeley Philharmonic, the oldest symphony west of the Mississippi, Greeley draws facility users not only from northern Colorado but from the Denver metropolitan area as well.

The Civic Center is only one of several exceptional public facilities which flavor the quality of life standards in this regional area. On behalf of the city of Greeley I encourage you to consider our proximity to the proposed Colorado site, and as a further factor in the environmental assessment of this area as a potential site for the SSC. Thank you for the opportunity.

DR. TEMPLE: Mr. Sasaki?

MR. SASAKI: Yes?

DR. TEMPLE: Could you tell me how far it is in distance and in time from Fort Morgan to Greeley?

MR. SASAKI: It took us 45 minutes to get here this evening.

DR. TEMPLE: Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: And what's the distance?

MR. SASAKI: It's about 45 miles.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. The next commenter is the Mayor of the city of Sterling, the Honorable Edith Evans.

599 STATEMENT OF HON. EDITH EVANS

MS. EVANS: Good evening, gentlemen. I'm Edith Evans, Mayor for the city of Sterling. I'm also the instructional director for the Business and Science Division at Northeastern Junior College that you heard Mr. Reed speak of a little bit earlier, and I'm the president of the Colorado Municipal League. I reside at 1325 Buchanan Street in Sterling, and I speak this evening on behalf of the city. On behalf of the City Council and the citizens of Sterling, Colorado, I would like to thank the Department of Energy for the opportunity to appear at this hearing concerning the site selections for the SSC Collider.

The city of Sterling enthusiastically endorses the selection of the Colorado site for the Super Collider, and I would like to make a few comments as to why this selection would favorably impact the city of Sterling, and how we as neighbors and residents of the area can assist with the SSC project.

Sterling is a regional hub for northeastern Colorado, as it is the largest city in a six-county region. We are also located a reasonably short distance, approximately 40 minutes, from the proposed site in Morgan County. It is our opinion that our location would be helpful in handling the anticipated growth that such a project would bring, and that we could be of assistance in minimizing some of the problems associated with that growth.

The city of Sterling is actively seeking growth, and would see this as an opportunity to gain secondary businesses and industries. We are presently working on a new planning and zoning ordinance which would assist us in helping to manage to control the impact that growth from a project such as this might have for our area.

There are numerous housing opportunities available in our city for use by potential construction employees and for future permanent employees of the project. Because we are located within 40 minutes of the proposed site, we would be a viable source of housing and other facilities for the temporary construction workers, other employees and their families.

There are currently many vacant houses and we have numerous vacant lots for those desiring to become permanent residents and wishing to construct housing in or near our city. Sterling as a regional business location for northeast Colorado offers a wide variety of businesses. We have national retail outlets such as Sears, J.C. Penney's, Walmart and K-Mart.

We are proud of an excellent public school system, K through 12, plus one private church-related elementary school. Northeastern Junior College, established in Sterling in 1941, is a comprehensive junior college offering an outstanding and widely recognized transfer curriculum as well as a broad variety of vocational programs.

The Sterling Regional Med Center is presently constructing a new hospital to replace an older facility, and upon completion it will become a very modern medical care facility. The medical community is constantly striving to keep its force of doctors complete and up to date, from general family practitioners to specialists.

We believe that Sterling and Logan County would be a viable source for some of the local work force which will be needed during the construction phase and for staffing the facility after the construction is completed.

The city of Sterling is a modern, progressive, full-service city. It cares deeply about its citizens, and would welcome the opportunity to help share in and meet the challenge of growth that this project would undoubtedly bring to northeast Colorado.

In summary, our location, available housing, retail businesses, eating establishments, educational facilities, medical facilities, churches, cultural activities and a variety of recreational facilities and activities all would help us to assist those cities in Morgan and Washington County who are in closer proximity to the project location.

Thank you again for the opportunity to speak. We encourage you to select the Colorado site as the best location for the SSC project.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you Mayor. That concludes our list of pre-registered speakers. At this point we will now turn to our list of individuals who registered at the door to speak this evening, taken in the order with which they've been received here. First is Mr. Joe Karban.

693 STATEMENT OF JOE KARBAN

MR. KARBAN: Good evening. I'd just like to say that well first of all, I'm one of the landowners on the east side of the ring. In the Environmental Impact Statement it says that the water level during the construction period would be depleted in our area.

Well believe you me, gentlemen, it wouldn't take too much to deplete it because it's being depleted for a number of years now. There isn't that much water out there. We can't afford to lose any more wells. Another thing, from our place on the east side of that ring, it's 100 miles to Denver. The people driving back and forth that much just create extra pollution and we don't need it. I guess that's about all I've got to say. I'm dead opposed to it.

MR. EIGUREN: Mr. Karban, did we get your name and address please?

MR. KARBAN: My address is Star Route 2, Box 81, Akron, Colorado.

MR. EIGUREN: And the name please?

MR. KARBAN: Joe Karban. K-A-R-B-A-N.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Mr. Karban. The next commenter is Maggie Goodwin.

694 STATEMENT OF MAGGIE GOODWIN

MS. GOODWIN: Good evening. I am Maggie Goodwin and I reside here in Fort Morgan at 808 Peron. Tonight I am representing the Women's Economic Development Council for the State of Colorado, and I will be entering a letter from Martha Ezerd, who is the chairman of the Council.

On behalf of the Womens' Economic Development Council, a gubernatorially appointed council within the Office of Economic Development, we concur with the citation in Volume I, Chapter 2, on the scientific need for the development of the SSC.

We acknowledged that the knowledge gained regarding physical phenomena in recent years has been achieved through the use of high energy accelerators. We believe that the United States must construct the Superconducting Super Collider, and we support and endorse the Colorado SSC proposal.

The Womens' Economic Development Council serves as an accountability committee to monitor, evaluate and advise the Colorado SSC project staff on issues of gender equity. With the Colorado designation of preferred site, the Council will actively participate to ensure equity in employment, construction contracts, procurement contracts, and continued operation representation.

We are pleased with the specific inclusion of WBE statements within the blueprint document, as previously mentioned by both David Thompson and Tony Hernandez. We look forward to an active partnership in building the Colorado SSC. Sincerely, Martha Ezerd. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. The next commenter is Jim Collard.

695 STATEMENT OF JIM COLLARD

MR. COLLARD: My name is Jim Collard. I'm the city administrator in Brush. I live at 441 Stanford Street, in Brush, Colorado. My remarks will address Volume IV, Appendix 5a, and Volume I, Section 5.1.8.5. This concerns community values and attitudes.

I think it's important to understand that this project cannot be underestimated in terms of the benefits that it brings to this area. Diversification is a good buzz term in the world of economic development now, and certainly in an area such as this with its dependence on oil and agriculture, is in a position of dire need for diversification.

The people of this area want this project. I think that's been very well demonstrated. Many networks are already in place to accommodate the in-coming visitors. An example is the Adopt a Scientist Program, which starts with prior written communication with the people, then meeting them at the airport, the wives in the area taking the scientists' wives and other visitors around to shop, helping them get into the many recreation programs and the school systems and so on. Thirteen committees, with an average of 15 people apiece have been involved in this at the local level.

The SSC has yielded a tremendous amount of benefits to this area already, without ground even being broken. There is already a desire for cooperation before this project was even a figment in someone's imagination. This has served as the catalyst to turn that cooperation into a reality.

I want to change my topic a little bit, and lead off with a question. I wonder if this is really a Federal project, because in my mind it's a local project. Our society is not a top to bottom society; it's a bottom to top. It was not scientists and PhD's that took the field at Concord; it was farmers and merchants and cowmen. It was the people that gave their life's blood for this country and the people that are in this area now. It was the common man.

I get amused at times because of the emphasis on urban areas, and it's thought to be in an urban area is to be -- to have a high quality of life. I've been in urban areas a lot; I know how long it takes to get from Logan International to downtown Boston, and I know how long it takes to get from Brush, Colorado to Stapleton.

I know what a world airport will be, what it will mean to this area, whether the SSC comes or not. But I also know the importance of that world airport to the SSC project. I think it's interesting in the international press that they talk about a worldport. We're going to have the only new airport in the area, in the country. It would be nice to go into a place where everything works for a change.

I think that it's important to not forget what local people can do. In fact, I wish in a sense that after you correctly decide to site this project, that those in the Federal government would get out of the way and I would submit to you that if you were to do that and then come back in a few months, that you need to have your track shoes on, because the people in this area will run with it like you have no concept of.

This will serve as a beacon on the plains, a beacon of knowledge, put together not by the high society and the cream of the crop, quote unquote, although that's kind of a deceptive term isn't it, because the cream of the crop in my mind is not the ones in the headlines, it's the doers. It's the people with the plows in their hands and the shovels, the people of this area.

We have the technical ability here -- I'm getting kind of emotional -- this to me is what America is all about And I think -- I guess I've been a little dismayed because all we talk about is the technical aspects of this project. And really it's the idea of the project that seems to be more important to me. Anything is doable in our country; that's what we've proved from the very beginning.

The technical aspects are a secondary issue. It's the idea. We have the technical ability in Colorado, but what's more important in my mind is that we have the spirit. We have the spirit of achievement and of adventure. We have it in our blood in this country. And in the final analysis, that really is what the SSC is all about.

Let's not forget our roots, for the sake of impressing anyone. Let's allow our roots to impress the world. Thank you for your time.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. The next commenter is Stan Sailsbery.

696 STATEMENT OF STAN SAILSBERY

MR. SAILSBERY: Good evening. My name is Stan Sailsbery. I'm a farmer-rancher out northwest of Fort Morgan. Address 25530 Road 14, Wildona, Colorado 80653.

I'm a candidate for Morgan County commissioner. As you realize this is an election year. We've worked real hard in this community, all of us, the citizens, the administrators, the committee heads and so on, but as you realize this is an election year and faces may change.

And on behalf of all the commissioner candidates in the area, because as you realize as we make a transition from a community as we are to a Super Collider, to a scientific center, the commissioners must be the ones to take the lead. On behalf of the commissioner candidates throughout the area, I would like to pledge my cooperation and their cooperation and enthusiasm for the Super Collider project. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. That completes our list of registered commenters this evening. The only person whose name is on my list, who is not here, was Leona Graham. Does she happen to be here? Is Leona Graham here?

She apparently is not. Is there anyone in the room who is registered to comment who has not had the opportunity?

There being no one in that category then, that concludes our receipt of public comment at this, the September 29, 1988, public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC project, held in Fort Morgan, Colorado.

Because the Federal Register notice that indicated to the public at large that these hearings would be held in various locations, and because that notice did provide that the hearing here would be from 7:00 until 10:00 p.m. this evening, we will have a hearing panel available to receive additional comment in the event that someone should arrive and would like to give us comment.

So we'll be here until 10:00 p.m., but as matters now stand, we're going to go ahead and formally conclude the public hearing at this point in time. We'll resume in the event that someone does show up.

On behalf of both myself as well as the Department of Energy hearing panel at the front, we thank you for your attention and your courtesy and your very thoughtful and reflective deliberative comments. They're very helpful in building a record in this particular matter. I wish to thank you, and good evening.

(Whereupon, at 10:00 p.m., the hearing was officially closed.)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Public Hearing on the Matter of:

SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

Gymnasium
Waubonsie Valley High School
Aurora, Illinois

Thursday, October 6, 1988
and
Friday, October 7, 1988

APPEARANCES

PRESIDING:

DR. ED TEMPLE
Executive Director, SSC Site Task Force

MODERATOR:

ROY L. EIGUREN, ESQ.
Lindsay, Hart, Neil & Weigler

PANEL:

DR. ED. TEMPLE
DR. JERRY NELSEN
DR. ROGER MAYES
U.S. Department of Energy

PUBLIC SPEAKERS:

First Session:

JEFF MILLER
DR. CRAIG JONES
WILLIAM A. TARDY
BARBARA ROSI
SHARON LOUGH
SHARON VESELY
BETTY ZAHNER
EDWARD KIST
DAN DEES
IRVING K. HANSEN
CAROL HADAMIK
STEVE THOMPSON
PAM LONG
CATHIE TARDY
PETER ROSI
DR. WAYNE LARSON
NANCY BRACKMAN
LINDA JONES
CHRIS PETSCHKE
DIXIE THOMPSON
JANET CASSELL
WILLIAM HANNEMAN
BECKY PETSCHKE
MARILYN HANNEMAN
ROGER SOUDERS
JOANNE JOHNSON

Second Session

MARY BARTH
TERRY SIEGLER
KATHLEEN HICKEY
PHILLIP HADAMIK
JENNIFER HANNEMAN
WILLIAM R. HANNEMAN, IV
BLANCA SOUDERS
MARTIN CASSELL
CHRISTINE DAVIS
BRADLEY SCOTT
LARRY NORDBROCK
SHERRIL KIST
TIM STOLA
DONNA STACHNIK
VICTORIA WEST
RICHARD LACZYNSKI
KAREN WILTSEY
ROBERT WHITEHOUSE
LAWRENCE J. CHALHAN
DAVID WERDIN
JUDY MASTALSKI
GLENN MASTALSKI
DONNA SERO
BETTY STAFFORD
LORRAINE STAHL
CARLEEN McFARLANE
KAREN SMITH
RICHARD SMITH
SANDY GULLICKSON
GENE STAHL

Third Session:

LORIN NEVLING
KRISTIN DEAN
CHARLES PAJOR
JIM ANDERSON
OWEN TRIMBLE
DARLENE VIOLETTO
ALBERT D. McCOY
DENNIS E. KOMES
JEFFREY SCHIELKE
MARY BETH STRIEDL
MARJORIE HARTFORD ANDERSON
MARK FRECH
MARVIN HUBBELL
MICHAEL WIANT
MARY BUSHNELL
STAN YONKAUSKI
GARY WRIGHT
PATRICK LA MASTER
BRIAN CROSS
RICHARD CRAIG
MARY TROTZ

Fourth Session:

BERNARD P. KILLIAN
LISA SCHRAMER
TERRY A. SCHWEITZER
FRANKLIN B. COFFMAN
MOLLIE SCHMIDT
GEORGE SCHRAMER
DONALD A. SCHINDLBECK
HOWARD DECKER
JIM THRALL
JEFF KEHOE
WARREN BRIGHAM

PETER CONROY
JOE LIGUS
RICHARD SMONIN
KRISHAN SINGH
ADRIAN VISOCKY
CARL BECKER
MICHAEL DIVINE
THOMAS EMERSON
KEITH SHERMAN
STEVE SCHLICKMAN
BILL CAHILL
MARY WALL
STEVE SHARD
ROBERT SABOLICH
GEORGE FLEMING
JEANNETTE WAMPACH
MIKE T. BROWN

Fifth Session:

GREG GULLICKSON
THEMIS KLOTZ
ED MYSZKA
JACK POOL
ARTHUR BLAKE
JIM BRYSKI
CHERYL CONRO
RICHARD STOUFFER
GINNY GEMMELL
CAROLANN LAIRD
GORDON HARD
ALAN DUTKIEWICZ
TERRY DESMOND
ED LENINGER
CHERYL HERMAN
SUZANNE LEGATZKE
KEN ROBINSON
ALLAN PERETZ
JOHN LEDERER
CYRIL D. CURTIS
MARK McINICOFF
ROD WELLANDORF
WILLIAM J. NOE
GERRY LONG
FRED W. ULLRICH
GREG CHARTRAND
RONALD A. TEMKO

FIRST SESSION

(October 6, 1988: 2:00 p.m.)

DR TEMPLE: Good afternoon. This is a hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, the EIS, for the Superconducting Super Collider, SSC.

My name is Ed Temple and I am the Executive Director of the Department's SSC Site Task Force. I am also the presiding official for this hearing. The purpose of my brief remarks is tell you why we are all here. After my brief remarks, I will ask our session moderator, Mr. Eiguren, to outline how we will conduct our meeting this afternoon. The purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens an opportunity to comment in person on the Department's draft EIS on the SSC. This hearing is not your only opportunity. You may also send us your written comments which should be postmarked by October 17, 1988

We want you to know that we are sincerely interested in hearing your comments on this document. And that each of your comments will be considered and responded to in the final EIS. Let me refresh your memories about the SSC site selection process.

In January 1987, President Reagan's decision to proceed with the SSC was announced and construction funds were requested from Congress. In April 1987, the Department issued an invitation for site proposals. We subsequently received 43 proposals and 36 of these were found to be qualified. These qualified proposals were forwarded to the National Academy of Sciences and National Academy of Engineering for further evaluation. Based on the criteria in the invitation, the Academies' recommended a best qualified list, BQL -- you will hear us use that terminology -- of eight sites to the Department. One of these proposals was later withdrawn by the proposer.

Following a review and verification of the Academies' recommendations, Secretary Herrington announced the Best Qualified List, including the Illinois proposed site, on January 19, 1988. Three days later on January 22, 1988, the DOE formally announced that it would develop an EIS on the proposed SSC. This followed a May 1987 advance notice of intent to prepare an EIS.

In February of 1988, we held scoping meetings in each of the seven states to obtain public comment on the nature and scope of the environmental issues to be considered in the EIS. Scoping meetings were held in February here in Illinois at the Fermilab auditorium. The DOE received approximately 2,100 comments on the scope of the EIS. These comments were considered in the preparation of the draft EIS.

Following public hearings here and the other BQL states, we will develop a final EIS to be issued in December of 1988. The draft EIS evaluates and compares four types of alternatives: site alternatives; technical alternatives; programmatic alternatives and the no-action alternative.

Site alternatives address the seven locations identified on the BQL. Technical alternatives consider different technology, different equipment or different facility configurations. Programmatic alternatives included possibilities of using other accelerators, international collaboration or project delay. And, the no-action alternative was the option not to construct the SSC.

This draft EIS identifies and analyses the potential environmental consequences expected to occur from siting, constructing and operating the SSC at the seven site alternatives. These sites are located in: Arizona; Colorado; here in Illinois; Michigan; North Carolina; Tennessee; and Texas.

This draft EIS provides as much information as possible at this stage of project development regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed construction and operation of the SSC at each of the alternative sites. However, the Department recognizes that further review under NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, is appropriate prior to the actual construction and operation of the proposed SSC.

Accordingly, following the selection of site for the proposed SSC, the DOE will prepare a supplement to this EIS to address in more detail the impacts of constructing and operating the proposed SSC at the selected site and to identify, where possible, alternatives for mitigating those impacts.

Let me tell you a little bit about the draft EIS. This is a large document containing more than 4,000 pages. It is organized into four volumes. Volume I is entitled Environmental Impact Statement. Volume II is the comment resolution document and is reserved for our response to public comment and is for publication in the final EIS only. Volume III describes the methodology for site selection. And, Volume IV contains 16 appendices providing detailed presentations of technical information which back up the conclusions in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Comments received at this hearing will be used by the DOE to prepare a final EIS to be issued this December. This document will identify the Department's preferred sites. No sooner than 30 days after the final EIS is distributed, the Department will publish its record of decision which will include the final site selection and complete the site selection process.

This afternoon we will use a professional moderator to assure a fair and orderly proceeding. Measures have been taken to permit the maximum opportunity for interested citizens to utilize this session for expressing their comments. Can we please have it quite in the auditorium?

We urge all participants in this afternoon's meeting to focus their comments on the draft EIS and to avoid or minimize statements aimed solely at expressing opposition or support for the State's proposal. While all comments will become part of the formal record of this proceeding, those specifically addressing the draft EIS will be most useful to DOE in preparing the final document.

As I noted earlier, in addition to this opportunity for oral comments, individuals may also provide written comments to the DOE. These should be postmarked by October 17, 1988, the end of the formal 45-day comment period, to assure that they will be considered in the preparation of the final EIS. We will, however, consider comments received after that date to the extent possible.

One final comment on the role of the EIS in the site selection process. The National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, requires that environmental impacts be considered by Federal decision makers in taking major Federal actions with potential environmental consequences. An EIS is one of the methods used to do this analysis, provide for public comment and participation and to make a final decision that meets the NEPA requirements. The EIS will be considered by the Secretary in making the site selection.

Thank you in advance for your interest and participation. Let me now introduce Mr. Roy Eiguren, who will describe how we will conduct today's session.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Dr. Temple. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Roy Eiguren. I am an attorney in private practice with the law firm of Lindsay, Hart, Neil & Weigler which has offices in Seattle, Washington; Portland, Oregon; San Francisco, California; and Boise, Idaho.

My practice and that of our law firm is heavily focused on environmental and energy law. Both in prior government service as well as in private practice, I have had a bit over a decade's worth of experience in either conducting or participating in a significant number of National Environmental Policy Act hearings such as the one we are conducting here today.

I have been retained by the Department of Energy as a moderator for this and other hearings on the draft EIS for this project. I am not an employee of the Department, nor am I an advocate for or against the Department's proposed action in this proceeding. Rather, my single expressed purpose is to serve as independent, unbiased, objective individual to moderate this series of hearings. My role is to help assure that the Department of Energy fully complies with both the letter and spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, so as to allow all individuals and organizations a fair and equal opportunity to comment on the record relative to the Department's proposed action.

As Dr. Temple stated earlier, the purpose of this hearing is to give all interested citizens an opportunity to comment on the record relative to the Department of Energy's draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Superconducting Super Collider project. In February, the Department conducted a scoping meeting here to hear comments from individuals and organizations on what issues should be considered in the preparation of the draft EIS.

Now that the Department has prepared the draft EIS, it seeks comment from the public on it. In particular, we are seeking specific comment on issues that members of the public feel are relevant and should be considered by the Department of Energy prior to finalizing the EIS and selecting its preferred site for the SSC project.

I would like to note at the outset that this is a record proceeding. That is to say, everything that is said here today is begin recorded by the court reporter who is here with us in the front of the room. And, all of the hearings in other states under consideration have been recorded as well. The court reporter will make a verbatim transcript of this hearing and all the comments received, and submit that transcript to the Department of Energy for inclusion in the final record in this proceeding.

The Secretary of Energy's decision will be based upon the record that we compile in these meetings. At this time, I would like to tell you what procedures we are going to follow and the conduct of this as well as the other hearings that have been held to date.

I am going to announce speakers based upon pre-registrations as well as walk-ins and I will go down a list of pre-registered speakers first as provided to me by the Department of Energy from their personnel at the registration table in the back of the room. We are going to take people in the order within which they called in to sign up in advance. If you are here to speak and have pre-registered but haven't checked in at the registration table, we would ask you to do so.

Every individual will have up to five minutes within which to make comment. At the end of five minutes, we would ask that you would then end your comment and I will signal you when your five minutes is up. I have generally been fairly liberal in terms of interpreting the five minute rule, but given the large number of commenters here today, I would ask you to bear with me and when I ask you to end your comments, please bring them to a close as quickly as you can.

As Dr. Temple stated earlier, the purpose of this hearing is to receive comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Accordingly, your comments should be focused on the issues that are addressed in the draft document itself. I do reserve the right to ask individuals to focus on issues contained in the draft EIS if they wander from the topic of the session.

My intent is not to limit remarks but rather to assure that what comments you do provide are effective in achieving the objectives of this hearing as outlined by Dr. Temple earlier. However, it has been my practice throughout the course of these hearings to allow any comment that people want to make relative to this project into the record.

Written comment and oral comment receive the same weight in the record of the proceeding. Therefore, we would encourage you to submit written comments as well as any written questions you have about this project, either before or after your presentation today or by mailing to the Department of Energy. If you do have written comment or question with you, I would ask that when you conclude your presentation, you leave it with the court reporter here in the front or if you are more comfortable, you may leave your comment with the registration table personnel out in the lobby.

If you do intend to provide written comment, as Dr. Temple mentioned, after this hearing, you need to postmark it by no later than October 17, 1988, which is the close of the record in this proceeding. And we do have, in the back of the room at the registration table, a card you can pick up that gives you the address to mail your written comment.

We would ask that when you do send your written comment, that you would provide us with your name, address and zip code. This session has obviously started at 2:00 p.m. today. We intend to run until 5:00 p.m. this afternoon, reconvene at 7:00 p.m. this evening and continue until approximately 10:00 p.m. tonight. Due to the large number of pre-registered commenters that we have, we are doing two things to accommodate everybody -- one is that we are going to have additional hearings tomorrow starting at 9:00 a.m. and going until 10:00 p.m. in the evening. We also have a parallel hearing in this building in the auditorium which is just across the way and there is another hearing there. The hearing panels that you see here have been in the various states. We have had one hearing panel go to three of the states. Another hearing panel go to another three. And then both hearing panels are here in Illinois to accommodate the large number of commenters.

Since this is a recorded proceeding and we have to be concerned about making sure that everything that is said is properly recorded and because we are using an oral recording system, the court reporter will need to take a break about once every hour or so to change tapes. So, you can regularly plan that about every hour or so, we will take a brief recess to allow her to change the tapes and allow people to get up and stretch.

We are going to accommodate walk-in registrants to the extent that people do come to the door and want to speak. We will accommodate those people either at the hearing in the auditorium, or if time allows, we will accommodate them here at this hearing.

I would like to go very briefly through the procedures that we are going to use in terms of public comment. When we call your name, we would ask that you would step forward to the podium here where we have a number of microphones, speak clearly into the microphone nearest you, give us your name and address, and if you are speaking on behalf of any organization, we would ask that you would list that organization. I will not start timing you until you have completed your introduction.

In addition to that, to try to move this through as expeditiously as possible, we have reserved this front row here to my immediate left for those individuals who will be coming up in sequence to speak. So, what I will be doing is when I call our first speaker, I will call the next three or four speakers and we would ask that those later in time speakers come forward to the front, if you are inclined to do so. If you are already up front, you don't need to do that.

I have been asked by the School District to make a few brief announcements relative to the use of this facility. I have been asked to remind you that this is a smoke-free building. Accordingly, there is not smoking allowed within the high school. The cafeteria is for student use only. There is available to you a snack bar just across the lobby if you would like to have coffee or other snacks.

The hearing is being held in the high school with students and faculty in attendance tomorrow. Accordingly, the School District has requested that those of you who are participating in these hearings either stay in the lobby or in one of the two hearing rooms as opposed to going throughout the building.

Now the building will be open for public access at 1:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. today. Tomorrow the building will open up at 8:30 a.m. for the morning session, 1:30 p.m. for the afternoon session and 6:30 p.m. for the evening session.

We do want to thank the School District for making these facilities available to us. We would ask that you would assist them in trying to keep the building free from litter and please do your part in that regard.

Finally, I have been reminded to ask you that we are holding two hearings, I have already mentioned that briefly. There is one in the auditorium as well as the one here in the gymnasium. If you are registered to speak at either one of them, you will need to make sure that you sign in at the registration table. I know people asked me earlier whether or not we are going to allow people to testify more than once. That is to say, can they testify once here and once at the other hearing. Unfortunately that is not the case, we have consistently throughout this course of hearings steadfastly maintained one rule relative to commenting and that is that you may only comment once on the record. However, that does indicate that if you would like to have additional written comment considered by the Department, it's important that you provide us written comment.

Finally, I would like to indicate to you in the audience, the panel who is here with me -- which is Dr. Ed Temple, who is the Executive Director of the Department of Energy's SSC Site Selection Task Force; Dr. Roger Mayes and Dr. Jerry Nelsen, who are environmental specialists with the Department of Energy, are here expressly for the purpose of listening to your comments.

It has been their practice throughout the course of these hearings as appropriate to ask clarifying questions of those individuals who are commenting. Their purpose in doing that is to make sure that we get a complete record of your particular concerns relative to the environmental issues associated with the project. So, what we would ask you to do is when you have completed your oral comment here at the front, if you would stay standing at the podium for just a brief moment to allow anyone in the panel to ask a question if they have any.

With that, we are ready now to begin the receipt of oral comment in this particular proceeding which is the first of the Illinois hearings on the DEIS for the SSC project. It has been the Department's practice that during the course of these hearings, in each state under consideration, to allow either the Governor or a member of the Governor's staff to make a presentation on behalf of the State. The State has been accorded up to 30 minutes within which to do that. The State here has indicated that they wish to take ten minutes to do so. So, at this time, I am going to call upon the Chief of Staff to Governor Thompson, Mr. Jeff Miller, who will present the State's position. Mr. Miller.

1561 STATEMENT OF JEFF MILLER

MR. MILLER: This sounds a lot like what I heard on television last night. First to I would like to say, welcome, and to those of you who have been here before, welcome back. We are very pleased to have you here in Illinois, and we are pleased to be on the short list for consideration for this project.

The Governor is in Washington today. As you know, a part of the selection process was an opportunity for each of the finalist states to make a presentation to the Secretary on behalf of the State. By the luck of the draw, DOE assigned both the beginning of our hearing here in Illinois and the presentation to Herrington on the same day. So, he is there and I am here.

The purpose of this hearing is to respond to the draft of the Environmental Impact Statement. You will hear from experts on various aspects of that Statement whether it be farmland preservation, wetlands, wells, groundwater protection, they will all testify on behalf of the State. You will also have a situation where scores of citizens have indicated a desire to testify. And to intend to accommodate that, we have consciously decided to significant limit the amount of oral testimony that we offer by the State.

We will deal with the issues we consider important, but we will deal much more extensively in the written commentary that we provide as part of this proceeding. That, I think, will afford as much public input from citizens as possible.

Illinois agrees with the general conclusion in the draft Environmental Impact Statement that there are no serious environmental problems at our site, and no environmental reason to select another site over ours. This conclusion which is reached in the draft EIS is strengthened when you realize that the summary draft EIS states 320 wells will be lost. This includes all wells within a 1,000-foot corridor.

We believe, and will provide testimony to bolster this belief, that in fact only 31 wells would actually be impacted. Second, the draft EIS states that 850 acres of wetlands might be lost if Illinois is selected. Over 600 of these acres are on Fermilab property. In fact, they not only won't be lost, over 500 of them were actually created when Fermilab was created. I think you can look at the record of Fermilab and understand -- far from being threatened -- those wetlands would be preserved.

And one more example. The 6,500 acres of farmland mentioned in the draft EIS -- we believe only a few hundred of those acres will be lost. Illinois stands ready to continue to work to mitigate even these minimal environmental impacts to the maximum extent possible.

We do have one major disagreement with the draft EIS and that's in the area of cost. The EIS appears to conclude that costs do not vary significantly among the sites. We believe that conclusion is incorrect. An independent cost study conducted by A.T. Kearning found that $3.28 billion could be saved by building on Fermilab. More than $426 million in components that we have here now,

would have to be duplicated if built elsewhere. Startup costs in Illinois would be $113 million lower. Eighty-eight million dollars in operating costs savings would be realized from a combined Fermilab/SSC site. This factor alone over a 15-year operating life would account for $1.3 billion.

The State incentive contribution of over $500 million in construction costs and site enhancements represents further savings. And finally, the interest cost over the 25 years for financing these various components would add another $959 million in savings.

We have provided detailed analysis to support these statements and we are intending to work with you. Illinois has been collecting and analyzing data regarding its proposed SSC site since 1983. This allowed us to anticipate all the environmental concerns that were raised in the draft EIS and to develop plans for mitigating their impact with no consequences to the operation of the SSC.

Illinois is, in our opinion, second to none as an environmentally sound site. The substantial savings associated with building at Fermilab make us the lowest cost site. We hope you will reach the same conclusion, and trust you will reach the same conclusion we have. Illinois is the best site for the SSC.

MR. EIGUREN: Excuse me, ladies and gentlemen. We will go ahead and let you exercise your First Amendment rights, that's fine. There are a couple questions of Mr. Miller from the panel. We would like to have him respond to those, please. Only the panel can ask questions. Could we have it quiet for just a moment, please?

DR. NELSEN: Mr. Miller, you indicated that there was a more detailed basis for the numbers and so on in your comments, has this been provided?

MR. MILLER: Yes, it has.

DR. NELSEN: It will be provided for the record?

MR. MILLER: It has been and it can be provided again. The question was whether the detailed information that I referred to, the A. T. Kearning study, had been provided to the Federal Government? The answer is, yes it has. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Quiet please. An unemotional quiet crowd here today. What we are going to do is take a very brief recess and go ahead and change the tapes. We need to do that. And then we are going to start receipt of public comment. We are about 30 minutes -- quiet please -- we are about 30 minutes ahead of schedule at this point, so what I am going to do is when we come back in five minutes, we are going to start in sequence our commenters. The first commenters will be Craig D. Jones. Followed by William A. Tardy, Barbara Rosi and Sharon Lough. Lough, I am sorry. My name is Eiguren.

We will be in recess for five minutes.

(Recess)

MR. EIGUREN: Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to go back on the record. Can we have it quiet please? I would like to resume formally this hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC project. I am going to ask you once again if you would please give us the courtesy of allowing our commenters to comment and exercise their First Amendment privileges throughout the course of this proceeding. It's terribly difficult to hear up here because the acoustics in this room are not particularly good. It's doubly difficult to hear when we have everybody in the audience making a lot of noise. I don't want to cut you off and I understand there is a lot of emotional attachment to this issue one way or another. But, I would remind you again that this actually is a quasi-judicial type proceeding.

What we are doing is building a record that will be used by the Secretary of Energy in his decision-making as to where he is going to put the project. So, it behooves you all I think to give each commenter the courtesy of being quiet throughout the course of their comments. If you feel compelled to applaud or boo or whatever you do, try to save it for the end of each commenter. That would help a great deal.

We are now ready to go into the receipt of comment from those members of the public who pre-registered to speak here today. I would like to briefly remind you what the ground rules are. When I call your name, I ask you to come forward here to the podium and speak into the microphone that is hooked up to the recorder which is one of these here in the middle. Just kind of shoot for all of them and you will be close. We would ask that you give us your name and address. If you are speaking on behalf of an organization, tell us what that organization is and then after that, I will go ahead and start timing you. You have five minutes within which to comment.

I am going to fairly rigid in terms of adhering to the five minute rule. Shortly after five minutes, I will indicate that your time is elapsed. Once I have done that, I would ask that you would quickly bring your comments to a conclusion. If you go on much longer, one of the things I can tell you is that aside from the bad acoustics in here, there are a lot of optical illusions in this room -- I am actually six foot four and weigh 235 pounds. There will be big trouble. So, please observe the five-minute rule.

So, with that I will start with our first commenter and then I will call the next three who can be ready to speak after our first commenter. Our first commenter is Craig D. Jones.

922 STATEMENT OF DR. CRAIG JONES

DR. JONES: My name is Craig Jones. I reside in Campton Township.

(Pause)

DR. JONES: Thank you very much. My name is Craig Jones. I reside in Campton Township. I hold the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and Economics and I have relied extensively on that background in preparation of my remarks today.

My comments will address deficiencies in the socio-economic section of the draft EIS. There are relevant but lengthy arguments which cannot be dealt with in five minutes. Those arguments are contained in a rough draft of a study I have prepared for the Heartland Institute, copies of which I have provided here. I will attempt, however, to summarize that study and some additional material in a few sentences.

My primary objection to the socio-economics of the draft EIS is that no consideration is made of financial and land resource opportunity costs. The estimates of jobs created by this project are presented as though they are a net gain, but, this is not the case. The subsidy of the State of Illinois, the subsidy proposed by the State of Illinois is over $1.6 billion, including financing costs.

The removal of this amount of money from the private sector or from other areas of the public sector will result in the loss of jobs that would have been generated had that money been spent by those sectors.

This job loss could be substantial and the much-touted multipliers would apply to it as well resulting in an even greater loss of potential employment.

Regarding land resource costs, in one case alone 500 acres of industrial zone land will be lost to SSC land seizure. This 500 acres would have developed by acreage comparison over 8,000 jobs. Far more than the 3,300 jobs supposedly to be created at Fermilab. Jobs which probably would not be filled by current Illinois residents in any case. These negative effects of the project receive no notice in the draft EIS.

Any comprehensive assessment of the economic effects of a project must include the cost of lost opportunities as well as projected benefits. This omission invalidates the draft EIS socio-economic assessment.

The draft EIS also notes that a recently completed telephone survey indicates an overall favorable attitude toward the project by area residents. This is a gross misinterpretation of the results of that survey. I have two comments. One, this survey was completed in the spring of 1987, almost one full year before the specifics of the SSC were made available to area residents. If I had been asked at that time if I favored siting the SSC site at Fermilab, I probably would have said yes, not being aware of the many negative aspects of the project.

Even with this lack of information about the SSC project, the survey produced the following results which have been ignored by the draft EIS. Fifty-five percent of respondents indicated that they would be moderately or very concerned about a collider tunnel near their homes. And the question that received this response was preceded by the statement, "You would see almost no construction activity on the surface." We now know this statement is totally inaccurate.

Even more revealing is the survey response to a State incentive of $500 million. Only 26 percent of those interviewed supported that incentive, which is less than the actual State incentive by at least $70 million plus the value of the secret sealed incentive and its financing cost. And this is called an overall favorable attitude toward the SSC.

In Texas, a $1-billion incentive proposal was put on the ballot for Texas voters to decide. They passed it two to one. In Texas, the taxpayers were asked. In Illinois, they are told. In Texas, they favored a $1-billion incentive two to one. In Illinois, only 26 percent favored an incentive half that large. Illinois does not want this project.

I would caution the Department of Energy not to underestimate our resolve in this issue. You may site the project in Illinois. But, let me assure you, you will not build it here.

MR. EIGUREN: Dr. Jones has left for the record, extensive written comments on the project. We will include those into the formal record of proceeding.

DR. NELSEN: Roy, is there title on the draft?

MR. EIGUREN: Yes. The title of his document is "Superconducting Super Collider Super Boondoggle?" by Craig Jones.

Moving down the list, our next scheduled commenter is William A. Tardy, followed by Barbara Rosi, followed by Sharon Lough. Mr. Tardy.

839 STATEMENT BY WILLIAM A. TARDY

MR. TARDY: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Good afternoon to the Department of Energy and welcome to you all. My name is William Tardy and I reside in Campton Township, Kane County, Illinois. I am the President of the Citizens Against The Collider Here, otherwise known as CATCH.

We are a 20,000-plus people organization who live in the State of Illinois. Our committee has read, studied and thorough analyzed all 4,700 pages and 16 appendices of the Environmental Impact Statement dated August of 1988. It doesn't take a rocket scientist, or should I say a Fermi physicist, to realize that the draft Environmental Impact Statement clearly shows that Illinois is a terrible choice as the host state for the SSC.

Some of the shortcomings of the State of Illinois are as follows -- and I will not read all the reference numbers but I do have them listed here. We have more affected parcel owners than all other sites combined. We have the second most number of wetlands with 850. We have more acreage of prime farmland that would be removed from production than any other state. We have more businesses that would be closed than all other states combined. That is 60 businesses representing approximately 1,000 employees.

Illinois currently has a regional groundwater shortage. Illinois would have the most groundwater leakage into the tunnel. More people would be adversely affected by noise, air pollution and exposure to airborne radionuclides than any other site. Illinois currently is in a nonattainment status for carbon monoxide and ozone levels. And surface water in Illinois is the worst of any of the seven states.

However, the draft Environmental Impact Statement is deficient in many areas which will be enumerated by many of the following speakers over the next several days. Some of these areas that will be discussed in detail are as follows: the potentially affected wells, as referenced to in Volume IV, Appendix 7, page 113, Figure 7.17, is clearly deficient. The count shows 320. We have taken our own *surveys with neighbors and farmers around the ring and we have only encompassed half the ring and we* are at a count of 610 potentially affected wells. If one were to extrapolate this figure to include the entire ring, one could assume that there could be over 1,200 potentially affected wells.

Another item that is not indicated in the Environmental Impact Statement. The number of affected parcels, in Appendix 4, Table 4-2, page 16, it shows 3,305 parcels. And gentlemen, I encourage you to open up that document and just physically count the parcels. One, two, three and you will come up with a number of 3,624.

In addition, that does not even include the 1988 housing starts that have been located on the ring which are approximately another 500. I believe, on a conservative number, we are talking about 4,375 affected parcel owners which, gentlemen, is ten times more than all the other states combined.

The E8 site isn't even included on the map the State of Illinois provided. Neither is the F8 site. It's not even on the map, gentlemen. It's not on there. These two particular E and F sites are right across the street from a 60- and an 80-acre subdivision and, for whatever reason, it's not even indicated on the maps.

These are just a few of the shortcomings that will be addressed in more detail and I will be sending in for the public record. But suffice it to say, gentlemen, you and the State of Illinois have put a lot of people through a lot of misery -- a lot of time and a lot of expense --during the last nine months. And, quite frankly, we don't appreciate it.

We don't like the State of Illinois' actions. We don't like their misinformation. We don't like their arrogance and we don't like them stonewalling this project and not answering our questions. And we think it's reprehensible the way this project is being conducted.

We don't approve of someone just come charging in, taking over our homes and our factories and our farms and we will not stand for it and we will not be good neighbors if you should make the mistake of siting this project in the State of Illinois.

Please very carefully make a notation of this. After reviewing all the negative impacts that are involved in the State of Illinois and after discussing this with Mr. Herrington and once a final site is selected, if you should make the mistake of siting it in the State of Illinois, I strongly recommend that this will not be built here. We will do everything in our power legally to stop this project. We will never allow it to come on-line.

I would recommend you give it to a state that wants it, a state that needs it, a state that welcomes it. That state, gentlemen, is clearly not the State of Illinois.

In conclusion, we have been garnering signatures over the last nine months. We have gotten 20,000 signatures that we had hoped to present to Governor Thompson. Unfortunately, he is not here. These are the petitions that we would like to urge you to enter all of the names and all the addresses of these 20,000 individuals to go on record against siting this project.

This is the wrong place to put this project the State of Illinois doesn't need. The people don't want it. And we will not allow it to be built here. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: For the record, we will note receipt of a box of petitions labeled "Petition To Remove Bid To Site The Superconducting Super Collider, SSC, Atom Smasher In The State of Illinois."

I would like to express the appreciation of both myself and the panel to the audience for keeping your collective expressions of emotion either before or after the individual's comment. That's very helpful. We will continue moving on through the list. Our next commenter is Barbara Rosi, followed by Sharon Lough, followed by Dan Dees.

1060 STATEMENT BY BARBARA ROSI

MS. ROSI: Good afternoon. I would like to call your attention to a specific are --

MR. EIGUREN: Ma'am, excuse me. I need your name and address for the record.

MS. ROSI: My name is Barbara Rosi and I reside in Campton Township. And now I would like to call your attention to a specific area on the Illinois Land Acquisition Map included in the draft Environmental Impact Statement as Attachment A-3C showing the section in the upper arch. More specifically, take note of the land in this 1,000-ft easement on both sides of Denker Road where somewhere there is to be located E8.

It is stated that this service facility can be moved or rotated. Thus the narrative about this site is ambiguous by design. However, I can assure you there is no logical place here for the destruction of this land or the construction of this facility.

A false assumption in the part of planning is that this proposed E8 facility could be compatible with its surroundings. Table 13-3 shows the project land use zoning as light industrial compared with the existing land use zoning as planned unit development farming district. Now a drive down Denker Road shows that for the most part, the farm is gone. One side of the road is estate zoning and the other side is a planned unit development. This area certainly has been developed and it is quite residential. I quote Section 16.3.31. " Residential land uses are not visually compatible with the proposed project because of the obvious functional and structural contrast between project features and residences."

Again, looking at the map, parcels 62, 53, 51 and 18 are sites of private family homes. The area of parcel 2 is shown as one large piece, but actually represents another phase of the planned unit development as it was recorded. It is ludicrous to think that this facility and its ramifications should be placed on someone's front lawn or on a homesite in a subdivision.

In the same 1,000-ft easement, parcel 72 is an area of floodplain and waterway for drainage that runs into a lake on the other side of the road which is in parcel area number 64. This lake has a spillway into Ferson Creek which makes its way ultimately into the Fox River. This land is certainly not buildable nor would you want to disturb the flow of water and the surrounding natural habitat. Surprisingly though, this local floodplain area is not specifically addressed in the DEIS as to direct or indirect impact.

The attack on our environment and our quality of life during the construction of E8 would be obscene. The blasting, the digging, the hauling, the draining of water from the shaft and during the tunneling, the dust and the muck. And, when you are finished, by your admission, we will have a VM Class four, uncharacteristic of its setting in a highly sensitive area.

I know this area. You should come to know this area. E8 doesn't fit in. E8 won't work here.

I would like to leave you with a thought to take back to Washington with you and to pass along to the powers-that-be. In your deliberations, keep this thought paramount. There are hundreds of dedicated people here who will remain steadfast in their commitment. We will not accept a decision to site the SSC in Illinois. Thank you.

225-775 88 - 4 (BOOK 11)

MR. EIGUREN: Our next commenter is Sharon Lough, followed by Dan Dees, followed by Sharon Vesely.

852 STATEMENT BY SHARON LOUGH

MS. LOUGH: My name is Sharon Lough from Campton Township. And I am a human receptor. I prefer to think of myself and the rest of people living in the Fox Valley as human beings. But, after reading the draft Environmental Impact Statement, I have discovered that the Department of Energy is unfamiliar with that term.

I would like to call your attention to the draft EIS, Volume IV, Appendix 14, page 98. The draft states, "By the year 2000, the SSC is expected to be at full operating employment level providing approximately 3,200 direct jobs. Secondary economic activity would add about 3,800 jobs to the total SSC regional employment impact during SSC operation."

One of Fermilab's most repeated arguments for the SSC is that it already has an infrastructure and support staff in place that would save the Department of Energy more than $3 billion. If that is the case, than there is no way the SSC could create an additional 3,200 permanent jobs. And if does not create an additional 3,200 jobs, then all of the figures in the draft EIS concerning total employment impact and economic benefits are grossly overstated. Come on, guys, Illinois can't have it both ways.

Let's continue with Volume IV, Appendix 14, turn to page 129. On that page, you cite a survey conducted by the Center for Governmental Studies at Northern Illinois University. That quote indicates "an overall favorable attitude towards the SSC by residents of the area." You go on to say, "an important ancillary finding of this research is that concerns over potentially adverse effects of the SSC tend to diminish as knowledge of the project is increased."

Well, I have here a copy of that survey and I defy you to find any reputable opinion research organization that would describe this as scientific, unbiased research. If I had been a respondent to this survey back in April of 1987, I would have supported the SSC. Why? Because the only knowledge available at that time was what Governor Thompson and his administration had spoon-fed us.

It wasn't until January of this year when we finally got a look at the specific proposal that we discovered that State officials had done a magnificent job of lying to the public or, at the very least, they had committed sins of omission. They have grossly overstated the number of permanent and temporary jobs -- grossly -- both direct and induced, that this project will create while failing to inform the public of the thousands of real and potential jobs it will destroy, resulting in a net loss of income to the Fox Valley, if not to the State.

They have ignored the effect this project will have on our water supplies, which are already overdrafted. They have kissed off the threat to our wetlands. They don't care that far more people than they are willing to admit will suffer economically from devalued homes, their titles forever clouded, their front yards turned into ugly views of helium factories and tank farms.

I could go on, but others before and after me have or will state the specifics more eloquently than I. The point I want to make is this: How can our Governor submit a proposal to you, the Department of Energy, that has so many devastating effects on so many people. We have tried to ask him that question but he refuses to give us an audience. He tells the press he will protect us by asking a head-in-the-sand General Assembly to compensate us for our loss. He calls it "good neighbor legislation." I call it dishonest since the triggering mechanism that would bring this law into play is in the hands of the robber instead of the robbee.

When the Governor stated at a media event in Geneva in August to sign the alleged "good neighbor legislation," he stacked the audience with SSC supporters so that the very people he claimed he was protecting couldn't even enter the government center. Three of them risked arrest and physical harm from his goon squad by crashing into the signing ceremony to see how they were being protected. But still the Governor won't talk to us. Twenty thousand of us who have signed petitions opposing this intrusion into our lives and thousands more who haven't have an opportunity to sign a petition.

And why is the good Governor not here today? Why isn't his good neighbor not here to explain to us how we will benefit from this? I will tell you why. Just as it was in the government center in Geneva, he is afraid to face us. Instead, Governor yellowbelly Thompson cowers off to Washington to lick the boots of your Secretary Herrington hoping that by landing the SSC, the fat cat contractors will stuff his campaign treasury and those of his political cronies. That's what it comes down to -- I will wind it up, I will wind it up, Ray -- because any logical right-thinking individual who analyzes carefully the Illinois Site Proposal and the draft Environmental Impact Statement, will find that this obscenity, this welfare project for the overeducated, has no benefit for the little guy.

Twenty years ago the people of western Illinois were raped by the State of Illinois when they were forced to give up their property at fire-sale prices as documented in the book Policide written by Drs. Lowe and Ginsberg. In some cases, land was outright stolen from them, as they received no financial remuneration.

To your everlasting shame, your predecessor, the Atomic Energy Commission, encouraged this action.

MR. EIGUREN: Sharon, I am sorry, I have to cut you off.

MS. LOUGH: Can't I say one more sentence.

MR. EIGUREN: You have run six minutes, I am sorry.

MS. LOUGH: Do not underestimate the opposition --

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

MS. LOUGH: We are formidable. If Illinois is chosen, the SSC will never get built here.

MR. EIGUREN: We will receive for the record the written documents of Sharon Lough along with a supporting document entitled, "A Center for Governmental Studies," developed by Northern Illinois University. And the actual topic is "An Overview of Citizen Reactions to the Proposed Superconducting Super Collider in Illinois." We will receive it and include it in the record.

The next commenter is Dan Dees, followed by Sharon Vesely and Betty Zahner. Is Mr. Dees here? Mr. Dan Dees? We will pass him over for the moment and call his name later. Sharon Vesely.

1121 STATEMENT BY SHARON VESELY

MS. VESELY: Good afternoon. My name is Sherry Vesely from St. Charles.

Table 4-4 of the EIS is in error when it indicates that groundwater usage by municipalities is projected to decrease due to future planned replaced by Lake Michigan surface water. DuPage County does have plans to eventually shift over to Lake Michigan water because of their well-publicized groundwater problem. However, only a very small portion of western DuPage County is the Region of Influence of the SSC. In fact, only a small portion of only one municipality, West Chicago, lies in both DuPage County and on the ring.

1 What is a more important question is what are the plans of Kane County cities? The manager of the northern regional office of the Illinois State Water Survey, Mr. William Baker, has indicated that absolutely none of the cities in Kane County have any plans to switch over to Lake Michigan water. The cities of St. Charles, Geneva, Batavia, North Aurora and Aurora all plan to continue to use groundwater wells for their complete source of water supplies.

The fact that Table 4-4 assumes that Lake Michigan water will eventually be in use is a misrepresentation of the truth. In fact, it is in direct conflict with statements made on page 5.1.2-29 of the
2 EIS. This portion of the EIS specifically indicates that since plans and schedules for cities switching wholly or partially to surface water sources are not definitive. It is assumed that a worsening of groundwater overdraft problem cannot be mitigated.

This is the number one problem with the SSC in Illinois. Our overdrafted groundwater supplies can be expected to dwindle if the SSC is sited in Illinois. This is but one example of how the EIS is often self-contradictory. The Illinois State Water Survey has also indicated that there are very specific local groundwater problems within the region of the SSC tunnel, especially in Campton Township in the entire northern arch of the ring. That area alone, contains over 20,000 residents all of whom depend
3 upon private groundwater wells.

William Baker has indicated that Kane County officials are very concerned with this existing local problem and that they are examining plans to limit further development of private wells in that region. Any new developments may be required to provide their own local municipal water supply such as the one now existing at the Winding subdivision. Would Kane County officials be thinking along these lines if there weren't already a problem? Why make matters worse with the SSC?

Campton Township and all of Kane County will not have Lake Michigan during the life of the SSC. The
4 error that exists in Table 4-4 clearly indicates that the DOE has been presented with facts that simply are not true. The regional overdraft cannot be expected to be relieved. It can only be expected to worsen. Continued rapid development in the Fox Valley virtually guarantees it.

Current statistics indicate that Kane County's population growth rate is the highest in northeastern Illinois, even greater than that of DuPage County. The EIS clearly shows that the proposed Illinois SSC site is the only site where this continued change in land use from rural to urban industrial is
5 expected to occur. This fact alone should preclude you gentlemen from selecting Illinois as the home of the SSC.

The sheer numbers of human receptors who may be adversely affected by the SSC in Illinois makes our state the most illogical choice of all. Don't listen to Governor Thompson, Leon Lederman of SSC for
6 Fermilab, when they say that Illinois is the logical choice. Their mouths talk about pride and

progress while their hearts are full of greed and and jealousy. Illinois is not the logical choice for one basic reason -- people. If you scientists can't comprehend this fact, then your hearts must also be full of greed and jealousy. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Dr. Mayes has a clarifying question.

DR. MAYES: Does your testimony have a reference to the Illinois State Water Survey report?

MS. VESELY: I am sorry, I can't hear.

DR. MAYES: Does your testimony have a reference to the State Water Survey report?

MS. VESELY: No.

DR. MAYES: Do you have one?

MS. VESELY: Yes. Mr. William Baker.

MR. EIGUREN: Mr. William Baker.

DR. MAYES: Okay. It was a personal communication, not a reference report.

MS. VESELY: Yes.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. We will receive for the record for inclusion the written comments of Sherry Vesely.

Our next scheduled commentator is Betty Zahner followed by Edward Kist and Carol Hadamik. Give your name and address for the record, please.

1122 STATEMENT BY BETTY ZAHNER

MS. ZAHNER: My name is Betty Zahner. I live in Campton Township.

This brief presentation is intended to address specific negative aspects of the SSC being placed in Kane County with regard to the SSC DEIS comments regarding sedge meadows, radiation in our groundwater and radon.

First, page 4-67 of the EIS indicates that sedge meadows are very rare in the area proposed for the SSC. This being true their presence is of even greater significance to the local community and every attempt should be made to preserve any existing rare sedge meadows. The EIS mentions two that do exist near the SSC site.

One is immediately south southwest of Lily Lake and the another is southwest of Kress Creek north of the collider ring. The EIS fails to mention how they are to be protected. The EIS also fails to mention the sedge meadow that exists west of Denker Road and south of the E8 access shaft area. This sedge meadow and adjacent wetland area will be adversely affected by the SSC project because of encroachment
1 that will occur with the widening of Denker Road as a haul road leading to and from area E8. This area will also face degradation due to the enormous amount of truck traffic that will pass by it. Due to the fine texture of much of the hauled material, windblown and rainwashed silt can be expected to originate from the traffic and adversely affect both plant and animal life living in that area.

The EIS is incomplete for failing to acknowledge the existence of the sedge meadow and wetland area, especially since this type of habitat is termed by the EIS to be rare. You can be assured that the Army Corps of Engineers will hear and be interested in this one.

Second, chart 4-13 clearly shows that Illinois has the greatest exposure to the presence of radionuclides in its groundwater because of elevated levels of radium. Citizens of the Fox Valley are already exposed to better than seven times as much radiation through our drinking water as any other site under consideration. With our site also containing the greatest number of people, any further exposure from SSC-related
2 radiation can, therefore, be expected to produce greater numbers of cancer-related ailments.

Why do Governor Thompson and our other elected officials feel so obligated to expose such large numbers of people to this risk? This is sheer madness.

Last, Table 4-8 and Table 4-9 give statistics pertaining to radon levels present in living spaces and basements at each site. The figures that appear for Illinois are in error. Both charts show that Illinois State levels and the SSC Region of Influence levels of radon are below Environmental Protec-
3 tion Agency standards. However, as recently as September 21st of this year, John Cooper, Manager of Environmental Safety for the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety, has been quoted in the St. Charles Chronicle as saying, "the average level of radon in Kane County homes was a little over the State average of nearly five picocuries."

4 If this is true, then both the State and Kane County radon levels are actually above the EPA standards. Has the Illinois ENR again provided the DOE with inaccurate or outdated information? How many times does this have to happen before the DOE tells Illinois to get its act together.

In closing, how long will the rape of the environment continue leaving a mess not only ourselves, but for posterity. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commenter is Edward Kist.

1123 STATEMENT OF EDWARD KIST

1 MR. KIST: Yes. I am Edward Kist. I live in Campton Township. I live on Denker Road. My home is directly on top of the ring and it appears that service area E8 is sited directly across Denker Road from my front door. Yet, we have not received any notification whatsoever from the Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources.

I repeatedly called the Department in early February and asked them to notify us. But, to this day, they still have not. I said it appears that E8 is directly across the street because the EIS has E8 sited at several points on Denker Road in various sections of the report.

2 In Appendix 10, Section 5b of 16, page 120, the E8 site is described as being crossed by Denker Road with approximately 25 percent of the site lying west of the road. If that is true, then this site is directly in my front yard. This tells me you will be taking my home. Is that true, gentleman? Do you think perhaps I have the right to know that?

3 Elsewhere in the EIS, specifically Volume IV, Appendix 1-3 of 16, page 29 of the chapter called Site Specific Adaptations-Illinois, E8 is described as adjacent to the east side of Denker Road with no mention of any intrusion upon the western boundary. Well guys, which description is correct? Are you taking my front yard and home or aren't you? The fact that I don't know, that I have received no notification whatsoever, supports our argument that the number of affected parcels is significantly understated in the EIS.

4 It is exactly this kind of arrogance and incompetence on the part of the State of Illinois and the DOE that has made these past nine months a kind of living hell for people like my wife and me.

5 You have changed the description of the E8 site in yet another volume of the EIS. Specifically, Volume I, Chapter 5, page 5.1.10-3, in the chapter titled Environmental Consequences and Mitigative Measures, there you describe the site as "abutting the entrance to the subdivision" with those exiting the subdivision aimed directly at the facility. That is simply impossible. Directly across from the Denker Road exit is a private lake and directly across from the only other exit is a large corn field on Silver Glen Road. In fact, the site lies between the Denker Road exit and the intersection of Denker and Silver Glen on ground higher than the majority of the subdivision. It is fully in view of the majority of the subdivision.

6 The only thing you have got right in your description is that this site will be highly sensitive to us human receptors in the area. I can also tell you, as a matter of fact, that at least ten of my neighbors directly on the ring have received no notification from the State. Yet, the former director of ENR, Don Achison, has repeatedly said in public that all affected landowners have been notified. Well, that is a bold-faced lie. No wonder Mr. Achison is the former director of ENR.

The sad fact of the matter is that the way the State and the DOE have handled the Illinois Site Proposal is an absolute disgrace. Our elected officials have publicly tried to discredit us and repeatedly refused to meet with us. They have called us misguided, uninformed and irresponsible. Governor Thompson, Congressman Hastard, Don Achison, wherever you are -- you have blown it. You have blown it because you have placed more importance on the pork barrel than the concern of your constituents.

7 Virtually every concern we have raised has been verified in the EIS. I will leave it to my colleagues to attack the issues of aquifer overdraft, closing of wells, loss of wetlands, loss of tax base, etc., etc., etc.

I have focused my few minutes on one intermediate service area E8. You can't get your story on this one single aspect of the site proposal. Your incompetence of this single aspect of the Illinois Site Proposal has disrupted the lives of many families in my community. Frankly, gentlemen, we don't trust you. You are not welcome here. We look forward to bidding you good riddance from our community. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Ladies and gentlemen, we are about 10 minutes ahead of schedule. We need to take a recess at this point for five minutes. When we return, we will go back to the top of the list and call that speaker whose name I called earlier, Mr. Dan Dees, who has now arrived. We will be in recess for five minutes.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

MR. EIGUREN: Ladies and gentlemen, if I could have your attention, we are ready to resume. If I could ask you, please, to take your seats. Ladies and gentlemen, just a couple brief announcements that are fairly important. Could we have it quiet, please? Please take your seats.

I apologize for the problems we have been having with the microphones here. I think we have resolved that. The microphone in the immediate front of the podium that's on the stand is the live mike that goes into the PA system. So, when you come forward to speak, we ask that you point toward that.

I have also been asked to announce that we have apparently a fairly significant number of people who were pre-registered to speak in the auditorium for the other panel who have not appeared and there was concern that perhaps some of those people were in here. So, once again, I want to remind you we are running simultaneous panel hearings and if you are pre-registered to speak, you may be either here or in the auditorium. You need to make sure that you check in with the registration table to determine where you are to speak.

It is now 3:38 p.m. by my watch. We will go ahead and formally recommence our public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC project being held here on the sixth of October in Aurora, Illinois.

I have been going down a master list of pre-registered commenters provided to me by the Department. We had called all the names up through the hour of 3:35. There was one individual who had not yet arrived, Mr. Dan Dees. Mr. Dees is now here. I call him and ask him to first give his name and address and any affiliation for the record and, sir, you have five minutes within which to comment. Thank you.

1124 STATEMENT OF DAN DEES

MR. DEES: Thank you, Mr. Moderator and members of the panel. I am Dan Dees. My address if 14 North Cottonhill Road, Springfield, Illinois 62707. I am the Deputy Director of the Office of Planning and Programming for the Illinois Department of Transportation.

My comments today will focus on the abundant transportation services available in this region. The specific on-site highway improvements planned for the SSC and the State's commitment to the northeastern region to film [sic] projects that will improve travel conditions and reduce congestion.

1 In terms of transportation services, the Illinois site benefits from one of the most active transportation hubs in the world. The Fermilab campus is minutes away from a large network of major expressways, truck terminals, rail yards, airports and deep draft and inland docks that connect northeastern Illinois to the nation and the world.

The draft EIS fully describes the region's transportation assets which include a well-developed highway system in the suburban area of DuPage County and the extensive County road network in rural Kane County. Further, the draft EIS recognizes Illinois' contribution of site specific improvements to facilitate the construction and operation of the SSC.

2 This improvement plan includes the strengthening of haul roads, construction of two-lane paved access roads to the 20 ring points as well as to the J and K areas, upgrading of Butterfield Road to four lanes from Illinois 59 to Kirk Road and an intersection improvement at the Fermilab entrance. Reconstruction of [copy missing] Road at the far experimental area to serve as an access road and other highway improvements totally $57 million.

3 The proposed site area is located in and adjacent to a fast growth area and is experiencing some congestion problems associated with rapid development. However, the level of investment in transportation in fast growth areas such as DuPage County is responsive to the rapidly changing needs. The Illinois SSC Proposal identified $57 million of highway improvements for the SSC site.

This investment, while significant, is dwarfed when compared to the annual and multiyear highway program already budgeted for the Chicago area. Between fiscal years 1984 and 1988, the highway investment program for this region exceeded $350 million annually.

4 Over the next five years, the State has identified $1.4 billion for highways in northeastern Illinois. Additionally, State and local agencies, through the long-range planning process, will identify problem areas and develop programs to solve congestion problems.

This is particularly true of U.S. 34 which is located several miles south of Fermilab. Although this route is not a part of the network providing direct service to the main campus, it is experiencing congestion in the area near Illinois 59.

An engineering study of this route will be undertaken and would to making improvements along a 7.5-mile stretch of U.S. 34 from Oswego to Illinois 59. This is a major step and commitment of funds toward responding to congestion issues.

Similarly, other long-term projects are being considered as part of a northeastern Illinois transportation plan update. This periodic update was begun after Illinois' SSC Proposal submittal date and after the development of EIS. As an example, the Fox Valley Freeway, which would serve as a major north-south artery for traffic in the SSC site area, is currently being evaluated for inclusion in the 2010 plan for the Chicago area.

The main message of my comments today is that the proposed site area has an extensive transportation system already in place. The State has proposed a good transportation improvement plan that would construct and upgrade facilities needed specifically for the SSC. And, finally, over a six-year period from fiscal year 1984 through 1989, the State has invested over $2 billion in this region for highways and is targeting its funding toward solving congestion problems in the urban and suburban areas. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: There are no questions. Thank you, Mr. Dees. The full written statement of Dan Dees, on behalf of the Illinois Department of Transportation, has been received and will be included in the record.

At this point, we will return to our list of pre-registered speakers. However, I am going to exercise the discretion of the Chair. There is one walk-in individual who needs to be able to leave here by 4:00 p.m. because of a medical situation, and so we are going to call him at this point. Mr. Irving Hanson. Is Mr. Hansen here? Mr. Hansen, if we could have your name and address for the record and you have five minutes to comment, sir.

858 STATEMENT OF IRVING K. HANSEN

MR. HANSEN. My name is Irving Hansen. I live in Naperville, Illinois. Seventy-eight years old and I am interested in our country.

This letter is addressed to Dr. Wilmot Hess, Chairman of SSC Site Task Force, Office of Energy Research, U.S. Department of Energy.

The United States Department of Energy draft Environmental Impact Statement dated August 1988, Appendix 4, Land Acquisition Plans, page 21, clearly shows that Governor Thompson's Illinois administration has invited the human rights policy of Fermilab to be violated by the United States Department of Energy who own and operate Fermilab.

This policy may have been violated in spirit, if not in fact by some high-level Fermilab personnel. If the human rights policy is violated, hundreds of relocations are proposed for residences and businesses involved. The Department of Energy should enforce compliance with their human rights policy or delete from their published material and not mislead the public any longer.

The policy cited above is as follows: "The policy at the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory is to pursue its scientific goals with an emphasis on equal employment opportunity and a special dedication to human rights and dignity. In any conflict between technical expediency and human rights, we will stand on the side of human rights. This is because of our dedication to science. The support of human rights in our laboratory and its environs is inextricably intertwined with our goal of having the laboratory the center of technical and scientific excellence. The latter is not likely to be achieved with success without the former."

Fermilab public information advised on October 4, 1988, that the above-cited policy is still in effect. The intent of this letter is to help the DOE avoid any embarrassment, legal or otherwise. The writer of this letter is not a member of CATCH but has concluded that the SSC should be located in an area that presents the least amount of problems for all concerned parties now and in future years.

MR. EIGUREN: The written statement of Irving K. Hansen to Dr. Wilmot Hess will be included in the record as we see it.

I will now call Carol Hadamik followed by Steve Thompson, followed by Pam Long.

1126 STATEMENT OF CAROL HADAMIK

MS. HADAMIK: My name is Carol Hadamik and I live in Campton Township. Time restrictions force me to respond to only three items pertaining to the EIS. But, I have included in written form a listing of several more discrepancies and objections that I have found in the EIS. And I would like to present them to you. And there's more coming.

Equally as important as the facts one finds in a report. What a state does not tell you, gentlemen, may prove to be a vital issue in the decision-making process. When the final EIS is published, it is my hope that the following three subjects will be addressed.

The first subject not addressed in the EIS is the number of human receptors. Contrary to what Volume I, Chapter 3, Table 3-6 states, the total number of affected parcels in Illinois will be 3,826 and not 3,305 as the EIS has stated. This corrected number is a greater amount that all the other six remaining states combined. Unfortunately, these statistics only reflect the number of affected parcels and it does not indicate the number of affected people. Once the State does provide this information, it will still be inaccurate data because it will not indicate human receptors such as my husband, my two children and myself who live off the 1,000-foot easement but close enough to be recipients of the adverse effects of the SSC. My family and I would be human receptors yet we are not included in the data. If you do request this information from each state, Illinois will undoubtedly have the greatest amount of human receptors. And then you will know what I have known all along -- the SSC does not belong in Illinois.

The second detail missing in the EIS, pertains to the detailed parcel maps that each state submitted as seen in Volume IV, Appendix 4. Every State, except Illinois, provides a complete map of their individual sites, including the surrounding areas. Illinois' map has the appearance of a 53-mile band of parcels situated in a void. This intentional ploy on our State's part lessens the focus on the density of the Fox Valley area, especially the area adjacent to the ring. If Illinois is requested to submit a map similar to the other six states' maps, you will be better able to see the ever-growing development in the Fox Valley and then you will know what I have known all along -- the SSC does not belong in Illinois.

The third and most important element that was overlooked in the draft EIS was the measurement of the intensity and magnitude of the opposition in each state. You cannot ignore this most critical fact. We have 20,000-plus signatures against the project being sited here, more than the amount New York had when their Governor withdrew their proposal. The presence in Illinois of the largest opposition to this project can be equated with more time and money being spent if Illinois is selected as the site. The selection of another site won't require extensive amounts of mitigation and litigation. After today, when you see our opposition first-hand, you will know what I have known all along --the SSC does not belong in Illinois.

In the planning stages of Illinois' proposal, the designers had the option to situate the ring east of Fermilab instead of to the west. The attempt was never made because of the density of human receptors in DuPage County. One does not have to have a PhD to notice the westward trend of development in the Chicagoland area. Nor does one need to be a prophet to foresee that in the next decade, by the time the SSC is even completed, Kane County will be very similar to DuPage County in the density of human receptors.

I trust that the astute members of the Department of Energy will be able to see what is so obvious. There are simply too many human receptors in Illinois.

MR. EIGUREN: Your time has elapsed. Could you bring it to conclusion? Your time has elapsed.

MS. HADAMIK: Okay. This is my last paragraph. Our government, both State and Federal, acted shamefully in the Weston Fermilab story. The misinformed citizens of Weston welcomed the coming of Fermilab with open arms being under the illusion that this project would benefit their town. I ask you, where is Weston now? The people of Fox Valley are informed and we do not welcome the SSC with open arms -- rather with a closed fist. And, gentlemen, in case our concerns expressed today by all of these people fall on deaf ears, I have a message -- no SSC in Illinois.

MR. EIGUREN: Ms. Hadamik informs the moderator that she will submit her oral comments in writing and it is my assumption that you intend to have your other lengthy written comments also included in the record. Thank you. We will move on to our next commenter, Steve Thompson, followed by Pam Long.

1127 STATEMENT OF STEVE THOMPSON

MR. THOMPSON: My name is Steve Thompson, St. Charles Township, representing CATCH Illinois.

Gentlemen, I would like to address my comments on your EIS guidelines with respect to the socio-economic area and with emphasis on what I call the human factor. The general subject of human values and how they relate to the SSC is an area that many people have a difficult time understanding, particularly our Illinois politicians. However, it is not difficult for those of us living in the Fox Valley who will be so severely impacted by the construction of the SSC. Consider these examples from your own report -- 850 acres of wetlands will be impacted in Illinois, the second largest amount of wetlands among the seven states, Table 3-7. More property owners are involved in Illinois than in all other states combined, Table 4-2. More wells will be closed in Illinois than in all other states combined, Table 3-7. More businesses will be closed or relocated in Illinois than all other states combined, Table 4-2.

Where do these facts come from? From your own EIS report, not from our State government. However, we have become accustomed to this type of arrogance by our State officials. But, it would serve no useful purpose to dwell on that point at this time. It is sufficient to simply say that the Illinois proposal is one of the most horrendous and flagrant intrusions upon people's lives, properties and the general environment that could have been conceived.

It is solely because of the preexistence of the Fermilab that the 53-mile SSC ring has been proposed for the fastest growing populated area in Illinois, Kane County. And the negative ramifications on the people and environment are outrageous. Every significant building code in this area has been relinquished by local government officials for this project. This will allow six-acre helium compressor stations within our neighborhoods and the dynamiting of access shafts in and adjacent to people's yards every two and a half miles throughout the ring.

During the latest DOE visit in May, we were refused a meeting with your representatives and, instead, they flew over us in helicopters and they drove by us in buses at the shaft sites and the helium station sites within our neighborhoods. The problem with that is simply that when you fly over people at 1,000-feet you cannot see into their hearts. And, when you speed by them at 55 miles per hour you cannot touch their souls. Therefore, you will never fully understand the depth of our frustration, the sincerity of our concerns and, most importantly of all, the devastation and construction which the SSC will bring to the environment and quality of life within the Fox Valley that we have all worked so hard to achieve and which we will tenaciously defend and never relinquish.

The situation is even more reprehensible when you consider the following. If the proposed area of the 53-mile ring was a swamp inhabited by snail [copy missing] fish and Indiana bats hanging from trees, then the SSC could never be built in this area. They are considered endangered species living in natural wetlands. Unfortunately, the majority of the ring is comprised of viable communities, beautiful homes and subdivisions and farms which have been in families for generations on top of prime farm land and inhabited by, of all things, human beings. Consequently, no restrictions apply because human beings and their homes and their land or expendable. What a strange reward for human endeavor and work. What a sad perversion of human values.

Everything was fine in the Fox Valley until the State and local politicians, along with Fermilab and now you the Department of Energy, knocked on our door and said, "move over and give us your land, your homes, your peace and tranquility and the beauty of your countryside. For we know how to run it better than you."

Well, you do not know how to run it better than us and the answer is no. We were not asked if we wanted the SSC, we were told. We will never allow this flagrant and disruptive intrusion upon our land, homes and families to occur. Whatever morale, ethical and legal means available to us will be employed in this regard. We respectfully request that the SSC be placed in a state and area not hostile to your interest. For if it is placed in the Fox Valley, the people will never allow it to proceed.

This is merely a statement of fact. If the SSC is needed for America, than it should be placed in an area of our nation where it has the least negative impact on people and environment. Illinois is at the bottom of the list in regard to these critical issues. If you truly want and respect the SSC, gentlemen, give it to a State that will welcome it, a State which can afford it and a State that will not turn neighbor against neighbor and the people against you and the SSC. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commenter is Pam Long followed by Cathie Tardy.

1128 STATEMENT OF PAM LONG

MS. LONG: First, I would like to say that Mr. Thompson has said very well what we all feel. My name is Pam Long and I live in Kaneville. I stood in front of you six months and gave you reasons your SSC should not be placed in Illinois as did many other people. They were valid reasons and you thanked us for informative input.

Over the past six months, so many of us have researched every piece of info on the SSC we could lay our hands on. Now, here again I stand and I could talk for two hours on the reasons the SSC does not belong in Illinois and they are all good, valid reasons.

But, who are we to tell you. You are the supposed experts on the subject and what good would it do anyway. I am sickened by the politics involved in this scientific experiment. The State of Illinois has worked very quietly on this project for the past five years, changing legislation to accommodate the SSC.

There are three levels of government -- local, State and Federal. These levels, when operating correctly, should complement each other and serve as a check and balance to disallow any one level to acquire too much power. Unfortunately, this check and balance system has been effectively eliminated in conjunction with the SSC in Illinois.

First, the SSC Act of 1985 passed by the State of Illinois, strips the local government of all regulatory control concerning the SSC. Second, much of the Federal authority has been delegated to the BQL states, as shown in Chapter 6 of the DEIS. This chapter identifies the Federal permits, licenses and other entitlements that may be necessary in implementing the SSC proposal in each state. Just a few

examples include: one, under the Clean Water Act there may be need for national pollutant discharge elimination system permits. The EPA issues permits to facilities which discharge to surface waters and less authority has been delegated to the States. Illinois has been delegated the authority.

Two, also under the Clean Water Act is found antidegradation which protects the existing quality of water. The provisions vary from State to State leaving judgement to each State.

2

Three, the Safe Drinking Water Act whose purpose is to set primary drinking water standards and prevent underground injection that can contaminate drinking water sources. The EPA has delegated authority for regulating public water supplies to the seven BQL states at the site alternatives. Also, and most dismaying, Illinois and Texas have been delegated authority to issue underground injection control permits.

3 Four, Clean Air Act which sets national primary and secondary ambient air quality standards. These standards are enforced by the States through State implementation plans.

Five, Solid Waste Disposal Act. The statute is intended to place primary responsibility for control of solid waste activities on State and local governments. All seven states have authority to implement
4 the base of RCRA Permit Program. This is too much authority entrusted to a State that has stripped local regulatory and tried to slip one by its affected citizens. There are several DOE orders, but these do not placate me, as the State and the DOE are working towards the same end - building the SSC.

I also feel eminent domain laws are being grossly abused. Kwiktake, which was originally intended only
5 for emergency wartime measures, is now being implemented to acquire land quickly and easily for the DOE. People are being forced from their homes for a scientific project.

We the opposition are being made to feel unAmerican for blocking progress in the name of science, when
6 in reality the techniques being used on us have been anything but American. I stand here and attack this project with much trepidation. Too many friends and neighbors have received harassing and obscene phone calls and, yes, even death threats because of their opposition to the SSC.

This project has already caused us a lot of heartache and tears in Kaneville. I cannot imagine the anguish if Illinois is chosen as the preferred site. But as I warned you in February, we will use every legal recourse open to us and we will hold you morally and financial responsible for the health and safety of our family and friends. And, I will take this warning one step further. If Illinois is chosen as the preferred site, you can expect to fight to the bitter end. We will not be gotten rid of
7 quietly or peacefully and I know that I speak for more than just my husband and I when I tell you, it will take physical force to remove us from our land and our homes.

One last thought to leave you with. Picture this scenario if you will, Kaneville -- the State taking homes for the DOE's SSC; men, women and children crying as they are being physically forced from their beloved homes with every major media in the area to cover the story. I will guarantee you, this will be the image created for the DOE if push comes to shove.

MR. EIGUREN: The next commenter is Cathie Tardy followed by Peter Rosi.

1129 STATEMENT OF CATHIE TARDY

MS. TARDY: Hi. My name is Cathie Tardy. I live in Campton Township here in Illinois. Siting the SSC
1 in Illinois will have grave environmental safety implications for the people of the Fox Valley who will be forced to live next to the SSC project facilities or over the collider tunnel.

The EIS is at fault for trying to minimize the seriousness of the radiation problem associated with the operation of the SSC. The EIS also makes it clear that you scientists are fully aware that your number one problem is to try and alleviate the public's concern over radiation. Otherwise, the EIS wouldn't *attempt to spend so much time discussing this subject.*

The radiation section in Appendix 12 on health impacts bombards the reader with chart after chart and table after table of facts and figures on expected radiation doses. Do you really think that all these figures are really telling us something? Do you really think that all these charts remove any of our concerns about radiation? Why does Table 12.3.1 go on and on for over 33 pages. Why haven't we seen charts like this pertaining to other SSC-related problems? Do you feel guilty about the radiation
2 issue or is this wealth of information simply a ploy to defuse what you scientists know full well is the major objection to the SSC project.

If that was your intent, you failed. Chart after chart and page after page of information will never, I repeat never, remove people's concern about radiation exposure. The simple truth is that you scientists in the Department of Energy have lost your credibility with the public. You have been proven wrong by Three Mile Island, by Sharon Noble. You have been proven wrong by the Love Canal and perhaps, more importantly, you have been proven wrong when the Department of Energy officials themselves recently estimated that it would cost $100 billion to clean up the contamination which has piled up over the past five decades at your own DOE facilities.

The truth is that your record stinks and your credibility is at an all time low, especially here in the Fox Valley where Fermilab officials have berated and misled the public for the past nine months. Why should we the public, trust you when we are told that the low-level radiation doses inherent with the SSC project are harmless. The truth is that any dose of ionizing radiation, no matter how minute, can produce mutations.

It was Dr. H. J. Mueller who won the Nobel Prize for discovery that ionizing radiation induces cancer and genetic defects in living organisms and for his conclusion that there is absolutely no safe dosage of ionizing radiation.

This scientific truth means that, no matter what you say or how many statistics you provide, your supposedly minute SSC produced radiation doses are in fact unsafe. There is no safe level of ionizing radiation. Why does the EIS mention Dr. Mueller's discoveries? The lack of emphasis of the truth is a gross error in the EIS especially when the health and safety of the surrounding community is at stake. You obviously are going to take steps to reduce any possible exposure to radiation. But, Murphy's Law indicates that at some time, something will go wrong.

3 With such an occurrence possible, it is unthinkable that the DOE would even consider placing the SSC in a heavily populated region such as the Fox Valley when the proposed tunnel is so close to the wells of thousands of individuals. This is not true at the other six SSC sites. Logic and moral decency dictate the Illinois SSC Site should be withdrawn from the competition.

4 My brother fought in Viet Nam. The United States sprayed the brush with Agent Orange to kill the vegetation to better see the enemy. Three years ago, he was operated on and lost his kidney to cancer. He is 36 years old. Agent Orange is a mistake we are paying for now. The SSC is a mistake in a populated area because you cannot guarantee its safety. It has not been tested. Look amongst us. Which life here are you willing to jeopardize?

5 Put it where it affects the least amount of people. You cannot take the chance when there are so many people concerned. If it comes here, I will fight you. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: We will next call Peter Rosi followed by Wayne Larson.

1061 STATEMENT OF PETER ROSI

MR. ROSI: Good afternoon, gentlemen. My name is Pete Rosi. I live in Campton Township.

My subject this afternoon is parcel count. If you would look at Appendix 4, Table 3-5 on page 3-30 and look at footnote G, you will see that it states, "the number of affected parcels and ownerships in Illinois may vary as much as 20 percent and the numbers of relocation by as much as 50 percent." It is interesting that the Department of Energy is willing to admit this. Whereas our own State officials have continually denied it.

One of the major points that CATCH has tried to make the public aware of is that the Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources has misled the Department of Energy concerning the numbers of people who will be directly affected by siting the SSC in Illinois. At the beginning, the ENR used 1986 tax maps to prepare their list of affected parcel owners, wells, etc., obtaining a count which was accurate as of January 1, 1986.

Due to the extensive rezoning that has taken place since then and the rapid development throughout the entire Fox Valley area, we -- members of CATCH -- knew that Illinois understated the true facts.

Not only were the numbers kept small because of this, but hundreds of affected parcel owners were not duly notified that they would be potentially affected by this project.

Those who appeared in the tax roles as of January 1, 1986, were notified by the ENR when verification first became necessary in late January of this year. However, hundreds were not notified until much later and large numbers still have not received notification. This situation has been mishandled by the State and is a major blemish of the Illinois Site Proposal.

If you look at the Illinois land acquisition maps, beginning on page A-3A of Appendix 4 of the DEIS, you will discover that the 1987 tax maps are used for the first time. You will also notice that each parcel has a number on it. A simple tabulation of the numbers in each section gives you a total of 3,826 parcels. This new count is larger than the parcel count of the other six states combined totalling 3,330. This is an increase of 521 affected parcels during just one year yet this higher parcel count still only reflects conditions as of January 1, 1987.

What about all of the development that occurred during 1987 and in the nine months of this current year. None of that increase is reflected and we all know that rapid growth has occurred during that time span. It is very possible that considering the trend, the real number of affected parcels involved at the proposed SSC site is in excess of 4,500 parcels.

It is apparent that Illinois has by far the largest parcel count, the largest well count and the largest population living in the region of influence of the proposed SSC. This statistic is a measure of the insensitivity of the state of Illinois to try to impose this project on such a large number of its people. Because of this large parcel count in Illinois, the ENR and the Department of Energy are confronted with the most difficult land acquisition process that will be involved in any state which could delay your important 1996 target date.

If you gentlemen are sensitive at all to the protests of over 20,000 individuals, you will place the SSC in a state where the local citizens welcome you with open arms. And, believe me, that is not the case in Illinois. The only way the SSC will come to Illinois is through our courts. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Wayne Larson followed by Larry Wright.

856 STATEMENT OF DR. WAYNE LARSON

DR. LARSON: My name is Wayne Larson. I am a doctor of veterinary medicine and I am a resident of Kaneville, Illinois.

As a resident of Kaneville, Illinois and a State taxpayer, I can only oppose the siting of the SSC in this state. A few of the reasons are as follows. One, of the 26 E, F and J sites, 13 of them or 50 percent are to be moved or relocated due to subdivisions, individual homes, industrial parks, roads and creeks. Many sites have duel impacts also. Nineteen of these will remove cultivated land from production.

Two, Appendix 16, Mitigating Impacts on Scenic and Visual Assessments, goes on for seven pages describing ways to reduce the unsitely nature of E, F and J sites. Yet the last statement, 16.3.3.4 reads and I quote, "for the proposed site, no laws, plans, policies or regulations apply to scenic and visual resource protection." In other words, seven pages of lip service that do not have to be applied. Only Arizona applies because it is mostly government land.

Three, I take exception to a study that gives more paperwork to an Indiana bat and a clover bush, neither of which they know for sure will be affected, than it does children. I have found three sentences in the EIS that pertain to children in the proposed area. What the EIS leaves out is the fact that all of the children from Kaneville and Sugar Grove use Dobberman Road as the main travel route to and from school -- kindergarten through high school. The most direct route for spoils from F5 and 6, E6, K3, 4, 5 and 6, would be from Dobberman Road into Kaneville, on Harder Road and out of Kaneville on Main Street to Quarry Number 4. Located at the intersection of Harder and Main Streets are the following: grocery and ice cream store; child care center; public library; community gymnasium; post office and baseball field used by all ages of organized ball for the Kaneville children. The endangered species are not the Indiana bat and the clover bush, they are the children of Kaneville. This has not been addressed at in this EIS report.

Four, as stated, this is the heart of the black soils country in northern Illinois. And as stated, two-thirds of our precipitation falls during the growing season. Even though this country has suffered through a severe drought, crops are being harvested at near normal levels and without the need of irrigation. Not only will the SSC take this excellent soil with its adequate rainfall, but future secondary growth as constantly proposed by bringing the SSC here, will invade more farmland more rapidly.

Five, by conveniently being able to leave out the major cost to Illinois taxpayers for land tunneling, etc., the EIS completely discredits the validity of any economic gains that could be incurred by siting the SSC in Illinois. The total increased State government revenue from 1989 to 2000 is estimated at $83.2 million. How is $83.2 million supposed to pay off $570 million in State bonds and interest? The bonds and interest by the year 2000 will be nearing $1 billion.

Added to this, a sealed incentive that we are told we cannot know the value of. That's taxation without representation on the part of both the State government and the Federal government. All this State-incurred cost for a project that increases the projected baseline four million jobs for the region of influence by only .3 percent. All of this cost for misleading job opportunities that try to indicate a maximum of 10,500 jobs? Only 2,600 of which are construction jobs based on peak-year construction projections and some of these short-term. The majority are 7,000 secondary jobs that are arrived at only by multiplier effects.

Accelerated in-migration will burden school systems that are already in financial difficulties. Local tax payers will have to deal with this immediately through increased real estate taxes. Let Fermilab run out its life expectancy and return the 6,800 acres back to the private sector. The private sector will produce jobs, goods and be of a benefit financially to the State of Illinois and the Tri-County region, not a financial drain of Federal, State and local taxes as the SSC will be.

The draft EIS contains assumptions and mitigations from start to finish. It leaves the back door open innumerable times for the possible need of more land acquisition as development on the project continues. The final design has not even been agreed upon. We cannot afford this SSC project on the terms presented in this draft. The best position for the Department of Energy to take is to mitigate this entire project out of Illinois. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: We will include in the written record, the comments of Dr. Wayne O. Larson, along with an additional addendum to his comments as well as the comments of his son Derek Larson.

At this point, ladies and gentlemen, we have 12 commenters left in this afternoon's session. By my quick mathematics here, that gives about an additional hour of comment yet to be received. We are at a point now when we need to take a brief recess to change the tapes in the recording system. So, we will be in recess until the hour of 4:30 p.m.

(Recess.)

MR. EIGUREN: We will pass Larry over for a minute and I would ask Nancy Brackman to step forward.

1130 STATEMENT OF NANCY BRACKMANN

MS. BRACKMANN. My name is Nancy Brackmann. I reside in St. Charles Township.

Last January 21st, I attended the public hearing in St. Charles to learn about the SSC looking for the truth just as a I hope all of you are present to not only hear but really listen to what I am going to say as well as the other speakers.

1 According to the State's promotional video, Kane County is sparsely populated and while suited for the project in part because of that reason. My reaction as well as many of the people attending was one of disbelief. Governor Thompson comes to this antiquing [sic] and has to have blinders on if he can't see how the streets are already jammed and that subdivisions are going up everywhere. Kane County is the fastest growing county in the state and the draft Environmental Impact Statement backs that.

2 Illinois has the highest number of parcels involved, 3,305. And that number will rise even higher once the new subdivisions are finally accounted for. The same goes for the number of owners, 2,750. Tennessee is the next highest with 898 parcels and 807 owners. Illinois brags of only 160 homes having to be relocated neglecting to mention the 59 businesses and hundreds of jobs that go with them. Those numbers are the second highest affected of the seven proposed sites.

3 In the five public meetings I have attended, the State's representatives haven't been forthright about any of the negative impacts of the SSC starting with the cost. Mr. Achison said it would cost $570 million, when in reality the project will cost Illinois taxpayers at least $1.5 billion.

4 Then there is the number of wells affected in the regional overdraft issue. Illinois says your DEIS figures aren't correct on this, but are for the air pollution counts. Admitting to any drawbacks to Illinois' proposed sight is impossible for our state or, other words, being honest.

5 And my favorite, that the service areas, F sites, won't look like the generic style diagram, but could be styled after a victorian farm house or a ranch. I understood that the DOE wants to go to the site that's the least expensive. Spending extra funds for style and noise proofing can't be at the top of the list if producing the accelerator comes first. Noise proofing would definitely be impossible during construction which would take 10 months, 24 hours a day at each F site, correct?

6 Noise levels at these sites would be expected to reach a day/night average sound level of 70 dBA at 630 feet from the center compared to a vacuum running and 60 dBA within 2,000 feet compared to a dishwasher on rinse at 10 feet. According to Table 5.1.4-3, Illinois has 14 areas at which construction noise would result in highly annoyed human receptors and six areas during 25 years of operation. More than Tennessee. Double the amount of affected areas in Texas. And more than double of Colorado and Arizona.

7 Although DEIS figures "indicates the presence of human receptors, the number of human receptors at each point was not determined. As a result, the assessments expressed in terms of percentage of people highly annoyed cannot be reduced to actual numbers of people." I will tell you right now, there are tens of thousands of human receptors that would definitely be highly annoyed and be caused physical and mental stress.

8 Illinois hasn't been truthful to you about the number of people affected because they don't know. In Section 8, Spoils Hauling, the DEIS states, "In comparing spoils haul truck noise to a passenger vehicle noise, a spoils haul truck produces noise which would measure approximately 82 dBA at 100 feet, equal to freeway traffic at 50 feet." I live on the closest east/west road on which F7 and F8 and E7 to E9 spoils will travel to get to Quarry Number 1. A maximum of 290 trucks a day for two years isn't

9 safe or physically possible when including the traffic from the three subdivisions totally 218 homes being built, say 440 cars along with the traffic we already experience. Our roads weren't designed or constructed for that type of use.

10 There is much for you to listen to. I have always believe that it's important to tell the truth and keep your word. Governor Thompson gave me his word last March and again in August. Looking me in the eye, shaking hands, that yes he would meet and hear our concerns before today's hearings. Governor Thompson didn't even, though I wrote and spoke several times asking if anything had been set up. Almost eight months later, nothing.

If the Governor won't keep before a site decision, what are the chances for mitigating afterwards? How can I or you, for that matter, trust him to keep his word about other things? If Illinois was the best site, why didn't you just put it here? I was told by a representative of the State, you need a broad base support from Congress for funding. So, by singling out a site, the project wouldn't have received support period.

I believe you are trying to find the site that's not only the best suited, but where the least people and obstructions will block the way. Consider this, we will continue to oppose the SSC because we have the truth on our side -- that Illinois is not the best site. And you have the same in your hands in the form of the DEIS. If you want to see the SSC built, take it to a site where the people that are to be affected want it and while you still have Congressional support to see the accelerator built. Thank you for listening.

1131 MR. EIGUREN: Our next commenter is Linda Jones followed by Chris Petschke.

STATEMENT OF LINDA JONES

1 MS. JONES: I am Linda Jones from Campton Township. One of the criteria the DOE has repeatedly stressed for consideration in the site selection for the SSC is that it should be located near a city that would offer the scientists cultural activities and other entertainment. Isn't that wonderful?

Why should these people be pampered like this? Why shouldn't they go where the work is, like the rest of us who's tax dollars pay their salary? How could a site like Illinois possibly be considered when at least 160 homes will be seized if the SSC is be sited here?

2 The Denver Post reports that at the Colorado site, only four families and one business will be taken. The Arizona site proposal also proposes very little relocation. Well, I certainly sympathize with the people in these states, if the SSC is located there. That would certainly be preferable to the situation in Illinois where the citizens' own State government has arrogantly ignored the concerns of a large number of affected landowners.

Illinois has more affected landowners than any other state. The consideration of the Illinois site indicates the DOE's contempt for the rights of the many people who will be affected, their lack of concern for these people's health, safety and financial security. It is an unbelievable outrage that these people's futures can be jeopardized by bureaucrats whose salaries they pay. And now it appears that our tax dollars are not sufficient to placate them.

Now, they want our tranquility, our homes, our privacy, our property values, our environment in order that they can live in an area where they can be properly entertained. The scientist can go to hell.
3 Let them go where the work is offered like the rest of us.

If anyone should receive special consideration, it is not those who grow fat on public money squandered on dubious projects such as this -- projects that Nobel Prize winning physicists oppose. Special consideration should be given to those who produce useful goods and service for society. Those who pay taxes and those who have chosen their home sites and life styles to avoid precisely the sort of menace the SSC represents.

We, the affected homeowners, farmers and businessmen, are those people. If the scientists envy our lifestyle, let them achieve it fairly in the competitive marketplace. Not with a coercive and grossly unjust of eminent domain. You may foolishly site this project in Illinois, but it will never be built here.

MR. EIGUREN: Our next scheduled commenter is Chris Petschke.

859 STATEMENT OF CHRIS PETSCHKE

MR. PETSCHKE. Christopher Petschke, Big Rock Township.

Illinois should not be named as the preferred site for the SSC because of the serious and severe effects it will have on the people of Fox Valley. We do not want increased levels of radiation that you would subject us to. We do not a legacy of buried radioactive accelerator parts after you leave.

If you get this project funded, put it where it belongs -- away from people. For some strange reason, this project was originally called a Desertron by Leon Lederman. Does he know something he is not telling the people of Illinois?

This leads to some larger questions concerning trust. The affected people have lost their trust in you, the State and the paid proponents from Fermilab. We had been told in the draft EIS that every problem, no matter how large or complex, can be mitigated. This is false. How can we trust you when you make such ludicrous statements? How can we trust a Governor who doesn't have the guts to come here and listen to how the people really feel about the SSC? How can we trust the State when they don't disclose the facts that you forced them to do last January?

Specifically, your poorly written DEIS in Volume IV, Appendix 9, page 48, Noise Assessment's Map, doesn't show an 87-home subdivision on the ring approximately 1,000 feet southeast of F4. People living on the ring where it crosses Ash Road in Sugar Grove Township and 10 homes along Galena Road in Bristol Township east of F3. The base line noise level is only an estimate of 50 decibels. Actual noise levels, if they have been taken, would average much lower. The majority of the land around the F and E sites is residential or agricultural. Levels in these areas would 30 to 40 decibels. The 50 decibel base line is too high. Construction and operational noise impacts would be more severe because of this greater deviation from the true base line.

Visual impact assessments are also lacking in Volume IV, Appendix 16, pages 24 through 29. No assessments were made at the proposed sites' E5, E6, E10, F1, F3, F5, F6 and F8. Do you care if these sites were assessed? Specifically, the visual assessment at E4 is wrong. It should be VM class four, visually dominant. The industrial conflicts at this vent site will be viewable from a cemetery located on top of a hill.

It is contended that fencerow plantings and an east-west road for access makes this site "probably not viewable." Access can also be gained of the cemetery from a north-south road and the plantings loose their leaves in the fall, negating the minimum screening it affords in the summer. The electric transmission lines, as stated in the draft EIS, are viewable from the cemetery and the roads by E4. But, due to their distance from the south, it will not dwarf E4 as contended.

The air quality assessments, Volume IV, Appendix 8, Fugitive Dust Emissions Factors' parameters table 8-22, uses the wrong factor. Specifically, vehicle speed for spoils hauling. The factor used is 35 miles an hour. Realistically, the speed should be 55 miles an hour. Only a tiny fraction of hauling will be in a city speed limit zone. Since used the low factor for vehicle speed, the dust emissions are wrong. These figures need to be recalculated to a higher level.

Throughout this travesty you have subjected us to, we have been lied to, threatened and treated us like second-class citizens. We know and we are not going away. If you are foolish or stupid enough to name Illinois the preferred site, then you should be aware that we will never let this boondoggle be built.

MR. EIGUREN: Mr. Petschke, would we ask you to come back? We have a question for you.

MR. PETSCHKE: Sure.

MR. EIGUREN: I will note, for the record, that Mr. Petschke has submitted his written comments and we will include those in the transcript.

DR. NELSEN: Chris, I am sorry I didn't catch your last name.

MR. PETSCHKE: Petschke.

DR. NELSEN: Petschke. I wanted to ask you a question about this cemetery on E4. Has that been identified in your submission? Or is that identified in the draft?

MR. PETSCHKE: In the draft EIS?

DR. NELSEN: Yes.

MR. PETSCHKE: Yeah. It's been identified.

DR. NELSEN: Okay. So you are just pointing out to us that even though it's identified we didn't recognize it as a viewshed point.

MR. PETSCHKE: I can't hear all that.

DR. NELSEN: You are just pointing out, even though it's there, we did not call it out as a spot --

MR. PETSCHKE: Well, you didn't properly class it.

DR. NELSEN: Okay.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. The next commenter is Dixie Thompson followed by Nancy Mills.

1132 STATEMENT OF DIXIE THOMPSON

MS. THOMPSON. I am Dixie Thompson. I live in St. Charles Township.

1 Gentlemen, the EIS can be faulted for its failure to provide the DOE and the public with accurate information about the proposed Illinois SSC site. All data pertaining to the number of parcels, property

owners, wells, businesses and people affected by the siting of the SSC in Illinois is grossly understated. This is due to the fact that the Illinois ENR has provided the DOE with out-of-date information.

All of the Illinois statistics pertain to conditions as they existed on January 1, 1986. This is due to one totally illogical assumption made by the Illinois ENR. They assumed that by using 1986 tax maps, they could accurately reflect existing conditions at the proposed Fox Valley site. However, in their haste to prepare an SSC bid, the ENR was either unaware of the rapid development taking place at the proposed site or they simply didn't care.

The truth is, they really didn't care. For during March of 1988, Illinois provided the DOE with the State's own environmental assessment of the Fox Valley site. Specific changes in the Illinois proposal were discussed in order to limit or mitigate growing concerns of local citizens. The ENR could have used that new document to update their affected parcel list. However, they chose not to do so. The 1987 tax maps were available, but the ENR never even attempted to indicate any parcel count changes to the DOE. Why did the ENR choose to keep the DOE and the public in the dark about the growing parcel, the growing well count, and the growing population count at the Fox Valley site? Why has it been so necessary for Illinois to try and deliberately conceal the facts?

The answer to that question can be found in the book Policide by L. Ginsberg. This book describes in detail, the creation of Fermilab and the land acquisition process that was involved which literally wiped the town of Weston off the map. From reading this book, it becomes obvious that the demise of Weston and the birth of Fermilab took place because of the devious and sneaky political moves which occurred behind the scenes. The people of Weston were purposely fed misinformation and led down a primrose path to oblivion. Many of the political players involved in the Weston scenario remain politically active today. And, there it is no coincidence that Governor Thompson and the State ENR have basically operated under the same guidelines that were followed over 20 years ago.

In any case, there has been a deliberate attempt by the State of Illinois to withhold the true facts from the DOE and the public general. Our state is the only SSC finalist that has failed to make the list of affected property owners public. Ours is the only state that has failed to supply accurate detailed maps to the public so that anyone could determine whether or not their property was located within the ring alignment. And, even more importantly, it is only Illinois that has not properly notified all of the directly affected property owners to let them know that their house, or farm, or business, or well, or underground easement may be taken for the sake of the SSC. And, if Jeff Miller stuck around, I would like to know how much is in that sealed envelope? I don't even know how much this project will cost. Illinois State motto is supposed to be, Illinois puts you in a happy. Well, Illinois, you have put me in a miserable state.

This withholding of information by the State of Illinois reduces the value of these EIS hearings as many of the people who will be directly affected, have never been notified and are, therefore, unable to comment on their own behalf. A question which you gentlemen from the DOE should be asking yourselves is whether or not it is legally prudent to continue to include Illinois among the SSC finalists.

My final comment is from my heart. Our narrow country roads are saturated with school buses morning and evening carrying thousands of students. And yet, you are actually contemplating hundreds of trucks carrying excavated rock down these same roads in the years ahead from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. This is a disaster waiting to happen and we are going to see to it that it will never occur. It is an outrage.

MR. EIGUREN: Nancy Mills followed by Janet Cassell. Nancy Mills? Nancy Mills? Janet Cassell?

1133 STATEMENT OF JANET CASSELL

MS. CASSELL: Hello. My name is Janet Cassell. I live in St. Charles Township on the ring at D, the upper most arch. Thank you for coming today and listening to us. Our politicians are not listening to us.

We do not want the SSC in Illinois. Since we became aware of this project in mid-January 1988, we have gotten quite an education about where we live and politics. Our education has come at a great expense to us in dollars and hundreds of hours taken from our work and family functions. What we had perhaps come to take for granted -- our water supply, the local wetlands, our peace and quiet, just to name a few -- are being threatened without our consent.

1 A project we do not want in Illinois, subsidized with multimillions of Illinois tax payer dollars, is being shoved down our throats. In the last nine months, my state has lied to me. They have sought to keep me from finding out the facts that I needed to assess the condition surrounding the SSC. Do you think the Illinois politicians are being straight with you?

To give you an idea of an adverse effect that isn't covered in the EIS report, a month ago, we lost eight feet of our 100 foot well due to a sand cave-in when our well was subjected to routine pump
2 removal vibration. The sand apparently dislodged from the 25-foot sand level and followed the well casing down to the uncased bottom of the well. Our well is only 12 years old. The condition is

currently stable. But, we are worried. Our well man just looked at the ground and shook his head when I asked him what would be the result to our well when the dynamite blasting starts at access shafts E8 and F8 near our home.

3 Another sand cave-in will close our well, bury our $725 investment in a new pump and pipe and cause us to be without water for who knows how long while the Department of Energy and the State of Illinois decide what to do with us. We will, as owners and taxpayers, pay for all of this.

I suppose we are covered under those euphemistic phrases that inundate the Environmental Impact Statement such as "may be impacted" or "negligible effect." Negligible to who? Or, "with mitigation." Or, "could be affected." That all translates to English as tough luck, taxpayer.

Gentlemen, I am only one of many, many hundreds of people who may be impacted with well problems and dynamiting damage. I am one of many thousands who will be impacted by other problems -- both physically and economically -- totally against our will. We have signed petitions to tell you that. I hope you realize why the State of Illinois was the only one of the final seven states in the land acquisitions attachment DEIS, Volume IV, Appendix 4, to give only the parcels within that 1,000-foot ring.
4 Illinois does not want you to know of the dense development all up and down the Fox Valley. And they have done their best to prevent the CATCH organization from obtaining population figures. But, they cannot erase the population. We exist. We are growing and we do not want the SSC in Illinois. It shouldn't be built in such a highly populated and constantly growing area that depends on an already over-taxed water supply.

If you choose Illinois as the SSC site, we will have no choice but to continue to fight you both locally and vocally support to cut the funding at the SSC at the Federal level. You are dealing with thousands of newly aware, frustrated and angry citizens who will not soon lie down to be walked on again. We will not go away, for we have truly been impacted. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next commenter is William Hannemann. Bill, before you start, I would like to interject, Mr. Pitchford, if we are going to have folks from the TV doing live stuff in here, it's terribly distracting up here. Dr. Temple has asked that that not be done. Sorry.

1134 STATEMENT OF WILLIAM HANNEMANN

MR. HANNEMAN: My name is Bill Hannemann. I am from Big Rock Township in Illinois and my comments before the Department of Energy at the hearings conducted on the Fermilab site and by letter, I asked that the medical data be provided on employees at several particle accelerators. The response that I have found, a section that details potential radiation levels is in Appendix 12.

Because of the ramifications to one's health, the final statement should include the data that I asked for. Specifically, a study of Fermilab employees, both past and present, medical records with particular statistical attention being given to cancer, miscarriages and birth defects. Also, I would like the Department of Energy to review the medical records of the workers who have operated the high energy devices at Fermilab and other sites around the country.

Never have people been asked to live on top so experimental a facility nor has the DOE ever put up houses of its scientists above the Fermi facility. Only buffalo have been living there. A good neighbor would have this information available to the public. I will not be dismissed by with statement that appears in Appendix 12 and that statement is, "The effects of low dosages of radiation, i.e.,
1 background level and below, are masked by many other factors in the human such as inherited genetic defects, other carcinogenic intake, general lifestyles, etc."

Without the information that I requested, as it statistically applies to the health of individuals who operate, maintain and in other ways are engaged in activities near the accelerator, I find it difficult to discern how this may affect the health of those persons living near the site and how it will affect the employees that will be hired to operate this facility. Since our State can say nothing good about the project except jobs to be created, the persons who operate, maintain and in other ways are involved with this machine, are part of the environment and may be financial supporters of others in our state to be prematurely rob them of their health may cause additional burdens on tax payers as well as the happiness of their families.

A good neighbor would go the distance to prove how safe the Fermi facility has been. Or, does our good neighbor have something to hide? Revelations of coverups at other DOE facilities give area residents no reason to trust the DOE or Fermilab.

As for being a good neighbor, why doesn't Fermilab do any off-site monitoring of radiation to its
2 neighbors. Additional shielding was added to the Fermilab storage area for detective radioactive components, called the Bone Yard, near the site boundary. But no attempt was made to monitor dosages to these nearby residents. Some good neighbor you have been.

In reviewing the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory site environmental report for calendar year
3 1986, I find that clearly the radiation doses given are hypothetical. Just as high winds would reduce the time that people are subjected to radiation, a temperature inversion and low wind speed would

contain the radioactive cloud close to the ground and would encompass areas of people living near this site. Such individuals could receive very large doses of ionizing radiation under such conditions. Thus, in real life, one cannot hang one's hat on this air dose EPA study that you people site in your report.

One would expect people living around the accelerator to receive doses ranging from 0 to many times the average dose calculated by Fermilab personnel. Therefore, the only way to decide the actual doses received is to monitor continuously a large number of people that live in the area. There is no indication that Fermilab has actually monitored continuously any off-site individuals or group of individuals at risk to exposure to airborne radionuclides from the Fermilab site. The writers of the report is quick to point out that the radionuclides, once released into the environment, do not exceed standards for air and water. The standards referred to are the maximum permissible doses or maximum permissible releases.

It must be emphasized that the standards are not to be interpreted as safe doses or safe releases. Dr. Mueller, winner of the Nobel Prize for his discovery that ionizing radiation induces mutations in living organisms, was the first to realize that there is no safe dose of ionizing radiation. Even the lowest dose has potential to induce mutation. The truth remains as valid today as when Mueller first identified it. Therefore, I believe the laxities demonstrated at Fermilab, such as dumping radionuclides into air, land and water and the permitting of activated atoms to leak from soil or rock, should not be permitted at the SSC or Fermilab. This is not a good neighbor or one we want in our community.

As a general principal, the responsible behavior would be to avoid the introduction of any excess radioactivity into the environment. That's what a good neighbor would do, gentlemen.

MR. EIGUREN: Sir. Your time has expired, sir. Go ahead and bring it to a conclusion if you would.

MR. HANNEMAN: All right. Since looking into these matters, I feel that our local government should call for a citizens review committee on the effect of radioactive contamination emanating from Fermilab and the lack of regard for those who inhabit its nearest boundary.

4 Certainly as irresponsible a neighbor, the DOE should not be allowed to expand its presence in our state. If the announcement is made to site the SSC in Illinois, I will spend the rest of my life raising money to fund the legal bills to fight this proposal and to make sure that it is never completed, gentlemen. And as far as your report, any report that would be submitted in private industry that would not be in some type of organized form with data compiled in a manner so that each state can be compared fairly and accurately is a very, very sloppy job.

MR. EIGUREN: I am going back to call two speakers who were scheduled to speak earlier and were not in the room at the time I called their names. Larry Wright? Nancy Mills? Okay, going down our list then, Becky Petschke? Following Becky will be Marilyn Hannemann.

861 STATEMENT OF BECKY PETSCHKE

MS. PETSCHKE: I am Becky Petschke from Big Rock. The area of the EIS that I am truly disappointed in and found totally lacking is the impact the SSC would have on the people to make the unfortunate decision to locate it here in Illinois.

I am all for the Indiana bat, but you found more space for them than you did for us. You barely touched upon the amount of protest and the reason for that protest, much less the emotional aspect of the people that would be affected.

One of our State senators told me that the prospect of kicking people out of their homes was the unfortunate part of the SSC. And yet, he is still wholeheartedly endorsing this project. In fact, he is the one that introduced into the State Senate the "good neighbor bill," a bill, in part, meant to protect our financial investment in our home. It is a worthless piece of legislation at best.

What it comes down to is that we would loose more than 20 percent on the sale of our homes. This is assuming we would be able to sell our homes at all. It's ridiculous that our legislators assumed we would be thrilled with taking a huge loss on. For most of us, the major financial investment of our lives. What's more ridiculous is the name of this legislation. My good neighbors do not attempt to confiscate my property, my home, my job, my well, expose me to unwanted legislation, build huge, ugly helium and nitrogen containers in my backyard or lie to me.

We, the opposition, have been treated as if we have been the ones committing the wrongdoing. We have been accused of being rude, short-sighted, against progress, ignorant and obnoxious. I am not sure what everyone expected us to do when we learned that our homes, our wells, our property and our jobs would be taken from us. That we would be exposed to radiation, have easements clouding our deeds, have to put up with minor inconveniences -- such as construction noise and traffic -- loose money on our houses and have huge, ugly storage tanks in our residential neighborhoods.

I guess our Governor assumed we would roll over and play dead. Wrong. We are doing and will continue to do anything and everything we can to stop the SSC from being built here. I think its a bit ironic that Governor Thompson has publicly stated that he would turn down a vice presidential offer because he wouldn't want to move his family thereby disrupting his 10-year old daughter's security and routine. And yet, he is perfectly willing to do just that to the lives of at least 160 families.

The difference is, he had a choice. But he didn't have the decency or consideration to give these families a choice. We have been treated unfairly not only by the State and the press, but also by the DOE. I understand that Governor Thompson and a 21-member delegation are meeting today with Energy Secretary Herrington in the only opportunity to plead their case directly with the person who will select the preferred site for the SSC.

CATCH also asked to meet with Secretary Herrington to plead our case face-to-face with him. He denied this request for equal time. It's not fair. But, we have found that government isn't really interested in what's fair and what isn't when it wants something.

Supposedly our elected officials are to be working for us and with us. But instead, they have only been working against concerning the SSC. Before the decision has even been made about where to locate the SSC, the State has not had the decency to show consideration to people living near the proposed ring.

I am referring to the well drillers hired by the State to conduct SSC-related testing in the St. Charles area. This company was working on a deadline so the State could get the results before your visit and was drilling this well 24 hours. The noise level of this operation was more than double what the Illinois EPA sets for the allowable limits in a residential area. It took some members of CATCH to get the night drilling ended.

What concerns many of us is, should you make the unfortunate decision to site the SCC here, that this incident is just a preview of the inconsiderate treatment we would have to put up with during construction if the tunnel is built.

No one has told us what effect the SSC would have on our water supply and what the run off from it would do to our already flood-prone areas. We have not been told how the people that would be living on or near the proposed ring would be monitored for radiation exposure. The only thing we have been told concerning radiation is that the exposure would be insignificant. That's wrong. No amount of radiation is insignificant. And you have no right to expose us to any unwanted radiation. And because of past experiences with the government's unwillingness to claim responsibility or to even acknowledge wrongdoing when it comes to dangerous chemicals, poisons or radiation, I will continue to work towards stopping the SSC from being located here.

Your EIS lists the environmental problems and the solutions to those problems. We human receptors, as you refer to us in the EIS, are not interested in mitigation as the answer. Our answer is to locate the SSC somewhere besides Illinois. It does not belong in our highly populated area. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Our next scheduled commenter is Marilyn Hannemann.

864 STATEMENT OF MARILYN HANNEMANN

MS. HANNEMANN: Yes. I am Marilyn Hanneman from Big Rock Township and I would like to address the changes in the siting template that Illinois has made. The first thing you will notice on Table 3-3 of the EIS, is that Illinois proposes using Fermilab as the SSC injector. The State ENR and its supporters have indicated that this is the key advantage of the Illinois proposal. However, upon reading the EIS, it becomes very clear just how important Fermilab is for maintaining our leadership role in particle research. In fact, Fermilab and the SLAC at Stanford are going to play major roles while the SSC is being built and on into the 21st century.

You scientists need Fermilab in full operation while the SSC is being constructed. Otherwise, you run the risk of loosing precious time and prestige to your enviable CERN and Russian counterparts. Fermilab, therefore, becomes the Fermilab disadvantage for the Illinois site. Why? Quite simply, you cannot hook the Fermilab Tevetron up as the SSC injector without jeopardizing the loss of Fermilab for one, two or possibly three years. Therefore, this major change in the Invitation for Site Proposals as proposed by Illinois becomes the major disadvantage of the Illinois site.

Regarding the other changes which Illinois has made in their site proposal, chart 3-3 clearly shows that Illinois has made more changes or adjustments to the ring template than any other state. Illinois proposes moving five service access areas, F sites, from original positioning. Only Michigan has made as many as three such changes. Also, Illinois has changed the ISP so that four sites will be moved from their original position. Even more, such changes have been recently proposed by the Illinois ENR. Only one other state changes even one E site location. And, perhaps, more importantly, Illinois proposes moving the buried beam zone access areas J at five locations. Any and all changes as proposed mean altering the original design concept of the SSC and will necessitate changes which equate to increased time and cost for the Illinois site.

As E and F sites are moved further from the ring, additional tunneling and angled shafts become necessary. The Illinois tunnel is already the deepest of the seven proposed sites and actually exceeds the maximum optimum level of 600 feet below the surface at one stretch. By adding additional angled tunnels to accommodate the altered E, F and J sites, there will be far more tunneling required at the Illinois site than at any other alternative location.

All of this adds up to increased tunneling time and costs that the Illinois tax payer must pay for -- not the Federal Government. Without a doubt, the Illinois site provides the most difficult and costly tunneling project of the seven sites. It bears pointing out that these 14 or more changes proposed by Illinois can be compared to absolutely zero changes to the template as originally proposed in Arizona, Colorado, North Carolina and Texas.

The DOE has designed the SSC. But, Illinois apparently knows more than you scientists do because they have chosen to redesign it for you.

MR. EIGUREN: Dr. Temple says that's reasonable. We were actually discussing a matter brought up by the CATCH group. Mr. Tardy, if you would like to step forward. I understand that you have made arrangements to --

MR. TARDY: Mr. Ed Malek will make the statement.

MR. EIGUREN: Fine. If you would like to do now. This was the matter that Dr. Temple and I were discussing with Mr. Nolan earlier so you know it was being discussed. You may have the floor.

MR. MALEK: I understand. Gentlemen, my name is Edward Malek. I am one of the attorneys for the Citizens Against The Collider Here. Earlier Mr. Tardy handed to you a box containing of 20,000 signatures representing the opposition petitions. There was some concern by the Department of Energy that we would be relinquishing control of our original documents. Two or three days ago, photostatic copies of those petitions were forwarded to Secretary John Herrington. It has been suggested, and we agree, that rather than duplicating our efforts and xeroxing those and making it a substituted part of the record, we are asking and it has been agreed by Mr. Nolan of the Department, that we will substitute those petitions, photostatic copies of the petitions, for this record and we will retain our originals. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. That was the matter we were discussing so the record is clear. The final two commenters are Roger Souders and Joanne Johnson.

860 STATEMENT OF ROGER SOUDERS

MR. SOUDERS: Good evening. My name is Roger Souders. I live in Kaneville Township and I am against this project being sited here in Illinois.

Appendix 1, page 7, Section 5, this discussed fire protection systems. Why is this necessary? What type of fires could occur and that probably are not addressed at all? It also tells of a need to have personnel and trucks for the fire service buildings. Who will provide this fire protection? The DOE? County or local fire departments? Will additional land be needed for a fire department in the fire service areas?

This pertains to site specific adaptions in Illinois. Figure 1.2.3-1 on page 26 lists the town of Kaneville in two different areas. If the State of Illinois made this error on a simple map, what other discrepancies has the State made through this proposal?

I am concerned about the homes and businesses that will be taken by Kwiktake. Will they be torn down? If not, who will live in these homes? Who will maintain these homes? Won't these homes be unable to use their existing wells? How will they obtain water and at whose expense? Will additional police be needed to prevent looters and vandals in the area? The Illinois Good Neighbor Bill does nothing to prevent lowered property values adjacent to these condemned homes and businesses.

Page 33, 1.2.3.9, Rail. If 4.8 miles is requested by the DOE, this would remove an additional 38 acres. Also, it could impact an additional one to three homes on its route to Kaneville from Big Rock. Why would it be needed? What type of material will it be hauling?

Appendix 2, Cost Estimates. We believe that the figures for the construction decommissioning are vastly understated. A study conducted by Robert Alvarez for the Department of Congress said that the Department of Energy had a very poor record in long construction projects, five years or more. This survey found 21 projects which had an estimated cost of $2.7 billion when they began and ended up costing $12.9 billion when they were completed or even worse, abandoned. This $44.7 billion project could cost the United States tax payers $16.5 billion and the decommissioning could jump from $38.5 million to $143 million in current dollars.

Appendix 3, Decommissioning Plan. It is impossible to believe that you only wrote eight and a half pages addressing this concern. Nearly everything is written in one paragraph such as 3.2.1, 3.2.1.1, I don't think I have to go on further. Then your final sentence is "Decommissioning would only take about one year." It took you years to put this project in the ground and one to decommission this questionable project? Who is kidding who?

Page 47 discusses the air quality. During this past summer alone, there were 19 days that exceeded EPA air quality standards in the Chicago metropolitan area. Page 57, Figure 5.3.5.1, again another omission in the State of Illinois, please note that Kaneland schools --they got a great school, St. Charles High School and Waubonsie High School, I think that's where we are at today -- are omitted. The proponent should have known of these schools. Again, you should be aware of these glaring omissions.

Gentlemen, trust is very important amongst citizens in this audience, the nation and the world. Trust cannot be given, it must be earned. Your Department has not earned my respect. Here is why.

One, officials in the general accounting estimates said it would cost $175 billion to clean up this country's nuclear waste. There are sites so contaminated that they will never be cleaned up and will be permanently guarded. The Richland, Washington, facility has shown nearby reservoirs have tritium and strontium as does the Columbia River and that is one of the sites that you proposed to put the SSC waste.

The New York Times reports of your desires in an opening of an underground disposal facility in New Mexico. However, a group of scientists from the University of New Mexico says water is seeping rapidly into what were supposed to be dry, underground chambers. This could cause a radioactive slurry and contaminate nearby water supplies to the Pecos River if it were allowed to be placed at this time. The EPA is trying to set higher standards and as such this site would be unable to open at this time. But, you still want to place radioactive waste in these chambers just to see if its safe over the objections of the EPA. Third, Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island has shown that radioactive material has entered the drinking water of nearby homes. These are all articles in the New York Times.

MR. EIGUREN: Sir, I am sorry. You time has elapsed.

MR. SOUDERS: I have got one real quick.

MR. EIGUREN: One more? Okay. Thank you.

MR. SOUDERS: It is also reported in the New York Times that the Department of Justice blocking the EPA from a law suit against your Department represented Tom Lukin, Chairman of the subcommittee of House Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce, said that the Department of Energy is hiding behind a shield of immunity and as a result of the cesspools of nuclear waste and all kinds of waste.

Knowing what I have stated, if you place the SSC in Illinois, the DOE will be better known as the Department of Errors. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Joanne Johnson.

1135 STATEMENT OF JOANNE JOHNSON

1 MS. JOHNSON: Joanne Johnson from DuPage. My concern is the Jericho Cemetery, E4. There has been a reference to it but not to the possible destruction or disturbance of the cemetery and that is my concern.

2 The effects of the blasting and boring. I have been assured that the cemetery would not be disturbed. However, I am not convinced. How can you blast and bore and not disturb the surrounding area? I am willing to be convinced, please convince me.

3 Please tell me this disturbance will not have any bad effects on the existing graves.

4 Whatever assurance you can give me about the care given to the underground boring and blasting and its effects will be greatly appreciated.

5 I would also like to know who is willing to accept the responsibility for the destruction of the graves if there is any? And who will give me a written statement to the effect that the cemetery will not be disturbed or any destruction could be corrected.

6 I am sympathetic with those in construction who want the jobs. I have a brother, a geophysicist, down in Houston. Texas could use this down there and he could possibly, who knows, get a job. I don't know. It would be nice to think that they could do something about that. But, after the jobs are gone, what will be left behind. That's all, gentlemen.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. I have gone through the list of both pre-registered speakers as well as walk-in registrants at least. We have called all names at least three times. I am going to call the names of two individuals who were preregistered to speak that did not appear. Larry Wright? Larry Wright? Nancy Mills?

With that, then, we have completed the list of commenters for this, the afternoon hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement on the SSC project being held here in Aurora, Illinois. We thank you for your patience and your courtesy and we do appreciate your comments.

We will now stand in recess until the hour of 7:00 p.m. this evening to resume our hearing. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 5:30 p.m., the Department of Energy panel recessed, to reconvene at 7:00 p.m., the same day.)

SECOND SESSION

(October 6, 1988: 7:00 p.m.)

DR. TEMPLE: Good evening; I want to welcome you to the Department of Energy's public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, EIS, for the Superconducting Super Collider, SSC. My name is Ed Temple and I am the executive director of department's SSC site task force. I am also the presiding official for this hearing.

The purpose of my brief remarks is to tell you why we are all here. After my remarks I will ask our session moderator, Mr. Eiguren, to outline how we will conduct our meeting this evening.

The purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens an opportunity to comment in person on the department's draft EIS on the SSC. This hearing is not your only opportunity. You may also send us your written comments which must be postmarked by October 17, 1988.

We want you to know that we are sincerely interested in hearing your comments on this document. And that each of your comments will be considered and responded to in the final EIS.

Let me refresh your memories regarding the SSC site selection process. In January 1987 President Reagan's decision to proceed with the SSC was announced and construction forms were requested from Congress. In April 1987 the department issued an invitation for site proposals. We subsequently received 43 proposals and 36 of these were found to be qualified. These qualified proposals were forwarded to the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering for further evaluation. Based on the criteria in the invitation the academies recommended a best qualified list, BQL, of eight sites to the department. One of these proposals was later withdrawn by the proposer.

Following a review and verification of the academies recommendations Secretary Harrington announced the best qualified list including the Illinois proposal on January 19, 1988. On January 22, 1988 the DOE formally announced that it would develop an EIS on the proposed SSC. This followed an advanced notice of intent to prepare an EIS which had been issued in May of 1987.

In February 1988 we held scoping meetings in each of the seven states to obtain public comment on the nature and scope of the environmental issues to be considered in the EIS. Scoping meetings were held here in Illinois at the Fermilab auditorium.

The DOE received approximately 2,100 comments on the scope of the EIS. These comments were considered in the preparation of the draft EIS. Following public hearings here and in the other six BQL states we will develop a final EIS to be issued in December 1988.

The draft EIS evaluates and compares four types of alternatives. Site alternatives, technical alternatives, programmatic alternatives and the no-action alternative. Site alternatives address the seven locations identified on the BQL. Technical alternatives consider different technology, different equipment, or different facility configurations. Programmatic alternatives and the possibility of using other accelerators, international collaboration, or project delay. The no action alternative meant the option not to construct the SSC. The draft EIS identifies and analyzes the potential environmental consequences expected to occur from siting, constructing and operating the SSC at the seven sites. These sites are located in Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas.

The draft EIS provides as much information as possible at this stage of project development regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed construction and operation of the SSC at each of the alternative sites. However, the DOE recognizes that further review under NEPA is appropriate prior to construction and operation of the proposed SSC.

Accordingly, following selection of the site for the proposed SSC the DOE will prepare a supplement to this EIS to address in more detail the impacts of constructing and operating the proposed SSC at the selective site and identify alternatives where possible for mitigating those impacts.

Let me tell you a little bit about the draft EIS. This is a large document containing more than 4,000 pages. It is organized into four volumes. Volume I is entitled, Environmental Impact Statement. Volume II is the Comment Resolution Document and it is reserved for our response to public comments and for publication in the final EIS only. Volume III describes the methodology for site selection. Volume IV contains 16 appendices for writing detail presentations of technical information which back up the conclusions in the Environmental Impact Statement. Comments received at this hearing will be used by the DOE to prepare a final EIS to be issued this December. This document will identify the department's preferred site.

No sooner than 30 days after the final EIS is distributed the department will publish its record of decision which will include the final site selection and complete selection process.

Tonight we will use a professional moderator to assure a fair and orderly proceeding. Measures have been taken to permit the maximum opportunity for interested citizens to utilize this session for expressing their comments. We urge all participants in this evening's meeting to focus their comments on the draft EIS and to avoid or minimize statements aimed solely at expressing opposition or support for the State's proposal.

While all comments will become part of the formal record of this proceeding, those specifically addressing the draft EIS will be most useful to DOE in preparing the final document.

As I noted earlier in addition to this opportunity for oral comments individuals may also provide written comments to the DOE. They should be postmarked by October 17th, 1988, the end of the formal 45-day comment, to insure they will be considered in the preparation of the final EIS. We will, however, consider comments received after that date to the extent possible.

One final word on the role of the EIS and the site selection process. The National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, requires that environmental impacts be considered by Federal decision makers in taking major Federal actions with potential environmental consequences. EIS is one of the methods used to do this analysis, provide for public comment and participation, and to make a final decision that meets the NEPA requirements. The EIS will be considered by the secretary in making the site selection.

Thank you in advance for your interest and participation. Let me now introduce Mr. Roy Eiguren who will describe how we will conduct tonight's session.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Dr. Temple. Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is Roy Eiguren. I am an attorney in private practice with the law firm of Lindsay, Hart, Neil & Weigler which has offices in Seattle, Washington; Portland, Oregon; San Francisco, California; and Boise, Idaho. My practice and that of our law firm is heavily concentrated in the area of environmental and energy law.

Both in private practice as well as in prior governmental service I have had over a decade's worth of experience in either conducting or participating a significant number of National Environmental Policy Act hearings such as the one we are conducting here today.

I have been retained by the Department of Energy as moderator for this and other hearings on the draft EIS for the SSC project. In that role I am not an employee of the department, nor am I an advocate for or against the department's proposed action in this proceeding. Rather my single expressed purpose is to serve as a moderator to be an independent, unbiased, objective individual to moderate this series of hearings. My role is to help assure that the Department of Energy fully complies with both the letter and spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, so as to allow all individuals and organizations a fair and equal opportunity to comment on the record relative to the department's proposed action.

As Dr. Temple stated earlier the purpose of this hearing is to give all interested citizens an opportunity to comment on the record relative to the Department of Energy's draft Environmental Impact Statement on the SSC project.

In February the Department conducted a scoping meeting here to hear comments from individuals and organizations on what issues should be considered in the preparation of the DEIS. Now that the department has prepared the draft Environmental Impact Statement it seeks comment from the public on it. In particular we are seeking specific comment on issues that members of the public feel are relevant and should be considered by the Department of Energy prior to finalizing the EIS and selecting its preferred site for the SSC project.

I would like to indicate at the outset that this is a recorded proceeding. That is to say everything that is being said at this, as well as the other draft EIS hearings being held in other states under consideration for the project are being recorded by a court reporter who is here with us in the front of the room. The court reporter will make a verbatim transcript of all comments received and submit that transcript to the Department of Energy for inclusion in the final record of this proceeding. The Secretary of Energy's decision will be based upon the information contained in the record that we develop. So accordingly it is critically important to us here that we have your assistance in being able to fully develop the record and that is the document or the basis under which the decision in this proceeding will be made.

At this time I would like to tell you what procedures we are going to follow in the conduct of this as well as all the other hearings that we are conducting in this proceeding.

I will announce speakers for this evening's program from a list provided to me by the Department of Energy. What we have done as I am sure most of you know is received by telephone or otherwise indications from individuals that would like to comment here this evening. Now those pre-registered individuals will be called in the order within which they signed up to speak.

If you are pre-registered to speak this evening we would ask that you would check in at the registration table out in the lobby so that we know that you are here. So when we call your name we know that you are here.

Every individual will have up to five minutes within which to comment. At the end of five minutes I will signal each individual speaker that their time has elapsed. Generally I am fairly liberal in terms of allowing people to go past five minutes, but given the very significant number of commentators we have which at this point by pre-registration is about 250 people, we have had to adhere to the five-minute rule. So I would appreciate your courtesy and patience in assisting us in keeping the five-minute rule in place. I stated earlier the purpose of this hearing is to receive comment on the draft environment impact statement. Accordingly your comments should be focused on the issues that are addressed in the draft document. I do reserve the right to ask individuals to focus on issues contained in the draft EIS if they wander from the topic of the session.

My intent is not to limit remarks, but rather to assure what comments you do provide to us are effective in achieving the objective of this hearing as Dr. Temple outlined earlier. However, as I said earlier it has been my practice throughout the entire course of these hearings, both here as well as other states, to all individuals to provide on the record any comment they feel appropriate relative to the project.

Written comment and oral comment receive the same weight in the record of this proceeding. Therefore we would encourage you to submit written comment as well as any written questions you have about the project either before or after your presentation, or at any time prior to the close of the record in this proceeding, which is October 17th. So if you do have written comment or written questions with you you may leave them with me and I will make sure they are included in the transcript, or you may leave them at the registration table back in the lobby. If you would like to provide written comment or have written questions after this hearing, as Dr. Temple mentioned earlier you may do so. You may provide them to us by writing to this address which is contained on the business card that is available back on the registration table. But again you will have to make sure that it is postmarked by October 17th. Make sure that any written comments that you do provide have your name, address as well as your zip code.

We have had one earlier session here today that began at 2:00 and lasted until 5:30. This program commenced at 7:00 and will run until approximately 10:00 p.m. this evening. In addition to the hearings we are holding here today we are also going to be holding hearings tomorrow to accommodate the large number of individuals that would like to comment. We are also holding parallel hearings. That is to say there is a hearing being held in the auditorium of this building at the same time that we are holding this to accommodate additional people.

It becomes necessary about every hour or so through the course of this proceeding to take a brief recess to allow our court reporter to change tapes. So bear with me. We will take recesses about every hour for five minutes.

We are going to accommodate any individuals who have walked in this evening and would like to comment. If you have not pre-registered to comment you will need to so back at the registration table and will receive your comment in turn either here as time allows toward the end of our session, or before the other hearing panel in the auditorium.

We would ask you to follow the following procedures relative to oral comment. When your turn comes to speak we would ask that you step forward here to the podium in the front. Give us your name and address and organization that you might be speaking on behalf of. Then once you have completed your introductions I will begin the timing of your five minute time slot. I will not begin timing, however, until you have completed your introductions.

We do have a staging area here in the front. What I have been doing to try to keep this process moving along fairly expeditiously is to indicate who are first speaker is and then the subsequent three speakers. Once I call your name in that sequence we would ask if you are not situated fairly close to the front please come up here and sit in one of the seats in the front row so that when your turn comes you may move up here quite quickly.

The high school has announced, or has requested that I announce a number of other rules that pertain to this high school facility. One is that this is a smoke-free building. Accordingly you are not allowed to smoke anywhere inside the high school. There is a snack shop that has been provided for your use that is directly outside in the lobby. It has been requested that you consume any beverages or any food that you might purchase out in the lobby area.

Tomorrow we will be having a hearing in this facility also as I have mentioned. There will be students and faculty in the facility in the high school. We would ask that accordingly you would restrict your movement to this room as well as only the lobby. Finally I would like to remind you that as I mentioned earlier there are two parallel hearings ongoing. One in the auditorium as well as the one that is here. If you are registered to speak at either of the hearings you need to make sure that you register in the back at the registration table so that we can direct you to the proper hearing room.

A couple of final comments I would like to make. One is that this obviously is a very emotionally charged issue here in the State of Illinois. People are collectively demonstrating either their support or opposition of the project, which is fine. We respect your First Amendment Rights and urge you to exercise them. The only caveat I have is that you would keep your clapping, shouting, booing, whatever to those points in times between speakers, either before or after speakers. We really request that you not interrupt speakers when they are giving their comments. The audience this afternoon followed that and we greatly appreciate it.

The other problem we have is the acoustics in this building are very, very bad. I apologize for the pejorative comment. But it is very difficult to hear up here. So we would ask to the greatest extent possible you would be as quiet as you possibly can be during the actual receipt of comment so that members of the hearing panel can hear comment.

The purpose for the members of the hearing panel being here is to hear your comments and as appropriate ask clarifying questions which they have been doing throughout the course of this proceeding. The purpose in their asking clarifying questions is to make sure they fully understand your comments on the environmental issues. Again that is apart of our trying to complete, or develop a complete record of your concerns on this project.

With me on the stage are Dr. Ed Temple who is the executive director of the Department of Energy's SSC Site Selection Task Force. He is the presiding official for this program. With him is Dr. Roger Mayes and Dr. Jerry Nelsen who are environmental specialist with the Department of Energy who have a similar responsibility in the development of the final EIS.

At this particular point in time we will go ahead and begin the receipt of public comment. We are running slightly ahead of schedule so I want to make it very clear to everyone that if you have pre-registered to comment you will have an opportunity to do so. Even if you have not arrived at the time slot that you are scheduled for what we have been doing is we keep going back to the top of the list and calling those names of individuals that might not have been in the room when I call their name initially.

So with that, the hour is now 7:22 and we will start with the actual receipt of public comment in the order within which the individuals signed up to speak this evening. Our first scheduled commentator is Mary A. Barth followed by Terry Siegler and Kathleen Hickey. Mary Barth.

1136 STATEMENT OF MARY A. BARTH

MS. BARTH: I am Mary A. Barth, 109 Sumac Court, St. Charles, Illinois. This is a water color of a wetland in a rural area that will be tremendously affected if the SSC is sited in Illinois. This beautiful natural habitat for wildlife is located less than one half mile from the 200 acre residential development that I owned until quite recently.

1 It is called Split Rail. When this development was presented by my husband and me to the Kane County Planning Commission for approval it was said by them that it was the best plan in all of Kane County. Mainly because we intended to keep as much open space as possible in Split Rail for future homeowners. Prairie grasses, a small stream running through the property, pheasant, deer, beaver, all apart of the natural beauty of the country in this part of Illinois.

What a wonderful learning experience for the children who will live there. In the last two and a half years more homes have been built according to the accepted plan. The number of homes has actually doubled since January 1, 1986.

This is no place to build a tunnel and an access shaft building in the midst of a quiet beautiful, rural and residential area. By the way Split Rail is just one of many, many home developments in the path of the proposed tunnel. Our area has grown tremendously and has highly populated since January 1, 1986. That date is very significant because the statistics given the DOE by our Illinois ENR are
2 accurate only as of January 1, 1986. This is October 6, 1988. The recently published 1988 Illinois tax maps verify the enormous growth in our area since January 1, 1986. Many more land parcels, wells and businesses.

The DOE cannot ignore these new figures. Even if our own Illinois ENR does not update the statistics. It is known that when members of the DOE toured our area and from a personal standpoint Split Rail specifically, they were driven at a very high speed down the township road by the homes there. Was it in hopes that the Washington officials would not notice the great number of homes.

Some DOE officials came back later to talk to some of the residents of Split Rail and expressed surprise of how many homes were in the area. They had be led to believe it was all purely agricultural land.

I would like to make another point. Our children. Children, how important to remember them as you are making big plans for excavating a tunnel on a 53 mile ring in a highly populated area. Children, future leaders of our country. What about the fact that education is at an all time low in the United States and Illinois. Can we afford the SSC here at the expense of our children's preparatory education that will enable them to earn doctorates in their chosen fields, including science.

How much of our tax money is to be used for better education. And how much of our tax money to build the Collider. It simply does not make sense to build the SSC in Illinois. The disruption of the lives of the people who live here will be unbelievable. As you well know when the dynamiting begins, 190 trucks per day during construction over many years create a dangerous hazards for our people. Let alone noise pollution, water quality and quantity affected, destruction of wetlands, natural habitats and wildlife, even radium danger.

Can you truly guarantee us that will not happen? Please listen to several thousand people who will be
3 affected if you choose the Illinois site for the SSC. We do not want the SSC here. Keep this picture in your minds, do not destroy it.

MR. EIGUREN: Terry Siegler is next followed by Kathleen Hickey and Philip Hadamik.

1137 STATEMENT OF TERRY SIEGLER

MR. SIEGLER: Hello, my name is Terry Siegler. I am from St. Charles. Do you know what the net result is of the thousands of pages in this EIS? That all seven states are still in the running. Every state has problems with its proposal and yet no problem appears great enough to eliminate any site from the running. This is exactly what the DOE wants.

They want every state to remain in the running so that failing interest in Washington will not erode any further. They want every state to think that they still have a chance to win the SSC so that their respective political delegations will continue to support the project before Congress.

Each state may not realize it, but they are all being manipulated very carefully by the DOE. The EIS document clearly indicates that whatever problem exist at whatever site the DOE can fix it. Everything under the sun is mitigable to the DOE. No potential health problem, not potential accident problem, no ecological problem, no archaeological problem, no radiation problem, no environmental problem, or no social problem is beyond the capabilities of the DOE to fix. Everything is delegated to a level of insignificance.

1 The DOE can and will mitigate anything and everything. The DOE and all of its highly sophisticated personnel are all that matters. Everything else is insignificant. The SSC is without a doubt the most necessary and most vital research project that the U.S. Government has ever undertaken. Without the SSC the DOE sees the U.S. losing statute worldwide and continuing its fall into disgrace and degredation.

There is absolutely no alternative to the SSC. Every scientific alternative, every anticipated technological advancement has been considered in the SSC as our one and only savior. We must have the SSC or else and most importantly of all it must be on line by 1996. Everything else is absolutely unequivocally irrevocably insignificant.

That is what this EIS book and all its appendices say and believe me it is not worth the paper it is printed on. The real truth is that the EIS is full of inaccuracies, discrepancies, subjectivity, double standards, errors, illogical arguments, outdated information and is a complete sham to the decision making process that you gentlemen have to do.

I resent the fact that I and thousands of other people are being forced to read it and comment on it in order to protect our families and homes. But since I must I will specifically speak out about the EIS and the Illinois SSC proposal.

If you turn to the back of the book in the Illinois land acquisition maps the first thing that you will notice is that each piece of property has a number on it. If you add these numbers up sector by sector you will discover that a new parcel count of 3,826 pieces of property are directly affected at the Illinois SSC site. This new count results from the fact that these new maps are 1987 maps rather than the 1986 maps that were originally used when the Illinois proposal was first presented.

2 This is the first time that either the Illinois ENR or the DOE has admitted that the original 3,305 parcel count was too low. However, the draft EIS still fails to incorporate this new information into any of its lengthy analysis. And these figures still only represent conditions as of January 1, 1987. How about the last 18 months of development that has gone on out here in the Fox Valley?

What does this new parcel count really mean? For one thing it means that the Illinois SSC site has more parcels and more property owners involved then at all the other sites combined. This also means that the Illinois site offers the most difficult land acquisition process of any site available.

The ENR's job will be made even more difficult due to the fact that many of us have already taken steps to cloud title on our property. If the DOE thinks that eminent domain is going to make this an easy process you are sadly mistaken.

Without a doubt your precious timetable of 1996 will be delayed if Illinois becomes the home of the SSC. This new parcel count indicates one more very important fact. There are more adversely affected people in Illinois than in all the other sites combined. This explains why we have more opposition towards this SSC project than in any other state. Something which the proponents have failed to realize is that Illinois is the only state which has tried to impose this project on such a large number of its residents. Every other state has basically placed the SSC ring in an area that is desolate in comparison to our Fox Valley site. Stop and think about it. There are more property owners involved at the Illinois site than all six other states combined.

With this being true it is not very difficult to understand why the local affected property owners are so adamantly opposed to the SSC in Illinois. Quite frankly wherever people are being forced to live
3 above or near this project the local people oppose it. They oppose it in North Carolina. They oppose it in Tennessee. They oppose it in Michigan. There is no opposition in Texas, Colorado, or Arizona because few if any people are being forced to live on or near it in those states.

There is nothing unique about Illinois. There is nothing unique about us opponents in Illinois other
4 than our numbers are larger and our commitment is greater. We are not interested in mitigation. We want litigation. We are fully prepared to meet you gentlemen in court. And I can guarantee you that if you are dumb enough to site the SSC in Illinois your project is doomed. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next commentator is Kathleen Hickey followed by Philip Hadamik.

866 STATEMENT OF KATHLEEN HICKEY

MS. HICKEY: My name is Kathleen Hickey. I am from Batavia. EIS makes it very clear that you scientists have but two goals. The SSC must be built as designed at all costs. And it must be on line by 1996.

This is all that counts to you and everything else is totally insignificant. You scientist can be faulted for using your highly regarded station in life as a means to influence people's opinion toward a project such as the SSC, wherein the public basically has very little knowledge or concern.

You overstep your bounds as scientists and enter the political arena to influence national policy decisions. The book Policide by Lowi and Ginsberg is a unique description of the process involved in the creation of Fermilab and the death of the town of Weston. A large part of this book describes how scientists can fall into the trap of actually believing that the ends justifies the means.

The authors state the following with the regards to the criteria used in determining site selection for Fermilab. Quote, "The scientists concern only about amenities for scientists and their families. And because no criteria were concerned with broader social values that might be effective by scientific facility of such size and expense." In effect the scientist were saying give us your site and do not tell us how you got it. This was the attitude of you scientists towards the public over 20 years ago, and as far as we affected property owners are concerned this is your attitude to this day. It is obvious from the EIS that any and all problems that occur at any of the seven sites is delegated to a level of insignificance by you scientists. No problem is insurmountable. Everything can be mitigated.

Your lack of concern for our families and our homes is well documented throughout the EIS. You could not care less that the SSC facility falls directly in residential neighborhoods. All local and building and zoning laws which would prohibit the existence of your tank farms near our homes have been conveniently eliminated.

You could not care less that thousands of people in the Fox Valley are dependent upon private wells as their only source of water. What is important though is that you and your families must have all the necessary social amenities at your disposal.

This type of attitude cannot and will not be tolerated. You were able to get away with it back when Fermilab was created, because the local townspeople were actually fooled into believing that Weston would live on and prosper.

Let me guarantee you, gentlemen, that this will not happen again. Your opposition here in the Fox Valley is too great and we will not back down. We will continue to fight you and to thwart your efforts to site this project here in Illinois. We have as many people, if not more, opposing this project as opposed it in New York. Their governor had the common sense and decency to withdraw the New York bid. Unfortunately ours does not. Let me conclude with another quote from Policide. "The story of Weston reveals a great deal about the requirements of proper exercise of power. It is an illustration of how institutions can be the enemy of rational men of good will, because it is a story of how such rational men of good will were led by their own responsibilities to abuse public authority or to allow its abuse on their behalf."

You gentlemen have the same responsibility and authority. Do not abuse it. Do not select Illinois as the site of the SSC. Put it where it belongs. In one of the other sites where people's lives do not have to be sacrificed for your scientists and your families well beings. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: We will include for the record the written comment of Kathleen Hickey. We will not call our next commentator Philip Hadamik followed by Jennifer Hannemann.

914 STATEMENT OF PHILIP HADAMIK

MR. HADAMIK: I am Philip Hadamik. I am from St. Charles. Table 4-1, page 4-4 indicates that the Illinois site will experience minimal groundwater inflows into the tunnel. However, page 16 of Appendix 10 shows that a five-mile stretch of the tunnel between E3 and E4 near the southern end of the ring will leak at the rate of 5,200 gallons per minute per 100 feet during construction.

This is nearly 20 million gallons of water per day over just a five-mile stretch of tunnel. This rate of groundwater inflow must surely be considered more than minimal. In fact no other site specifically points out any anticipated water problem areas like this area near Big Rock, Illinois.

The Michigan site and the North Carolina site will both experience greater amounts of tunnel inflow than will Illinois. But no stretch of their tunnels are expected to leak at the rate that is anticipated for our five-mile Big Rock sector.

Another question. Is the Department of Energy aware that there is quicksand in the marshes around Big Rock and site F4. On page 3-61 the EIS specifically states that the SSC project would be designed to limit radiation exposure to the general public. The key phrase here is that they intend to limit it, not eliminate it.

There is radiation involved with the SSC project no matter how you look at it. Other states may be willing to put up with your limited radiation dose, but we the residents of the Fox Valley will not tolerate it. We want to emphasize the acceptable standards set for radiation should not be interpreted as safe doses, or safe releases. H. J. Muller who discovered that ionizing radiations creates mutations in living organisms was the first person to realize that there is no safe dose of ionizing radiation. This is exactly the type of radiation which the population area around the Fox Valley would be exposed to by the SSC.

According to Dr. Muller even the lowest dose of ionizing radiation has the potential to induce mutation. That being the case we do not want the Department of Energy, Fermilab, or our elected officials to tell us that radiation will be limited. We do not want anything over and above what we are being exposed to already.

Take your machine and put it in an open land laboratory setting. Not in a residential area in Illinois.

Page 4-21 of the EIS indicates that there are 320 wells within the 1,000-foot zone of the collider ring. This number is far smaller than the true number, because it only reflects conditions as of January 1, 1986. The true number is far in excess of 500 wells. It grows day by day as new homes continue to be built.

Without a doubt Illinois has the largest number of wells within the 1,000-foot zone of the collider. The Illinois ENR has presented the Department of Energy with updates on their own environmental assessments of conditions in Illinois as recently as late March 1988. However, they have very conveniently failed to update the Department of Energy on the number of wells and the number of parcels which fall under the shadow of the SSC. This has been contrived by the ENR from the beginning. And makes one sick to think that their own government officials can act so irresponsibly.

We might ask the Department of Energy if these are truly the kind of people you want to deal with over the next 25 or 30 years. If you are satisfied with secrecy and deceit, and I hope you are not, you would feel right at home with our state government.

Our state and local representatives, and I use that term loosely, have by their secretive and deceitful actions informing the citizens of our community so late about this project and distorting the facts about all of its negative impacts have clearly demonstrated their utter contempt and the blatant disregard for the interest of the people they supposedly represent.

To these pompous egotist I say: Regardless of whether Illinois gets this project or not your trials will not end here, for you have violated the trust we have placed in you. You will regret the day that you decided to put our families through this unbelievable nonsense.

Finally, to you Department of Energy officials I say: Go ahead with your project. It sounds great. But for the love of God do not put it in a residential area. Fermilab or no Fermilab, how can you even consider this site.

MR. EIGUREN. Our next commentator is Jennifer Hannemann followed by William R. Hennemann IV. Your name and address for the record please.

865 STATEMENT OF JENNIFER HANNEMANN

MS. HANNEMANN: My name is Jennifer Hannemann. I live in the Big Rock Township. Good evening. I would like to address the economic alternatives and emotions. One of the major reasons why our land should not be a final site for the SSC is due to the extensive degree of development which exists in the Illinois site.

Page 4-72 and 4-21 both indicate the Illinois has the most complex pattern of current land uses available. Also page 4-76 states that of all seven sites only Illinois presents a situation where growth is triggering not only intensification of current use, but also major development classification. The remaining six sites did not portray this kind of future growth.

This is a key by the EIS. Only in Illinois are current land uses leading property moving from one land classification to a higher classification. As a consequence the land available at the Illinois site has potential alternate uses. This is not true in the other six sites.

The fact that the property at the Illinois site can be used for other purpose actually makes the property more valuable than the land located in the other sites. EIS indicates that no further land use changes are expected to occur at the basically remote and undeveloped sites.

Only Illinois stands off by itself as having alternative land uses available for the proposed SSC acreage. However, this opportunity cost associated with the Illinois acreage is never taken into consideration by the EIS or by the economic studies prepared by the Illinois ENR, SSC for Fermilab or by the Department of Energy.

The Illinois site is unique in its economic potential yet this fact is completely ignored by the proponents of the Illinois proposal. Our economic discussions have centered around the economic benefits which will be derived from the SSC project while ignoring many of the cost components which must be considered in a true cost benefit analysis.

Either the economists involved in preparing the EIS have made major mistake or there were no economists involved at all. Another factor that is obviously missing from the EIS is an analysis of psychological impact, which the SSC project is already having on the affected residents of each alternative site.

In Illinois for example there is no discussion about the degree of involvement necessary for people to fight this project. Nowhere does it describe the animosity which has developed between the affected property owners and the government of the State of Illinois. Nowhere does EIS describe the tremendous degree of mistrust of the local community has towards our government, our local political leaders, the DOE and especially towards Fermilab.

The EIS is deficient in describing local attitudes and feelings towards the SSC of its proposers. As a result you scientists do not understand the complete hatred which we affected property owners have towards the SSC in general. Nor do you understand from the EIS the resolve which the people have towards insuring that SSC will not be sited in Illinois. We are prepared to do whatever it takes to impress upon you scientists that you are not welcome here. Every legal means will be exploited in our attempt to force you to site this intrusion elsewhere.

The EIS has failed miserably in its judgment of local attitudes, and I just want to make one thing perfectly clear. The only way the SSC can come to Illinois is through the courts.

MR. EIGUREN: Can we have someone adjust the microphone for the next speaker? We will include for the written record the written comments of Jennifer Hannemann. Our next scheduled commentator is William R. Hannemann IV.

863 STATEMENT OF WILLIAM R. HANNEMANN IV

MR. HANNEMANN: My name is Billy Hannemann. I live in Big Rock Township. I am seven years old. I am here to tell you why I do not want the SSC built in my neighborhood.

My grandpa and I like to fish in the Welsh Creek just down the stream from the F-4 site. When they dump the spoils from digging on the ground it will only have to travel 200 feet to the creek. I think the suspended solids will kill all the fish. Then my grandpa and I cannot do that together anymore.

While they dig when the compressors run the school will be very noisy. It will disturb the deer and the other wildlife. In Big Rock it is very quiet and any noise travels a long way. I hope that I will be able to study with all the noise.

In the big blue book my dad says when they talk about people and noise we are called receptors. But I know I am a little boy, a human being, not a receptor.

If the SSC comes to my town there will be lots of people coming here to live. I hope my school will not become overcrowded and the classes to big to learn anything. I live near one of the four quarries that are okay to take the limestone.

In my township there are no sidewalks to ride my bike on. We have to ride our bike on the roads. I do not want to die because one of the 290 big trucks that carry limestone come each day does not notice me. Would people that work for the DOE be willing to sacrifice their children for the SSC? I hope not. But maybe they do not love their children. Why don't you put the Superconducting Super Collider someplace where there are no houses?

MR. EIGUREN: We will be in recess for five minutes.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MR. EIGUREN: Once again, ladies and gentlemen, I would respectively request that you would be quiet during the critical time that we have people commenting. Not only do we have a problem in terms of discourtesy to our commentators it is terribly difficult for the panel to hear up here. Again because of the acoustics. So again I would respectfully request that you would refrain from any talking or other disruptive activities when people are up here commenting.

Our next scheduled commentator is Blanca Souders followed by Martin Cassell.

1139 STATEMENT OF BLANCA SOUDERS

MS. SOUDERS: Gentlemen, this meeting tonight is to attack the draft EIS. Unfortunately five minutes is not enough time to do this report justice.

We note numerous errors such as the human receptor picture Figure 5.3.5-1. Please note that Big Rock Grade School, Kaneland School, St. Charles High School and even the building we are in tonight are omitted. The fact that the schools directly affected are not shown on the human receptor map tells me that someone did not do his or her homework.

1 This very school is only yards away from a being abort area. The bottom line is that the State does not want any notice of our children being anywhere near this thing.

Dr. Hess in a news conference in Colorado stated that the ideal site would not have anybody living above the ring. I would concur with his statement. It is obvious then not to site this project in Illinois as we have the most affected property holders than any other of the six sites combined.

2 I truly resent the fact that we are referred to as human receptors instead of human beings. It is pretty pathetic that the Indiana Bat rates higher on the list than human individuals. Keep in mind that we are the ones who will be paying the taxes for this pork barrel project. I certainly do not believe that Mr. Indiana Bat filed a 1040 tax return last year. Volume IV, Appendix 5b of 16. On page

3 25 it should be noted that local citizens are concerned about the flooding problem and they recommend a no growth policy for the city of Aurora and Kane County until the problem is solved.

4 Page 37 states that West Chicago has been placed on the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's restricted list because of the high rate and levels of water supply wells. If deeper wells will provide the water necessary for daily living will not this high rate and level pose human health problems in the years ahead.

5 Your EIS also states that the State of Illinois is second to last in student teacher ratio and last in social services. Is that the Fermi advantage we hear so much about by the State officials? All Fermilab and the SSC is welfare for the overeducated.

6 In the last EIS scoping Senator Dickson commented on the convenience of O'Hare Airport location to Fermilab. Of course he had the luxury of flying by helicopter. If you read today's Chicago newspapers, I have them here, headlines were about the cutback on the number of planes that can arrive between 4:45 p.m. and 9:15 p.m. The numbers were reduced from 95 to 80.

Why was this necessary? It was because in the last five days five mistakes occurred by the understaffed air traffic controllers. The FAA also stated that a total of 30 errors have been committed this year. This will cause additional delays already taking place at O'Hare and Midway. We certainly wish there are no delays or errors when you fly back to Washington, D.C. after these hearings.

7 Finally, the last nine months have been agonizing to our families. Especially my children. I have spent numerous hours in rallies, meetings, debates, parades to obtain signatures against this project. My children have spent more time with babysitters than their own mother the last few months. I realize that my children's school work has suffered and they too have experienced the stress that you have brought upon them.

But I am doing this for their future because I truly believe after reading the draft EIS the State of Illinois is not the preferred site. And we do not want it here.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comment of Blanca Souders of 2526 Old Locust Court, Elbourne, Illinois, will be put in the record. Along with the accompanying article from the New York Times.

The next scheduled commentator is Martin Cassell followed by Christine Davis.

1140 STATEMENT OF MARTIN CASSELL

MR. CASSELL: Good evening. My name is Martin Cassell. I live in St. Charles Township, Kane County and I am one of the affected landowners.

1 We have been listening to many complaints about the SSC and its effects upon the local residents. We have also heard a great deal about the mistakes in the Environmental Impact Statement. Perhaps I should not say mistakes. Just figures greatly different from those we have heard from the State of Illinois.

I would like to take this opportunity to point out to the Department of Energy just how important is the conflict between the State of Illinois figures and those reported in the Environmental Impact Statement.

2 First of all there is the big problem the State says there were only going to be seven wells taken and the environmental impact study says that there will be 320. Of course the State has now revised its figures to read 32. Who do we believe?

The importance to the Department of Energy is that all of these people who lose their wells must get water from somewhere. The State has promised water from another well, or from some other source. It will cost the State money to provide these new community wells or to truck in water. But with the figure being so much higher than that originally projected by the State the cost will be way above that which was originally projected. The Department of Energy does not need to worry about the cost. But the time it will take to put in these extra systems is very important.

3 Secondly there is the problem of the access sites and the pumping sites. Some of which have been increased in size from one acre to two acres and from six acres to ten as we look at the State original projections to those set forth in the Environmental Impact Statement. This will cost more money and it will take more time to acquire this land.

4 Thirdly there is the problem of the wetlands. Putting aside the issue of the destruction of the environment the environmental impact study indicates that a much larger number of acres of wetland will be affected than originally projected by the State. Here again we raise the problem of cost and the time of development it is going to take as originally projected by the State of Illinois.

If the State of Illinois has so grossly underestimated the numbers of parcels of land necessary for the project and has underestimated the number of wells to be taken, how over budget is this project going to be. Will the State have to appropriate more money. I know the department is not really interested in the cost to the State of Illinois. But it should be interested in the fact that if it takes more appropriations it is going to take more time.

5 I have mentioned time on several occasions for good reason. I am sure the Department of Energy is well aware that time is money. I need hardly remind them that there are those in Congress who are already are saying that the SSC project is too expensive. The time problem of longer construction, slower progress means more money and more congressional projects. Also more congressional problems. Siting the Collider here means more time to acquire land not previously in the State plans. As well as providing more water to those people which will all take more time.

All of this is well beyond that which was originally planned by the State of Illinois. Putting the Collider here means more time which means more money, which means more problems. Putting the Collider in Illinois makes no economic sense, makes no common sense, and is in fact just plain nonsense. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next commentator is Christine Davis followed by Bradley Scott.

1141 STATEMENT OF CHRISTINE DAVIS

MS. DAVIS: My name is Christine Davis and I am from Aurora, Illinois. Tonight I would like to express my opposition to the siting of the Super Collider in Illinois for several reasons.

1 As you probably know Illinois has been lurching from one financial crisis to the next. Our State is rapidly falling behind other states in its funding for programs such as education, including higher education, mental health, care for the hungry and homeless, improvements to our State's infrastructure as well as many other important programs.

2 Illinois cannot afford the added expense of the Super Collider without additional cuts to many other important programs. But my main reason for objecting to the Super Collider is the horrible impact it would have on our environment and quality of life.

3 The construction of the Super Collider will impact our wetlands by destroying them, modifying them, or through increased sedimentation. In addition wetlands adjacent to the construction areas will also realize some adverse effects during construction and wetlands that are down stream could also be damaged due to runoff and increase stream sedimentation.

4 During the construction of the shafts the pumping of water will affect nearby wetlands as well as surface waters. It is also possible that there would be a temporary impact of dewatering of wetlands due to shaft construction. The sultation and pollution of streams and wetlands that would occur during construction is particularly onerous to me because of its possible effects on our groundwater supplies and the aesthetic beauty of our streams and wetlands.

5 As an EPA fact sheet dated June 1988 states, and I quote, "Without wetlands the water upon which we rely for drinking and bathing will not be clean and clear. Recreational opportunities will quickly decline and nature's own flood control mechanism will be permanently lost. In short preserving wetlands makes economic sense not only for a select few, but for all of us who stand to gain from the services that they provide. When natural services of wetlands are lost someone, generally the public, has to pay to construct artificial systems to replace the lost services, or pay for damages from flooding."

6 Without a doubt wetland habitat will be lost or modified during the construction of the SSC. The effects on plants and animals and our environment in general would be substantial. There are four separate facilities that are planned that would encroach on our floodplains.

Specifically they are F5, K4, J3 and J6. This would impact Welch Creek and Kress Creek and would create serious problems in an already flood prone area.

7 I firmly believe that most Illinois citizens if given a choice would like to see the State of Illinois increase spending on existing projects before funding the Super Collider. The only support in Illinois for the Super Collider comes from individuals and businesses who think they will derive some economic gain from the siting of the Super Collider in Illinois.

It is now time for the Department of Energy to consider the people in the Fox Valley whose lives would be disrupted by the Super Collider. The people who are decent and hard working. The people who will gain nothing and lose so much. The people who are saying to you no SSC. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next commentator is Bradley Scott followed by Ray Nordbrock.

868 STATEMENT OF BRADLEY SCOTT

MR. SCOTT: Good evening, gentlemen. My name is Bradley Scott. I live in Big Rock Township as well as operate a business there. In addition I am on the board of directors for the Kane County Farm Bureau.

I am vehemently opposed to this project sited in this state and I would like to reiterate two topics that were briefly touched upon earlier tonight.

The first one concerns the sultation of our streams near F3 and F4. Page 16 of Appendix 10 indicates that 19 line ponds are proposed at the various E and F sites where the tunnel spoils will be removed. These ponds will be approximately one-third acre in size. The exception is at site F3 where three separate two acre ponds will be required because of the extremely large amount of water that is expected to infiltrate the tunnel over that five mile stretch between E3 and E4.

This is anticipated because of the results of test core samples that were conducted by the State Geological Survey Division. These results show that extremely large amounts of water saturate the area near and around Big Rock. There is a discrepancy, however, between the draft EIS and the Illinois geological survey material.

The core samples as presented would tend to indicate that it would be service area F4 between shaft excess points E4 and E5 that would be the one where this large amount of water would leak into the shafts and the tunnel. Not at F3 as the EIS states. This discrepancy between the EIS and the Illinois proposal is very critical because of the damage which may result from the sultation of our waterways.

The three ponds designed for the F3 site total 10 million gallons of storage. But this area is expected to leak at the rate of 5,200 gallons per minute per 100 feet or nearly 2 billion gallons per day over this five-mile stretch. Either this is a gross error in your figures, or you gentlemen are going to encounter an impossible tunneling job over this five-mile stretch.

As a result the holding ponds as designed are inadequate to hold the amount of water being pumped into them on a daily basis. Also the EIS states quite clearly that these ponds as designed will not be able to remove all the anticipated sultation.

The amount of sultant water entering the ponds in their inadequate size does not allow enough time for the water to settle out. Instead it appears as if this water will be forced to drain from the ponds into the surrounding natural drainage system of the area. And yet many of the fine particles of sulk created by these boring machines will still be suspended in the water.

The EIS should be faulted for not describing in detail how the sedimentation process is to take place and how the excess water will be released from these ponds. It is definitely not going to evaporate. The important point is that this area with an extremely high water table and extremely high levels of soil and rock permeability is actually at site 4 and not F3. This is important because any of the sulted water will naturally drain into the Welch Creek water shed. This cannot occur at F3, but it can be a natural disaster if allowed to occur at site F4.

The EIS makes it clear that excess water and the sediments within it will not be contained by the sedimentation ponds that are proposed. If this water is allowed to enter Welch Creek as it appears then degradation of that waterway and the wildlife which it supports will occur. We cannot allow this to happen.

The entire EIS makes it clear that no other site has a water infiltration problem as described for this five mile stretch at the southwest end of the Illinois ring. It therefore becomes extremely important to accurately identify whether it is F3 or F4 which is the area to be affected. The material presented by the State Geological Survey Division and the information in the draft EIS appear contradictory. Yet this information is extremely vital in determining adverse effects that this SSC project will have on our environment.

The second point I would like to touch on that I thought was almost overwhelming when I read it was the fact that, and this has been briefly touched upon earlier this evening, is the fact that there are over 4,000 separate parcels being affected by the SSC if built here in Illinois. That is more than in all the other states put together. To me that is absolutely incredible. For that reason alone it should not be built in Illinois. It just does not make good sense to build this thing in one of the most populated areas of this state. Listen to all the opposition coming from Illinois citizens here tonight. Not to our politicians who will not be physically affected by the SSC and who are only interested in their own political gain. Let's find out come November how much the Federal Government cares about their people. Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. EIGUREN: Excuse us. Dr. Mayes has a question for Mr. Scott.

DR. MAYES: You referenced a discrepancy between an Illinois Ecological Survey Report and a DEIS. Does your written testimony have a reference to that IGS report?

MR. SCOTT: Yes, it is all documented.

DR. MAYES: Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comments of Bradley Scott will be included in the record as a receipt from him. The next scheduled commentator is Larry Nordbrock followed by Sherrill Kist.

1142 STATEMENT OF LARRY NORDBROCK

MR. NORDBROCK: Gentlemen, I will address the topic of dewatering. That is removal of undesired water which leaks into the tunnel. This will occur during both construction and operation phases. In my talk I will mention certain sections and locations around the 53 mile ring.

We know that letters E and F denotes shaft access sites and there are 20 of them and there are 22.65-mile sections between shaft sites.

First during construction. The section in the EIS on dewatering during construction indicates that a severe design flaw if, and I repeat if, the State's figures are valid. The three two-acre ponds proposed at site F3 would have to be over 1,000 feet deep to accommodate the daily input of water from the tunnel during construction in that area.

1 This would be required because at the stated infiltration rate of over 5,200 gallons per minute per 100 feet, over two billion gallons per day, or in other words over 6,400 acre-feet of water per day must be pumped from the tunnel in this section. This enormous leakage may not be realistic. But I could only make calculations using published data from the EIS report.

2 Also during construction 15 of the total of 20 sections along the 53-mile ring have a supposedly lower leakage rate that of 5 gallons per minute per 100 feet, or only 15 million gallons per day. Which is equal to 46 acre-feet per day. However, using this supposedly lower rate during a one year period the leakage would amount to over 17,000 acre-feet. This amounts to 44 percent of the actual groundwater used by all of Kane County in 1986.

3 The EIS has stated that in 1986 38,300 acre-feet of groundwater was used in Kane County. I want to emphasize that the 17,000 acre-feet of leakage and the corresponding 44 percent comparison to the previously used water in 1986 that assumes the supposedly low 5-gallon rate, not the 5,200-gallon rate.

4 Secondly, during operation phases. The section in the EIS on water levels and overdraft during operation reveals another significant issue. Quoting the EIS, "Uncontrolled groundwater inflow into the tunnel would probably be only on the order of a few to a few tens of gallons per minute per mile. Assuming a rate of 50 gallons per minute per mile we find that the leakage would be 3,800,000 gallons per day, or 4,200 acre feet per year. This is equal to 11 percent of the actual groundwater used by all of Kane County in 1986."

5 How are we to believe the SSC proponents on anything when they have stated that the leakage is equivalent to six small garden hoses left running in the tunnel. The SSC is a direct threat to our local well water supplies. And as a consequence a direct threat to the values of our homes and property. You do not have to be in the 1,000-foot easement to feel threatened. All you have to be is a resident of Kane County. Over 30,000 people in the Fox Valley obtain their water supply from private wells. Therefore the water supply issue cannot be ignored. I feel it is a sham that all the people of the Fox Valley must sacrifice for the quote, "good of all," when there are many other locations where people will not have to suffer the adverse consequences of the SSC.

Illinois is not the logical place for this project. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: We did not get your address, sir. St. Charles, okay, thank you. Our next commentator is Sherrill Kist followed by Tim Stola. I would like to ask the people in the bleachers if you would only move in and out when people are not commenting. It is terribly disruptive. We are having a hard time hearing again because of that.

870 STATEMENT OF SHERRILL KIST

MS. KIST: My name is Sherrill Kist and I live in Campton Township. Representatives of the DOE I would like to use my five minutes to cite specific quotes from the Environmental Impact Statement. I believe these words, your own words, disqualify Illinois as an appropriate site for the SSC.

From Volume 10, Appendix 15-16, page 23 from the chapter titled, Scenic and Visual Resources Assessment. Quote, "Residential land uses are not visually compatible with the proposed project because of the obvious functional and structural contrast between project features and residents."

Given the fact that there are more affected land parcels, residences in Illinois than in all other states combined this is clearly the most disruptive of the seven sites and is therefore inappropriate for Illinois.

From Volume IV, Appendix 5b of 16, page 37-38 on the subject of groundwater. Quote, "The present and projected groundwater use shown in Table 5.32-6 locally exceeds the estimated yield of the cambrian or -- aquifers as is documented by the declining water levels. This overdraft condition is a significant groundwater issue in the area of Illinois."

We have said along we have a water problem in Illinois. Thank you for verifying that fact. This issue alone should disqualify Illinois. Eight wells within one mile of E8 will dry this summer in one subdivision. The SSC will certainly compound an already very serious problem.

Also on the issue of groundwater from Volume I, Chapter 4, page 4-18. Quote, "The one unique groundwater quality feature identified is naturally elevated radium levels in the region of the Illinois site."

Illinois is the only one of the seven sites with this problem. Again we do not need the SSC to combine existing problems.

My favorite quote from the EIS from Volume I, page 4-76 is a section titled, Planned Future Land Use. Quote, "Of the seven sites only Illinois presents a situation where growth is triggering not only in intensification of current use, but also major changes from one category of land use to a new higher development classification. The remaining six sites do not portray this kind of future growth."

The implication of the statement are far reaching. First we have a tremendous growth in our area. Kane County, particularly Campton Township, is the fastest growing community in Illinois. This means that our land is the most valuable of the seven sites. Therefore the detrimental impact of property values will be much greater than in any other sites. This also means that the opportunity cost will be much greater for the Illinois site. Nowhere in the EIS is the subject of opportunity cost even mentioned. This is a fundamental flaw in the report.

Another very important factor is not mentioned in the EIS. Namely, would Fermilab have to be shutdown to be retrofitted to the SSC ring and for how long? If the answer is yes then the question becomes whether the U.S. can afford to shutdown its premier high energy physics lab?

In conclusion the SSC is not welcome in Illinois. In spite of what our politicians tell you the opposition and most affected area is enormous. If you site it here your problems will just be beginning. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Next is Tim Stola followed by Donna Stachnik.

871 STATEMENT OF TIM STOLA

MR. STOLA: Tim Stola, Big Rock Township. I would first like to point out where my family lives in relation to the proposed SSC siting in Illinois. I feel I must do this because the State of Illinois has failed to inform the DOE of our existence. Our subdivision should appear between access E4 and service area F4, Volume IV, Appendix 4, Attachment A-3R.

We are not directly on the ring, but like so many people we will be directly affected by the SSC. This neglect to include the surrounding areas, farms, homes, subdivisions shows the typical inconsideration that all Illinois citizens are getting from their governor and State. Illinois citizens never voted to provide the funds for the SSC or this proposal. This is unlike Texas where the people made their own choice and voted two to one to support the SSC.

Illinois citizens are straining every day to meet the cost of education, fire/police protection, et cetera, for this area of Illinois. Illinois cannot afford the direct and indirect costs of the SSC. Especially with many annual real estate tax collection losses due to Federal takeover of properties and other cause of social and economic burdens bestowed on the area by the SSC.

One of our many concerns is the quality of our wells due to the SSC. We are located very close to site E4. This site is the area of the worst water leakage problem. Volume I and III. Comparison of water uses characteristics of site alternatives states, water resources available under Illinois, regional overdraft and major aquifers. This table was constructed before this past summer's drought. I would think a flood rate of 57,200 gallons per minute per 100 feet qualifies E4 site as a major aquifer. Where will our area go for water after you first contaminate the water and then pump this aquifer dry? What will the DOE do with approximately 20 million gallons of potentially contaminated water a day.

Another issue I would like to address which I find very disturbing is the 20 megawatts of electric power projected for the SSC and its effect on our future.

First, I find inconsistency in the EIS Volume IV, Appendix 14, page 97. The book states, for utilities serving the proposed sites planning reserve margins range from 15 to 28 percent. However, Table 14.2.2-3 shows Commonwealth Edison Company reserves for Illinois with the SSC falling below this 15 percent margin. Eight out of 10 years between 1997 and the year 2006.

During the operation of SSC it is loaded together with secondary loads and indirect loads puts the percent of planned reserves below Commonwealth Edison's own objective of 15 percent margin of reserves. In 1997 eight of the ten succeeding years Commonwealth Edison plans to retire approximately 200 megawatts or more of generating power.

Examples of these losses in reserves. Today, 1988, planned reserves without the SSC is 6,634 megawatts, or a 42 percent reserve. In the year 2004 planned reserves are only 3,083 megawatts. Or less than one-half of 1988 reserve, or a 14.2 reserve. In addition to these problems there are possible impacts of future regulatory actions dealing with acid rain. Since coal is a major fuel for Illinois electronic power new regulations to reduce emissions may adversely effect reliability of electrical supply.

Furthermore, output of existing coal units could be reduced if retrofitted with emissions. The EIS indicates if load forecast too low the percent difficulties for utilities to site, license, finance and construct new generating capacity in a timely matter may have a significant impact. This is especially true given Commonwealth Edison's preference for nuclear generating units. The SSC electric loads cannot be met without purchasing power from other utilities, or two, change in projected retirement plan, or three, construction of additional facilities. These three choices all mean additional costs, hazards, pollutions, problems to Illinois citizens again.

In conclusion I feel that many direct, indirect, short/long-term effects of the SSC have been irresponsibly addressed or not addressed at all by the EIS. If politics are kept out of your decision making it is clear Illinois is not the site for the SSC.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comments of Tim Stola will be put into the record as received. Our next commentator is Donna Stachnik.

869 STATEMENT OF DONNA STACHNIK

MS. STACHNIK: My name is Donna Stachnik from St. Charles. I would like to address the subjectivity of reviewers. Another situation where the subjectivity of the EIS riders is apparent occurs whenever the EIS specifically describes a potential problem and then sums everything up by saying it is insignificant because the problem already exist anyway.

For example let's take the very serious problem of groundwater supplies. Section 5 1.2, pages 28 and 29 discuss in great detail how Illinois has a regionally overdrafted water supply. In other words that usage exceeds replenishment of supplies. The EIS also explains how the operations phase of the SSC will worsen the overall groundwater situation.

The EIS also indicates that plans for municipalities to switch to surface water sources basically do not exist. So a switch to Lake Michigan water cannot be viewed as a possible mitigating measure.

However, in the very next sentence the EIS riders indicate that this potential long term negative effect of the SSC is insignificant anyway because of the wide area over which the effect will be felt. they say that major aquifers are already overdrafted and that the project would only add to an already existing situation.

This type of logic is nonsensical. It is like telling a person dying of lung cancer that they just discovered a brain tumor. But do not worry about it it is insignificant because you are going to die anyway. This type of logic is used throughout the EIS and is an indication of the lack of concern for people in our environment on the part of the EIS preparers.

These EIS writers cannot be allowed to make such broad judgments on the overall value of this SSC project. The writers viewpoints or opinions toward subjects not value should be of little concern to the DOE in deciding where to place this project. All that matters are the facts and the facts are that the EIS writers are biased, opinionated people and their viewpoints are the ones which everyone is being asked to accept.

Well we will not accept them. The EIS writers continually make assumptions and value judgments which should not be allowed. Just because they think that the overdrafted groundwater situation at the Illinois site is insignificant does not in it of itself mean the situation is in fact insignificant. On the contrary it is very significant to those of us who obtain our water supply from individual wells. That is over 30,000 people in the affected area. What the EIS writers believe and feel is of little concern to us and it should also be of little concern to you scientist of the DOE. All that you should care to see in the EIS are the facts and the EIS is obviously lacking as far as the facts are concerned.

In closing my home lies on the proposed patch of the Collider. Our family has worked hard and sacrificed much for years to buy a nice home out in the country where we felt it would be a great place to raise our kids. But if Illinois is the unfortunate site picked everything we came here for will be ruined. My children will not be safe to play in their own yards or get off the school bus once the hundreds of construction vehicles start rolling. Do not rape our land with this project. We really do love it here. Listen to the people like myself who will be most affected by this project and state to keep the SSC out of Illinois.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comments of Donna Stachnik will be included in the record as received. Now comes the moment you have all been waiting for, a five minute recess.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MR. EIGUREN: Will you please take your seats. We are now back on the record for the October 6, 1988 public hearing of the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC project being held in Aurora, Illinois. I would ask everyone to please take their seats.

We will now continue down our list of pre-registered commentators. Our next commentator is Victoria West followed by Richard Laczynski. Could we have it quiet please.

1144 STATEMENT OF VICTORIA WEST

MS. WEST: My name is Victoria West. I am from St. Charles, Illinois. I would like to begin by saying that I am opposed to locating the SSC in Illinois. What I have to say centers around one of Illinois most important resources, human life.

1 The proposed location for the SSC in Illinois is located in the fastest growing area in the State and right in the middle of one of the biggest population booms in the midwest. These are facts. Facts the State of Illinois refuses to address to the DOE.

As Tables 5.1.8-9 and 10 on pages 5.1.8-28 to 30 indicate the traffic impacts due to the SSC are letter F. This means that there will be, and I quote, "forced or breakdown flow with traffic demand exceeding the capacity unstable stop and go traffic."

2 I would also like to point out that the statistics in this table are based on the lowest level of service, and that is a quote. And yet within the same Table 5.1.8-9 the State claims that there will be no disruption to existing traffic patterns. Not even the State of Illinois could misinterpret the horrendous traffic problems created by thousands of vehicles already in this area.

As page 5.1.8-27 states, "areas around the SSC facility might experience an increase in traffic of between 200 and 1,250 vehicles per day." The State of Illinois is very quick to point out to the DOE in Table 5.1.8-9 on page 5.1.8-28 that Illinois will only have to add eight miles of new roads to accommodate the SSC. This is the least number of new roads of any of the seven states competing for the SSC. This simply means that all excess traffic, as much as 1,250 vehicles, will be using and sharing the existing roads which have already exceeded their design capabilities.

Using all of these facts how can it be determined on page 5.4-2 that the State of Illinois will have an increase of only ten injury accidents per year due to the SSC. Common sense alone tells one that when you add 200 to 1,250 more vehicles, the majority of which will be huge trucks, to an already overburdened traffic area a massive increase in accidents will occur. Once again the State of Illinois has done a masterful job in tricking the DOE. As is explained in table 5.1.5-4 on page 5.1.5-18 the way the injury fatality accidents were determined was by including all types of vehicles and as a state wide average value. Now Illinois has thousands of small sparsely populated towns and hundreds of miles
3 of roads with only country traffic. Yet these areas were used to lower the Illinois injury fatality accident rate considerably.

Such facts dealing with human life have to come from the area directly involved. Ninety-five percent of the SSC will be located in Kane County, Illinois. According to the State of Illinois Accident Records Division, and I have the phone number, in 1987 Kane County had 44 fatal accidents with 54 deaths. They also had 3,598 injury accidents with 5,447 injuries during 1987. These facts seem to be a contradiction to the facts given to the DOE by the State of Illinois. There are absolutely no mitigating strategies that can cope with the enormous increase in injuries and death created by building the SSC in the State of Illinois. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Our next scheduled commentator is Richard Laczynski followed by Karen Wiltsey.

872 STATEMENT OF RICHARD LACZYNSKI

MR. LACZYNSKI: My name is Richard Laczynski from St. Charles, Illinois. I would like to be on record as a licensed well building contractor until 1982 in the State of Illinois, licensed by the State and instrumental in several hundred wells being drilled in the Kane County area.

The EIS makes it very clear that the geology of the proposal Illinois site is not as simple and as ideal as we have been all led to believe.

Section 5.1.2-23 indicates that there is a hydraulic connection between surface waters the Illinois site and underlying aquifers. Furthermore, page 4-16 indicates that there is a porous -- flow in the glacial drift and the inner bedded sandstone sequences erupt. The solution and -- flow also occur in the carbonate and shale sequences. And because of the variable methodology of the glacial deposits they contain confined and unconfined conditions.

What does this all mean? Quite simply it means that the geology and groundwater patterns that exist at the Fox Valley site are very complex and varied. This is in direct contrast of what the public has been told by the Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources.

All that we have been ever told is that this 53-mile tunnel will be built and completely embedded within solid dolomite below the aquifers where people obtain their groundwater. The truth is that the geology of the Illinois site is extremely variable and complex because of the nature of the deposits that were laid down by the retreating glaciers many years ago.

Many peaks and valleys lay hidden beneath the surface while glacial drift lies above the underlying rocks in various thicknesses due to the uneven retreat of the glaciers. The EIS points out that this glacial material along with the dolomite and shale rock sequences are all connected because of the fractures and because of the porous -- of the material.

This causes groundwater to flow between the different layers of rock and actually creates a direct hydrology connected between surface water sources and other groundwater supplies. This means that two things can occur at the Illinois site that cannot occur at the other sites.

First of all any sediments or pollutants that the SSC may cause to be placed in our surface water sources could find their way to our groundwater through our water supplies. Secondly any radiation which may be transmitted through the tunnel walls could in effect reach our groundwater supplies because this dolomite is not completely nonporous.

I have had firsthand experience with us going into our neighborhood and drilling the water well and having phone calls come into our office indicating houses a block or farther away their water wells have clouded up because of our activity in the area. You scientist may say that such possibilities are remote and measures will be taken to eliminate them. However, the truth is that the Illinois site involves risk which need not to be taken. This hydrological effect does not exist at other sites, nor do people exist at these other sites.

The EIS states fairly clearly that dissolution or dissolving effect exist among the dolomite sequences of rock and that there is a flowing of water that occurs along existing fracture lines. It is a travesty that the proponents of this project have tried to hide the fact that groundwater does not move through the dolomite rock layers. We residents of the area have known it all along and because it is there where hundreds of our water wells are given us water supply.

In summation the EIS makes it very clear that the geology and hydrology of the Illinois site causes groundwater to flow between the different layers of rock and sediments and the overall glacial till. In fact a direct hydrological connection exist between surface waters and our groundwater supplies.

This condition only exist in Illinois and Michigan.

The possibility exist that thousands of people directly in the path of the Collider here in the Fox Valley could be adversely affected by the SSC project along with our water well supplies.

You gentlemen at the DOE have the moral obligation to place this machine among one of the other states where this possibility does not exist. Illinois is not the logical place for the SSC. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comment of Richard Laczynski will be included in the record as received by the Chair. The next scheduled commentator is Karen Wiltsey followed by Robert Whitehouse.

1146 STATEMENT OF KAREN WILTSEY

MS. WILTSEY: My name is Karen Wiltsey I live in Campton Township. Gentlemen, thank you for this opportunity to discuss the SSC draft Environmental Impact Statement with you. We have waited a long time.

1 The thesis that I present to you this evening is that the Illinois proposal is egregiously flawed. We know it. You know it. And even the officials of the State of Illinois know it.

This realization on the part of the Illinois officials is apparent when they disseminate selective information. They emphasize the benefits of the project and ignore disregard or worse yet deny the detrimental effects.

2 To substantiate this claim please direct your attention to Volume I, Figure 3-12, page 3-38. I would like to draw your attention to the C site. Yes, the Illinois proposal still has a C site. And it still looks like empty pasture. But in reality there are hundreds of homes in the C site with hundreds of people living there.

To those people Illinois officials say that future expansion area C will not be needed. While at the same time they continue to include the C site in their official proposal map. Throughout all the entire EIS appendices mention is made of changes in Illinois requirements due to the presence of Fermilab. And yet with regard to the C site no mention of this is made.

Appendix 58, page 114, C site is described as part of Aurora south of Fermilab zoned PDD and R1, Planned Development District and Residential. I ask you what is the status of the C site? If it is not apart of the plan then remove it from your maps. If it is to be taken at a later date then be honest with the citizens and the hundreds of families living there. Let them know that their homes are in jeopardy and also add 200 or more homes to the number of families relocated in the Illinois proposal.

3 I have just shown you an example of how Illinois is deceiving its citizens. You the DOE are also being deceived. Please examine Volume I, A4 section and A3 section. Note that Michigan and all the other states presented their land acquisition maps showing the size of all the parcels to be purchased fee simple and stratified fee estate.

Now look at the Illinois acquisition maps. You cannot tell the shape or the size of the affected parcels. This information is vital for a variety of reasons and Illinois has arrogantly chosen not to provide it.

4 In the next example of deception overt and covert tactics are employed. Please look at Volume I, Chapter 5, pages 5.1.4-5 through 5.1.4-11. A cursory reading of these maps might indicate that Illinois proposal regarding the number of human receptors does not fair too badly. However, a more careful reading will divulge a discrepancy between the Illinois key and the keys of all the other states. For all the other states conforming keys one dot means one residence. In Illinois key one dot is an isolated residence or a group of residences. For example the dot that represents my home represents 29 other homes. This overt deception is compounded with blatant lies. Almost all the dots on the Illinois maps actually represent subdivisions. Not isolated groups of residences. I urge you to check into this.

There are a myriad of other examples of deception. The CATCH president was accused of lying and spreading fear in the community when he estimated 95 truckloads of spoils per day would be on our
5 roads. But no public, nor for that matter private apology has been forthcoming when the DEIS was published and you printed a more accurate estimate of not 95 but 290 truckloads of spoils per day may be traveling to Cory 1 at MacCleen and 31.

CATCH Illinois has been crying foul since the site proposal was announced. I presented these
6 visible examples to you so that you will understand what the citizens of Illinois have had to contend with. As a member of CATCH I can tell you that our members are a cross section of fine upstanding citizens who have contributed their time, talent and resources to defeat this project.

In Illinois our resolve remains steadfast. It is my fervent prayer that you our esteemed panel and the other members of the DOE will reaffirm our belief in truth, justice and the respect for the
7 intelligence of the U.S. citizens. Do not champion this conspiracy to dupe the gullible and to discredit the honest by scientists and others who are prematurely viewing our beautiful Fox Valley with myopic vision. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: I next call Robert Whitehouse followed by Lawrence J. Calhan.

1147 STATEMENT OF ROBERT WHITEHOUSE

MR. WHITEHOUSE: Thank you. My name is Mr. Robert Whitehouse, St. Charles Township. I want to congratulate the DOE for a very impressive and fact-filled document. My concern this evening is similar
1 to that of the previous speaker. That the information provided to you by the State of Illinois is in fact faulty and you should proceed with caution in using their information.

We have a number of examples of this. For example the fact that there is only 320 wells that are going to be affected by this installation should be something that is verified. If you look at some of the site plans it is easy to see the fact that there are many houses in the area that are not on those site
2 plans all deriving their water from wells.

When this was originally planned statements were made that within a certain area the wells would be "controlled." What that meant by that was capped and shut off. But they were unwilling to be honest with the people involved.

In your report it indicates that Illinois is the most urbanized of all the sites. It has the most
3 naturally fertile soil cover. It is the most protected species of wildlife affected by this area. These are things you ought to consider in your Environmental Impact Statement relative to this site versus the other six. Sources of facts must be verified. The population and the unemployment figures
4 used in some of your tables imply a data base from 1984 or earlier. That information should be updated. There is no reason why we have to depend upon the information that is four years old. You talk about quarries being filled with the matter removed from the tunnels. What type of fill is this
5 going to be? We have heard stories of it being similar to concrete, a dust based item. Care has to be taken in transportation and storage of that, but it does not damage the ecology of the area.

A couple of general statements. There is a lot of information there how do you balance the data? How
6 do you compare the number of miles of roads versus the population effect, versus the cost of the collider, versus the number of jobs? There is no indication on which of these are the most important factors in your considerations.

Last, I believe throughout this activity for the last 12 months we have desperately needed an unemotional presentation of the facts. Everybody presents the facts distorted to represent a
7 preconceived idea. Not even the newspaper is capable of presenting information in an unbiased manner. Now is the time for people to come forward.

The Collider many people say if you catch the Collider it is like catching the flu. You can have it. I do not want it. Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. EIGUREN: Our next commentator is Lawrence J. Calhan followed by David Werdin.

1148 STATEMENT OF LAWRENCE J. CALHAN

MR. CALHAN: I would like to thank the board for giving us the opportunity to present our case to you. I am a local businessman for the last 20 years in the Fox Valley. I would like to bring up site 9 and F8. Appendix 16 which concerns the scientific and visual resource assessment fails to consider that E and F site which will actually effect individual site lines. For example, Section 16.3.2 identifies key viewing points along roads, railroads, bike paths where individuals will become annoyed if confronted continually having a view of the industrial yard nature of the compressor stations.

1 This Section of the draft EIS fails to indicate that the compressor station F8 will be located immediately adjacent to Randall Road, a main north south highway. Not only will this site be fully visible from all four sides, it will be located directed at the entrance to the newly developed Redgate

subdivision. How can the EIS fail to realize that this is a problem when it earlier states residential land uses are not visually compatible with the proposed project because of obvious functional and structural contrast between the project features and residences.

F8 will be constructed right in the midst of an area of estate homes. Logically side lines toward F8 would be measurable long-term negative impact and will be non mitigating. And yet the EIS very conveniently ignores this. This proposed F8 site happens to be the sites where the State Department of Energy and Natural Resources has purchased options on land in order to move the facility further away. The ENR has purchased an option on 10 acres of land at $20,000.00 per acre. Slightly further west from the north side of Bulkham Road. This new location for F8 is still in full view of Randall and Bulkham Roads and from the Redgate subdivision.

What the ENR apparently does not know is that the option land lies adjacent to a piece of property owned by Christ Community Church of St. Charles. Also this option site property is within 700 feet of another site owned by St. Patrick's Church of St. Charles. The Catholic church intends to begin construction on their new church next spring. While Christ Community Church has delayed their plans to
2 build until it is clear that the SSC project will go to Texas.

Whatever the outcome the EIS makes it perfectly clear that neither the EIS writers or the DOE is aware of potential mitigating SSC facility siting. They are once again unaware because the State ENR has failed to notify this situation.

How can an industrial complex be allowed to be built at the entrance to a residential subdivision,
3 adjacent to two churches, in full view of a major highway without the draft EIS mentioning in it. Does the ENR or the DOE feel this problem will simply go away by not drawing to it? This is totally an unacceptable location for your tank farm facility. Not only will it be an eyesore to everyone passing it, or living near it, but what about the noise. Are the church P.A. systems going to be abnormally loaded in order to compete with the drone of the compressor stations. Are the church windows to remain
4 closed forever? How can anyone be expected to attend church in an atmosphere that the DOE and the Collider are creating at this location?

Your failure to realize this situation exist in just another example of arrogance and unconcern for the quality of life that surrounds you. It is quite clear that all matters that you and your Collider
5 everything else is relegated to a level of insignificance. This cannot and will not be accepted.

The Fox Valley site is not a logical choice for the SSC project. Put it where Dr. Lederman originally planned for it to go, in the desert where it belongs. I thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Mr. Calhan, we did not get your address for the record.

MR. CALHAN: My address is St. Charles, 42 W 443 Meadow Lark Court, St. Charles, 60175.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. The next commentator is David Werdin followed by Judy Mastalski.

1149 STATEMENT OF DAVID WERDIN

MR. WERDIN: My name is David Werdin and my address is 2 S 540 Dobberman Road, Elbourne, Illinois, 60119. I am speaking tonight as an elected representative of township supervisor for the township of Kaneville. Kaneville Township is the most impacted township as far as above ground condemnation of land that there is in this entire save for the abort areas here on the east side.

It has been difficult these past months living in an area serving in a capacity where you try to represent everyone that elected you. Predominantly in my community there is nothing but the hope that
1 the SSC is not placed in Illinois. And there are very, very good reasons for that.

In case you do not know that and all of you that are here you all want the same things that we do. You want a home. You want to enjoy good food. You want to have a job. You want to have good water. And you want schools for your children. And you want everything that anybody on both sides of the aisles here want.

This project is no guarantee that it is going to be better. They have lied to us. They can lie to you. The situation as we see it in Kaneville is that it will segregate our township into two parcels
2 divided by a seven and a half mile long strip the minimum with the 1,300 feet wide and can extend wider. This will cripple the township as an existing functioning political body. It will reduce by eight to ten percent the tax revenues that we desperately need because we are a rural township. I
3 think too that it should be said that the prime ag land is my greatest concern. We are living in this

part of northern Illinois in a garden of Eden as far as land, climate, and the ability to raise and produce food. We seem to ignore that time and time again by having placed upon us federal projects which do not belong in this type of an environment.

The land use plan that I have worked on with the county for many years to get into place to have orderly growth to preserve the prime ag land is now cast aside in the spector of what will come should the SSC be placed here.

The emotional strain of the past few months is very telling on the people around me. It is telling on me. I am finding it difficult to talk rationally about it, because I am going to lose my home. The farm that I operate has been in the family of my wife for nearly 100 years. It has been active cultivation for probably close to 120-30 years. Today its productivity is as good or better than it was back then.

Man cannot produce a machine that can do what that soil will do. We have to preserve it. This is my major thrust. I feel incensed that after 64 years of living in this county and 60 some years on a farm that I am given five minutes to come up with appropriate answers that will impress you and impress people who are for this to see my side. But I am trying.

The health area in the future that may be caused by implanting into mother earth a magnetic ring at the depth of 300 to 400 feet is enormous in its chances of causing contamination. The ground level contaminants that are on roads, that are on fields, that are in the ditches from the salts and from the unburnt petroleum exhaust that will come in there when you have heavy surface rains during excavation have never even been addressed. If this is such a fool-proof system why has not the public health
4 service of both the State and Federal Government come up really publicly and endorsed this thing and alleviated a lot of the fears that are expressed. This has not been done that I have ever heard about.

I think that the surgeon general is willing to give testimony onto the evils of everything from bacon fat to everything else. But he has never made an announcement on this to my knowledge.

Right in the area fairly adjacent to my farm and my neighbors farms is a interaction chamber. I was particularly interested in this and I do not have the bible and verse of this. But one of the things that caught my eye is that this huge excavation will go down to the level of a tunnel at that point
5 some 350-360 feet. And if this is such a safe thing I was caught by one thing that said a 20-foot movable panel will be used to seal off the entrance chamber from the tunnel. This must be pretty hot stuff to have a 20-foot movable panel with air.

I would like to address too in closing this so called Illinois advantage of the Fermilab. The Fermilab 20 years ago was probably a mistake. But most of us did not know it. I lived on the edge of Fermilab for a good many years. And I knew all of the farmers that were displaced or nearly all of them and
6 some of them are my neighbors now. You go and talk to them you get a different picture. Yes we did haul balman out there. And there was a lot of truck driving jobs for that. But that has long since been forgotten. But the forgetfulness of the farms that these people loved has not been erased. And I have talked to a good many of them. This is going to happen again.

And if we use Fermilab as an excuse for annexing this on what about in 20 years. Are we going be able to deny then another new proposal because this one has outlived its usefulness. If so, the rest of you
7 are doomed to have your houses taken and your land taken. This is one of many, many reasons that I feel the SSC needs to be located in less populated areas, preferably the southwest. If the scientist are devoted to following the information they should be willing to go and use the benefit of science for all of mankind, including his environment. Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Our next commentator is Judy Mastalski followed by Glenn Mastalsky.

875 STATEMENT OF JUDY MASTALSKI

MS. MASTALSKI: Good evening. My name is Judy Mastalski and I live in Campton Township. As previously mentioned footnote G of Table 3-5 in page 3-30 indicates that in Illinois the number of affected parcels and ownerships may vary by as much as 20 percent and the number of relocations by 50 percent. As previously shown the true parcel count in Illinois is in excess of the 3,826 parcels numbered in the Illinois acquisition maps presented in Appendix 4.

1 With the parcel count still increasing day by day because of continued development the ownership count is also increasing day by day. But what about the 50-percent variation and relocations that the DOE expects. How do they account for that?

It is a major error of the EIS to allude to the fact that relocations may vary so greatly without ever explaining what you mean. Will relocations go down? Highly unlikely. Will relocations increase? This is very likely for three reasons. For one thing due to the increase in the parcel count and due
2 to the tremendous development that continues to occur throughout the Fox Valley we can prove that businesses and homes have already been built in proposed surface take areas since the time Illinois presented its site proposal. How could this happen? Very easily. The new owners of these parcels

were never aware that their property was being proposed as part of the Illinois site. Illinois presented its SSC proposal in September of 1987, but never divulged any specifics about that proposal until after January 19, 1988. When the DOE mandated that Illinois notify the public. The data presented to the DOE was all based upon 1986 tax maps. Checking with the Sid Well Company which prepares the tax maps you will find that 1986 maps show conditions as they existed on January 1, 1986. As a consequence numerous new parcel owners have unknowingly built homes and businesses in both surface take and underground easement areas simply because they did not know they were doing so.

The State ENR only notified people who were current owners as of January 1, 1986. Because those are the maps they used to compile their affected property owners list from. Those people or businesses who
3 have unknowingly built after early September 1987 when Illinois presented its proposal may have strong grounds for suing the State of Illinois or perhaps the DOE for failure to notify them in time for them to stop construction.

But what else may cause the Illinois parcel count and relocation counts to increase dramatically? Perhaps it is because Illinois altered the location as some of E, F, or J sites in order to move them out of nearby subdivisions. Perhaps what the DOE is saying is that those altered locations cannot in fact be made. Therefore many more people will lose their homes if the Illinois site is chosen.

Or perhaps the increased counts come from the fact the future expansion area C is described as including part of the city of Aurora. This my friends is the residential development area just south
4 of Fermilab. Also on page 114 of Appendix 5B this area is described as being zoned PDD, Plans Development District, with a small r-1, residential district. I guess 300 plus homes is small to the Illinois ENR and the DOE. The main point is that nowhere does the EIS indicate that this portion of area C is not required by the DOE.

Perhaps if Illinois were selected then and only then will we find out if these hundreds of homes and over 1,000 people will have to sacrifice themselves for the good of you inconsiderate scientist and the SSC.

Once again it is clear that the EIS does not clarify the issue of the SSC. It only continues to raise whole new questions.

In closing my husband and I moved out to this area because of its rural atmosphere yet the community
5 feeling that exist. We enjoy the peaceful serenity of our neighborhood which will change due to the fact that our home lives within eyesight and earshot of one of the proposed six acre helium factories. We have good neighbors. Fermilab is a good neighbor. Let's keep it that way. Site the SSC out of Illinois.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commentator is Glenn Mastalski followed by Donna Sero.

874 STATEMENT OF GLENN MASTALSKI

MR. MASTALSKI: My name is Glenn Mastalski. I live in Campton Township. I realize the knowledge to be gained from the Superconducting Super Collider's experiments can greatly aid all facets of life from medicine to military. But the SSC should not be cited here in Illinois.

Besides the strong negatives you have heard about the Illinois site here other states will feel much less of an impact on its environment and human receptors.

Table 3-6 shows Texas has 224 relocations. This is inaccurate and misleading because of the bulk of these relocations are due to the fact that people residing in a trailer park situated on the surface take area will have to move. They do not own the property in which they are being moved from. You cannot compare the inconvenient trailer home owner to those people in other states who must sell their land and home or businesses because of the SSC.

Paragraph 1 of Section 3.4.3 states that in Illinois the entire tunnel would be constructed by tunneling methods and dolomite below the water table. This is a blatant error or lie perpetrated by the Illinois ENR. In fact the tunnel happens to lie directly in the water table not below it. Information contained in the water survey material from the Illinois site proposal and from the Illinois Geological Survey Division clearly indicates that hundreds of wells in the region of the ring obtain their water supply directly from the same depth as the proposed tunnel. Using the logic of the EIS preparers does this mean that we are obtaining our water supply from below the water table. More logically it means that the Illinois ENR or the DOE are going to encounter more water in digging this water than they anticipate.

This again is a potential creator of lengthening tunnel construction time. In Table 3-6 impacts of constructing and operating the SSC on site alternatives it is shown that Illinois will in fact experience an increment increase in its regional overdraft groundwater supply situation due to the SSC. However, the EIS fails to indicate that an increase in a local overdraft situation will also occur.

All unincorporated regions west of the Fox River are on private wells. And due to extensive development many people have already experienced having their wells run dry this past summer. One subdivision, Deer Run, had six wells go dry in one week. This cannot be blamed upon the drought because these are wells that were 350 to 400 feet deep that had to be redrilled up to 700 feet deep into the underlying sandstone aquifer.

The addition of the SSC tunnel and its expected dramatic leakage as described on page 16 of Appendix 10 will automatically lead to many local overdraft underground areas around the ring. This fact is completely ignored by the EIS. Table 3-7 shows that Illinois will have the highest levels of TSP, total suspended particulate, near the E and F sites of all seven states under consideration. When this poor air quality is compiled with the fact that Illinois has the highest concentration of people near the E and F sites this adverse environmental impact takes on even greater significance. Illinois will have the worst air quality created by the SSC and the most number of human receptors to be adversely affected by it.

This is simply one more reason why Illinois density of population makes it the least desirable site. The Super Collider in Illinois would be a super mistake. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comment of Glenn Mastalsky will be included in the record as received by the moderator. Our next scheduled commentator is Donna Sero followed by Betty Stafford.

873 STATEMENT OF DONNA SERO

MS. SERO: Donna Sero, Campton Township. The EIS does little to accurately discuss the general opposition which exist toward the SSC project. There is absolutely nothing unique about the opposition here in Illinois. There also happens to be strong opposition to this DOE project in North Carolina and in Tennessee. Opposition is also beginning to form in Michigan. In fact wherever people are being asked to live above this experimental device people vehemently oppose it.

Little or no opposition has surfaced in Colorado because only 67 property owners are involved. Also none of those people are being asked to live above the tunnel. Instead the entire ring in Colorado is being purchased outright from owners. Opposition to the SSC is also lacking in Arizona or Texas because few if any people will be forced to live above the tunnel in those states. This can be verified by the fact that absolutely zero wells are expected to be closed at the Arizona site while only two wells will be closed in Texas. Table I-1, Volume I.

The State of Illinois and the local media have done a very poor job of describing the type of opposition at the extent of opposition that exist toward the SSC here in the Fox Valley. We opponents to this project have been labeled as unpatriotic or as standing in the way of progress. On more than one occasion we have been compared to Nazis or facists. I resent this. No one loves their country more than I. However, it is only those being forced to move or live above the SSC who have their human rights and constitutional rights violated. To describe those of us who have taken the initiative to stand up for our rights as Nazis or facists is unthinkable and down right assinine.

The media and proponents of the SSC project in Illinois should be chastised for their callousness and for not realizing the importance of wells being closed, of homes and businesses being confiscated, or of people being forced to live on top of a experimental device which is of questionable merit even within the scientific community.

The opponents to this project in Fox Valley do not stand alone. Nearly 40,000 men, women and children from this area opposing siting the SSC in Illinois. Every state where people will be forced to live above this monstrosity has people who are opposed to it. It is about time that the public in general realizes this. Whatever their reasons they quite frankly do not want to be part of a laboratory and they do not trust the government to provide them with all the facts.

I am quite sure that Cook County and the bulk of DuPage County residents are very happy that Fermilab was made the eastern campus rather than the western campus of the SSC. It is not a case of nimbyism on the part of the SSC opponents, it is more a case of the proponents basking in their knowledge that they are not physically involved. To say that opponents to the project are against progress is trite and unfair. We in general are not against the concept of the SSC. However, we are against blind progress and locating the SSC in Illinois is just that. This project need not be sited in Illinois. Do not assume that we the Fox Valley must necessarily be sacrificed for the good of all. This is simply not a worthy project that has but only one place to go. On the contrary there are six other sites available and at least four of them involve little disruption to the people living there.

Since the EIS indicates that little cost difference exist between the respective sites you, gentlemen, from the DOE must by necessity choose to locate the SSC where few or any lives will be potentially affected. This rules out Illinois being considered as a logical choice. In fact the humanitarian option rules out Illinois entirely.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comment of Donna Sero received by the moderator will be put in the record as received. Our next scheduled commentator is Betty Stafford followed by Lorraine M. Stahl.

878 STATEMENT OF BETTY STAFFORD

MS. STAFFORD: Thanks for the time and I hope it is the last time you will have to hear from me.

Please refer to Volume IV, Appendix 9, Noise and Vibration Assessments. There are several errors in Figure 9-20, Human Receptors Illinois SSC Site. You do not show St. Charles High School sitting directly on the ring near access site E9. See parcel site 339 and 341 on drawing PM-E3.

The school population is 2,600 students, teachers and staff daily. You also do not show Norris Recreation Center adjacent to the St. Charles High School which serves 1,000 people daily including a permanent staff of 75.

Figure 9-20 also omits Kaneland High School adjacent to the ring near site E6. There will be a marked increase in the population at the E9 site due to the construction of the Hunt Club, which has already begun unit one of 353 homes in the $300,000.00 to $400,000.00 range. Also construction has begun on the Royal Fox Golf Club and homes. This development consist of 400 townhouses and custom homes adjacent to the St. Charles High School. Both of these developments are within a half a mile of the E9 shaft. Attached to this is the plot for the Hunt Club only.

Again Figure 9-20 does not show DuPage County Airport on route 64 near service area F9. Landing and takeoff patterns pass directly over the Fox Chase Development area. I think you have under estimated the impact the noise of building this super nuisance will have in this E9 area.

A) General background noise of the home. Traffic to and from the high school along Dunham Road which intersects with Country Club Road. Noise from propeller and jet aircraft taking off and landing at DuPage Airport to which there are added two runways. Noise from jets passing directly over Fox Chase St. Charles High School area which are under O'Hare control at the 15 to 18,000 foot altitude.

There are occasions when these existing noises combine to produce intolerable levels of noise already. Table 9-2 states that we will be subjected to 60 dBA of additional noise during construction. Therefore you will exceed the federal highway administration noise abatement criteria for single family residences of 67 decibels.

This is intolerable for the residents and students in the E9 area. It is foolish to even contemplate any such construction as this in such a densely populated area. I will do everything I can politically and legally to prevent the building of this death ring in the Fox Valley. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comments of Betty Stafford of 77 Highgate, St. Charles, Illinois, 60174 will be put in the record. Included with the written statement is an attachment of a map as a recorded final subdivision plat. Next scheduled commentator is Lorraine M. Stahl followed by Carleen McFarlane.

877 STATEMENT OF LORRAINE STAHL

MS. STAHL: Hello, my name is Lorraine Stahl and I live in Campton Township. Thank you for allowing me to express my viewpoints of the Environmental Impact Statement.

While there are many reasons why Illinois is not the logical choice for the SSC I would like to focus my comments on just a few of these issues.

My first comment is in regards to the map of human receptors at the Illinois SSC site which seems to be a popular subject tonight. Appendix 9, Figure 9-20. Illinois appears to look favorable. Upon closer inspection, however, Illinois is the only state map that has a small dot representing groups of residences. Not just one residence. Did the Illinois ENR purposely draft the map in this manner to possibly mislead the DOE as to how many residences actually will be impacted? Does each dot represent 10 homes, or possibly 100 homes?

I believe the Illinois ENR was remiss in this manner and should have canvassed the area around the shafts in order to estimate the exact number of persons who will be subjected to noise levels above the EPA guidelines for noise impact analysis.

Also referring to Appendix 9, Section 914, page 71 in regards to noise levels. It states that quote, "Residential, commercial and industrial uses have higher background noise levels than do areas under agricultural use." It goes on to say that the impact of the SSC project activities will be less pronounced in the areas of development and more pronounced in the agricultural areas. To imply that residences and development already creates noise so therefore the SSC noise will not be noticeable is ludicrous. Why should we as homeowners directly impacted by this noise intrusion have to accept this logic? Pertaining to vibration assessments, Appendix 9, Section 9.2.3.3, page 84 the EIS states that Illinois has numerous farms, homes, subdivisions and industrial buildings within a radius of 600 feet which would feel severe vibrations from the blasting. I stress the word numerous. Not just a few as the other States have submitted. Therefore Illinois will have the most impacted property owners.

After studying the land acquisition plans, Appendix 4, Section 4.4.3, page 21 and 22, I found it rather peculiar that the St. Charles High School was not mentioned. In fact the St. Charles High School was omitted from the entire text of the EIS. And yet the SSC tunnel will go directly underneath the school and it will be in close proximity to the beam abort areas. Which is an area that has more likelihood of radioactivity being generated as diagramed in Appendix 10, Figure 10.1.2-7. Was this an oversight?

This high school has an enrollment of approximately 2,600 students and a faculty of approximately 200. Why do we place our children at risk for the sake of this scientific experiment?

Another reason why Illinois is not the logical choice for the SSC is the amount of opposition to this project. Referring to poor respondents received by the DOE as of mid May, Appendix 5, Section 5.3.10.2, Illinois sent the largest volume of letters opposing the project. Of the 1,389 letters sent 1,110 letters were against the SSC, 250 letters in favor, and 26 offered no opinions. 10C in comparison sent 72 letters and only four opposed this project. Does not this give the DOE and the State ENR the idea that we do not want the SSC in Illinois.

I commend the Governor of New York who at least listened to his constituents opposed to the project and then withdraw his state from the short list. Unlike our Governor.

Lastly I would like to comment on the personal impact of the SSC of myself and my family. We moved to St. Charles three years ago loving the tranquility and beauty this community offered. We used our hard earned savings to build our dream home on a secluded parcel of land and thought that we would be safe. Now three years later the State tells us that we will have to give up our land to the SSC project, have a cloud appear on our title and live on top of an experiment with so many unanswered issues.

This has caused us a great deal of apprehension and months of worry. I sincerely hope that you gentlemen also take these feelings and emotions into account when you make your final decision, and that is not to site the SSC in Illinois. Thank you for listening.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comment of Lorraine M. Stahl will be put in the record as received by the moderator. Our next scheduled commentator is Carleen McFarlane followed by Karen Smith.

876 STATEMENT OF CARLEEN McFARLANE

MS. McFARLANE: I am Carleen McFarlane I live in Campton Township. After reviewing the draft EIS statement I would like to bring out several brief but specific points showing the problems with siting the SSC here in Illinois. The references from the DEIS are noted after each statement in my written comments.

Some remnant prairie land loss is possible. Eight hundred and fifty acres of wetlands will be impacted in Illinois. This is the second largest amount of wetlands among the seven alternative sites. More acres of prime farmland are being removed from production in Illinois than in any other site. More property owners are involved in Illinois than in all other sites combined. More wells will be closed in Illinois than in all other states combined. More businesses will be closed or relocated in Illinois than in all other sites combined. Because of this Illinois has the most difficult land acquisition process of any site.

Illinois has a regional groundwater overdraft, but its groundwater usage exceeds the replenishment of supplies. Both direct and indirect water usage of the SSC will worsen the overdraft water supplies. More water channels cross the proposed ring at the Illinois site than any other. The Fox River is the largest surface water channel with the largest water shed area to cross the ring at any site. This means that the Illinois site has the highest probability for sultation of streams to occur. The presence of methane gas at the Illinois site will pose a tunneling construction problem. Groundwater leakage into the excess shaft and tunnel will be the greatest of all the sites. In fact the five mile stretch between E3 and E4 will leak at the rate of 5,200 gallons per minute per 100 feet, or nearly two billion gallons per day. This water problem should place the entire construction project in jeopardy.

The entire Fox Valley SSC site is covered by flood rate insurance maps and therefore shows the high probability for damage due to flooding. This is not true at other sites. The sedimentation ponds located at E and F shaft sites may or may not be large enough to hold the water long enough for adequate sedimentation. This could result in a measurable sediment impact on streams in the adjacent area. Sedimentation of our streams remains one of my major concerns.

The Illinois site has the largest number of people leaving adjacent to the proposed SSC facility sites, E, F and J sites. As a result more people in Illinois will be adversely impacted by noise pollution, air pollution, exposure to airborne radio nuclei, adverse visual impacts and noise and vibration impacts due to dynamiting than at any other site.

Illinois is the only site with and existing groundwater quality problem. Elevated levels of radium in our groundwater supplies. The surface water quality of the Illinois site is already the worst of the seven sites.

The air quality of the Illinois site is already the worst of the seven sites also. Ours is the only site which is in a region of nonattainment for both carbon monoxide and ozone levels. Only the Illinois site is located in an area that already has two sources contributing to an increase in the natural background radiation level. That is Fermilab and the Kerr McGee chemical plant. Illinois is already the site with the greatest number of potentially hazardous or toxic material sources.

Illinois shows the lowest levels of public services available at all seven sites. Our student teacher ratios are the worst. Our health care levels are the worst of any site. And our fire and police protection for DuPage, Kane and Kendall Counties are well below the national average.

The roads at the Illinois site are the most congested of all seven sites. And are the only roads subject to breakdowns in the flow of traffic. More travel time will be required to move from point to point around the ring in Illinois versus any other site.

Illinois is already the site with the greatest number of manmade sources of radioactivity. Illinois already has the highest levels of background noise adjacent to proposed E and F access shafts. Reduction in the number of spoils dump sites down to four quarries in Illinois creates a renewed problem of congestion, of truck traffic on all haul roads and at the dump sites themselves. As many as 290 truckloads of material may be traveling toward quarry number one on any given day. And quarry number one is on the corner of Route 31 and MacCleen.

There is a direct hydrological connection between the surface waters and groundwater supplies at the Illinois site. This creates the opportunity for our groundwater supplies to be adversely impacted by sultation or other pollutants entering our surface waters because of SSC construction or operations. The inclement Illinois winters can be expected to reduce the number of available working days and thereby increase tunnel construction time.

Because of the large number of human receptors at the Illinois site and their closeness to the SSC facilities a greater amount of mitigation changes will be required versus alternate sites. This equates to increase costs and increase construction time.

The presence of the largest and most organized local opposition to the SSC in Illinois is a problem in itself. Litigation against the State of Illinois and the U.S. Department of Energy can be expected to lengthen tunnel construction time in Illinois.

Illinois is the only site where land use patterns are expected to change to a higher level without the SSC. The Fox Valley site is moving from agricultural to residential or commercial. Only the Illinois site has alternative land uses. This opportunity cost is never taken into consideration in any economic assessments.

Finally the Illinois site has the most historical sites and the most prehistoric or archeological sites that may be adversely impacted by the SSC. Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comment of Carleen McFarlane will be included in the record as received by the moderator. The next scheduled commentator is Karen Smith followed by Richard Smith.

1152 STATEMENT OF KAREN SMITH

MS. SMITH: My name is Karen Smith. I reside in Campton Township and I qualify as an affected homeowner. My home title is one of the thousands that would be affected by the easement from the Super Collider and I am not happy about it.

1 I would like to focus on a few facts that some previous speakers have touched on. Item one, page 4-29 of the EIS admits that Illinois has the greatest number of human based receptors, otherwise known as people, close to project facilities. In other words Illinois has the largest number of people who will become annoyed with the visual and noise impacts provided by the SSC facilities, especially at the E, F and J sites.

2 Table 4-12 gives a comparison of concentrations of radio nuclei in service waters. Illinois did not include any information about this to the DOE. Are these concentrations high for Illinois? Without the information we and the DOE can only guess and we suggest that the State should provide some answers.

3 Table 4-13 shows that Illinois has an extremely high radium concentration in the groundwater at the site. Page 64 of Appendix 5b indicates that wells in excess of 1,000 feet deep are an important source of public water supplies. All of the major municipalities in the region except Elgin obtain portions of their water from these deep sources. And it is this deep source which has values for dissolved radium that exceed EPA standards and that standard be further exacerbated by this project. Table 4-14 on page 4-39 clearly shows that Illinois is already the site with the greatest number of sources of manmade radioactivity. For example the Illinois site is within a 50-mile radius of 10 nuclear powered electrical plants. This is not true at any other site and this number stands only to increase if Illinois Edison is not able to provide power through any other source.

Also page 68 of Appendix 5b indicates that the Illinois site has two sources which contribute to an increase in the natural background radiation levels. They are Fermilab for one and the Kerr McGee chemical plant in West Chicago. We sure do not need another one.

4 Illinois is already the site with the greatest number of potential hazardous and toxic material sources. Illinois is also the only site that already has the two above mentioned possible sources of hazardous or toxic materials within the perimeter of the ring. Adding a third source simply increases the risk of a potential accident occurring. Any insurance -- worth his salt would for sure give Illinois the highest insurance rates.

5 Illinois is the only site within a region that is designated as a non attainment for both ozone and carbon monoxide levels. In other words the region of influence cannot meet federal or state guidelines for air quality for both ozone and carbon monoxide. The addition of the SSC will only add to an already existing problem. Just because we already have to suffer the worst air of any site should we be subjected to a further reduction in quality? This does not represent logic or progress. Finally the total suspended particulate levels again at the local E, F and J sites in Illinois will exceed the national ambient air quality standards. This too is not acceptable when they are placed in residential settings.

We did not build our beautiful homes in a tranquil countryside to be situated next to industrial complexes and we are not going to take it lying down. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Ladies and gentlemen, our last three speakers are Richard Smith, Sandy Gullickson and Gene Stahl. We are going to take a 30-second break while we change tapes and recording system.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MR. EIGUREN: We will now resume the hearing. We are back on the record. Our next commentator is Richard Smith.

879 STATEMENT OF RICHARD SMITH

MR. SMITH: Gentlemen, my name is Richard Smith. I reside in Campton Township. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you tonight.

Page 112 of Appendix 7 discusses the subject of closing wells at the Illinois site. It mentions that as many as 1,500 wells actually exist within a quarter mile of the proposed ring alignment. It also indicates that 320 wells fall within a 1,000 foot path of the Collider ring. Well, surprise, surprise, both of those figures are inaccurate because they are based on conditions that were in effect on January 1, 1986.

The Illinois ENR has failed to update any of the affected parcel counts since that time. Who cares how many wells existed two and a half years ago? The only facts that are pertinent to us, the affected homeowners, and should be pertinent to you the DOE, are the number of wells that are within the ring, within the 1,000 feet now and how many of those will be closed.

1 We know for a fact that through actual well and home counts nearly 650 wells fall within the clutches of the SSC ring. Now you say how do we know that for a fact. I stand here in front of you as one of the affected homeowners. One of those phantom homeowners that the Illinois ENR does not want you to know about. We moved into our house on October 1st, 1987. We have lived there for well over a year now and we have yet to be notified officially by the State of Illinois or by the DOE that we are within the affected ring. Your updated plat maps in Volume IV, Appendix 4 indicate that our property is there. But you obviously do not know that we have been living there and drawing on our well for well over a year now. If that type of inaccuracy is inherent in the Environmental Impact Statement it is inexcusable and it shows that the Fox Valley site has been grossly misrepresented to the DOE.

Page 112 of Appendix 7 goes on to indicate that none of the wells within the 1,000-foot zone are municipal or large capacity wells. That is as far as they know. This too is wrong. Apparently Illinois forgot to tell the DOE about St. Charles well number 9 which happens to be located directly in the path of the Collider near Route 25 and Country Club Road. This well happens to be a major producer for the City of St. Charles. But the EIS apparently indicates that the DOE is unaware of its existence.

The EIS goes on to say that this problem of well closures will be of measurable impact on local water users and on water use patterns. Well a measurable impact is one that is classified as being of greatest importance to those who are affected. Hey, that is a great definition.

Therefore, the EIS writers view well closures as being extremely detrimental to local well users. Well if it is so detrimental why do they use their same wonderful logic to sum up the problem by saying that well closures will have a measurable beneficial impact on the overdrafted groundwater supply in the area. In other words they are telling us that in order to do away with the inadequate water supply, hey close down all the wells, no problem. Well, that seems slightly illogical to me. The loss of private wells is probably the number one reason why so many people are against the SSC project in

Illinois. That is why I am against it for one reason. And yet the EIS writers and the DOE tries to justify these closures by indicating that the net result will be an overall benefit to society and an overall benefit to people who may want to dig a well in the future.

Great they are going to benefit at the expense of the people who own wells now. It is a pretty callous approach if you ask me. It is just another example of what appears to be a cavalier approach in the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

I hope and pray that that is not actually the way that the DOE is looking at this situation. If they are, you know, we cannot allow this to continue. We live in what is admittedly an over litigious society. But sometimes litigation is the only way that responsible civilians, responsible citizens have any recourse to protect themselves and to protect their families and their property rights.

So you can anticipate that mitigation you speak about in the EIS will be followed by litigation if you choose Illinois as the preferred site. I think you should start concentrating on that right now and worry less about how you are going to grow trees around the tanks you want to put within a couple of hundred yards of my house. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comments of Richard Smith as received by the moderator will be included in the transcript hearing. The next scheduled commentator is Sandy Gullickson.

1153 STATEMENT OF SANDY GULLICKSON.

MS. GULLICKSON: My name is Sandy Gullickson. I live in Campton Township. Gentlemen, one of the major flaws of the EIS is that it is very subjective in its approach to some very basic problems. Many times it is evident that the writers involved used their personal subjective reasoning to obtain a very illogical solution to a problem. And in many instances a set of double standards resulted.

1 For example on page 5.1.10-7 the EIS writers indicate that and I quote, "The industrial yard character and large scale of the sector service areas, buildings and tank farms are incongruous with the character of residential neighborhoods and country residences." Just two sentences later though these same writers say and I quote, "Rural residential areas, however, are often associated without buildings or are near farmlands and pastures where utility sheds are not uncommon. Here the access areas will usually go unnoticed."

In one instance these tank farms are considered out of character and then suddenly the EIS writers reverse themselves and say they will go unnoticed. Which is it? Are they obnoxious looking or are they not? Why should it be left up to the writers or observers to determine which local areas are truly affected when it is obvious they do not have set standards upon which to judge or evaluate a decision.

2 As a result subjectivity becomes important and personal viewpoints play far too large a role in determining the fate of people who will be forced to live next to these tank farms. Writers or field observers cannot determine objectivity impact that local residents will experience living next to loud obnoxious looking tank farms. When field observers went to each shaft site area did they view each area under similar circumstances? Were sites in one state viewed during early spring when little or no plant growth appeared? Were others conducted when plant growth already limited sight lines? Were some viewed on cloudy days while others were viewed in full sunlight?

In any case without conditions being equal subjective reasoning come into play. And that has led to unfair and unequal evaluations. For example it should be clear to everyone that Illinois is the most heavily populated region now under consideration for the SSC. Numerous E, F and J sites happen to be
3 located right in the midst of residential areas. This is especially true at F7, E8, F8, E9, F2 and F4. The EIS writers indicate that there are definite problems associated with each of these shaft sites and their surrounding residential setting. But in each case they indicate that the situation is judged insignificant because it can supposedly be mitigated. I stress the word judged.

However, if you turn to the visual effect section for North Carolina you will find a completely similar set of circumstances which has resulted in totally different judgments. North Carolina also has E and F sites located in or near residential areas. They too are deemed potentially highly significant of
4 local nature. However, in this case the EIS writers judged that in three circumstances the problem cannot be mitigated. How could similar situations in two different states possibly be judged differently if it were not for the subjective reasoning of the observer teams in these two states?

Whatever the facts are this is but one example among many where the EIS loses credibility because of the subjective reasoning employed. When a project of this magnitude and scope can have the dramatic effect that it will on thousands of people there can be absolutely no room for valued judgments by those who are helping to determine the final site location.

5 Selection should be based upon fact and not viewpoints. The EIS writers and your DOE scientist very unscientific approach in choosing the SSC site is something which we residents of the Fox Valley are not going to tolerate. You can anticipate lawsuits being filed if you choose to place your project in our front yards, under our homes, next to our wells and under our schools.

I too would like you to take your project where it belongs. Out in the desert where Dr. Lederman originally planned for it to go. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commentator for this evening session is Gene Stahl.

880 STATEMENT OF GENE STAHL

MR. STAHL: Thank you. I know it has been a long day for everybody. I thank you for the opportunity to express my opinions on the EIS for Illinois.

During the course of today's hearings there have been many concerns voiced condemning the siting of the SSC in Illinois. I would also like to point out that of the correspondence sent to the DOE regarding the Illinois siting proposal 81 percent of the comments were against the plan. In addition the Illinois plan solicited 73 percent of all negative comments encompassing all seven sites.

I believe this reinforces the fact that the people of Illinois are very concerned about the viability and impact of this ill conceived project.

I would like to focus my comments tonight on two issues. The first issue is the macro view of the Illinois proposal, including the quality of the data provided and the unanswered questions this proposal raises. After reading the sections of the EIS concerning the Illinois siting it became obvious to me that this document is not conclusive. While the EIS identifies many issues it offers no solutions.

Today you have heard specific concerns over the water supply, noise levels, residential and business relocations, property values, safety, health and a multitude of other issues. Let me concentrate on just one area of concern. That being the water supply. Specifically the amount of water required by the operation of the SSC. As indicated in Section 5.2.3 of Volume I regarding the Illinois site and I quote, "A regional overdraft exist which would be incrementally increased by indirect water uses associated with the SSC in Illinois."

In Section 5.4 local water level decline and aquifer overdraft exist in Illinois. In Section 5.1.2.4, at the Illinois site the water level overdrafts impact would be measurable at the regional level and of a long-term consequence.

Based on water usage requirements detailed in Table 5.6-1, the SSC when operating will require over 1.3 billion gallons of water per year. This is the equivalent of water supply supporting an additional 36,000 people assuming 100 gallons per person per day. This is more than twice the population of St. Charles. This is not an insignificant amount.

Yet there are no solutions to this specific problem outlined in the EIS. Is surface water the answer? Is it every township and landowner for themselves when it comes to competing for the existing limited water supply? Does the State and DOE propose parking a tanker truck on my driveway? Or is this considered a nonissue with the State?

I ask the DOE and the State ENR how are you going to deal with the fact that the SSC will deplete existing wells? Is the State going to pipe surface water from Lake Michigan to the site? Is this cost considered in the budget? I believe the answer to these questions is no. I believe it is obvious that this lack of insight and planning is one of the many examples why the Illinois proposal is incomplete, misleading, and mismanaged. A plan that does not consider the consequences of its actions is not a plan at all. The Illinois site proposal is clearly a wish not a plan.

The primary reason the Illinois site proposal is the least attractive of the short list sites can be summarized in the following statement. The Illinois proposal adversely impacts more people than all six other sites combined. The Illinois proposal is not implementable. The risk it places on the substantial population in the vicinity of the siting far outweighs the prestige the State hopes to obtain by landing this project.

The second issue is on a personal level and the impact the Illinois siting will have on my family's quality of life. Since my house and property are square on the 1,000 foot easement required for the SSC I have an inherited a multitude of problems for which neither the DOE or State of Illinois have offered any viable solution. I ask the State and DOE to offer the following guarantees. Guarantee my property values will not depreciate and will continue to appreciate at fair market value. Guarantee the integrity of my water supply for both contaminates and volume. Guarantee there is no health risk associated with living on top of this experiment.

If you cannot make these guarantees how can you expect me to support this proposal. While I am all for projects to aid in the advancement of mankind I am not about to sacrifice my family for it.

In conclusion I am not about to go away. If for some political reason Illinois is chosen as the preferred site I will work through the judicial system to insure this project never gets under the ground. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes the list of registered commentators we had for this session. Is there anybody who has registered to speak before this panel who has not had the chance? There not being anyone in that particular circumstance on behalf of the Department of Energy, particularly the hearing panel, we do appreciate your attendance here. I personally want to thank you for your patience and your courtesy in helping us get through this hearing. It is obviously a very emotionally charged issue and it is one people feel very strongly about. It is emotionally also difficult for members of the panel up here to go through something like this. So we hope you understand that.

We thank you very much for your attendance. We will begin our hearings tomorrow morning at 9:00. There will be parallel hearings. We will once again be back here with this hearing panel at 9:00 in the gymnasium. The other panel will be in the auditorium again at 9:00. We will give you time to go again until 10:00 tomorrow evening.

In closing I do want to make one thing very clear and I stress this throughout. The record of NEPA proceedings are fundamentally important in terms of both decision making by the department and any ensuing litigation that may occur. So if you have additional comments that you want to put in the record it is imperative you do so. You may do that in writing. Again the address is available to you with the business card in the back. Or you may bring your written comments to us here tomorrow. The record closes on the 17th of October. With that I will formally conclude this the October 6, 1988 hearing on the DEIS for the SSC project in Aurora, Illinois. Thank you and goodnight.

(Whereupon, at 10:00 p.m., the panel recessed, to reconvene at 9:00 a.m., Friday, October 7, 1988.)

P RD SESSION

(October 7, 1988: 9:00 a.m.)

DR. TEMPLE: Good morning. It is just after 9:00 a.m. I want to welcome you to the Department of Energy's public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, EIS, for the Superconducting Super Collider, SSC.

My name is Ed Temple, and I am the Executive Director of the Department's SSC site task force. I am also the presiding official at this hearing. The purpose of my brief remarks is to tell you why we are all here. After my remarks I will ask our session moderator, Mr. Eiguren, to outline how we will conduct our meeting this morning.

The purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens an opportunity to comment in person on the Department's draft EIS on the SSC. This hearing is not your only opportunity. You may also send us your written comments, which should be postmarked by October 17, 1988. We want you to know that we are sincerely interested on hearing your comments on this document. And that each of your comments will be considered and responded to in the final EIS.

Let me refresh your memories regarding the SSC site selection process. In January, 1987, President Reagan's decision to proceed with the SSC was announced and construction funds were requested from Congress. In April, 1987 the Department issued an invitation for site proposals. We subsequently received 43 proposals and 36 of these were found to be qualified. These qualified proposals were forwarded to a joint committee of the National Academy of Sciences, The National Academy of Engineering for further evaluation.

Based on the criteria set forth in the invitation the academies recommended a Best Qualified List, sometimes called BQL, of eight sites to the department. One of these proposals was later withdrawn by the proposer. Following a review and verification of the academy's recommendations, Secretary Harrington announced the Best Qualified List, including the Illinois proposal, on January 19, 1988.

Three days later, on January 22, the DOE formally announced that it would develop an EIS on the proposed SSC. This followed an advance notice in an attempt to prepare an EIS, which had been issued in May of 1987. In February, 1988, we held scoping meetings in each of the seven states to obtain public comment on the nature and scope of the environmental issues to be considered in the EIS.

Scoping meetings were held here in Illinois in mid-February at the Fermilab auditorium. The DOE received approximately 2,100 comments on the scope of the EIS. These comments were considered in the preparation of the draft EIS. Following public hearings here and in the other six BQL states, we will develop a final EIS to be issued in December, 1988.

The draft EIS evaluates and compares four types of alternatives: Site alternatives, technical alternatives, programmatic alternatives and the no-action alternative. Site alternatives refer to consideration of the seven locations identified in the BQL. Technical alternatives meant possibly different technologies, different equipment or different facility configuration.

Programmatic alternatives addressed using other accelerators, international collaboration or project delay. And the no-action alternative meant the option not to construct the SSC. The draft EIS identifies and analyzes the potential environmental consequences expected to occur from siting, constructing and operating the SSC at the seven site alternatives. These sites are located in Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee and Texas.

The draft EIS provides as much information as possible at this stage of budget development regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed construction and operation of the SSC at each of the alternative sites. However, the DOE recognizes that further review under NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, is appropriate prior to beginning the actual construction and operation of the proposed SSC.

Accordingly, following the selection of a site for the proposed SSC, the DOE will prepare a supplement to the EIS to address in more detail the impacts of constructing and operating the proposed SSC at the selective site, and to identify other possible alternatives for mitigating these impacts.

Let me tell you a little bit about the draft EIS. This is a large document containing more than 4,000 pages. It is organized into four volumes. Volume I is entitled "Environmental Impact Statement." Volume II is the comment resolution document and is reserved for our response to public comments and for publication in the final EIS only.

Volume III describes the methodology for site selection. And Volume IV contains 16 appendices providing detailed presentations of technical information which back up the conclusions in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Comments received at this hearing will be used by DOE to prepare a final EIS to be issued this December. This document will identify the department's preferred site. No sooner than 30 days after the final EIS is distributed, the department will publish its record of decision, which will include the final site selection and complete the site selection process.

This morning we will use a professional moderator to assure a fair and orderly proceeding. Measures have been taken to permit the maximum opportunity for interested citizens to utilize this session for expressing their comments. We ask all participants in this morning's meeting to focus their comments on the draft EIS and to avoid or minimize statements aimed solely at expressing opposition or support for the State's proposal. While all comments will become part of the formal record of this proceeding, those specifically addressing the draft EIS will be most useful to DOE in preparing the final document.

As I noted earlier, in addition to this opportunity for oral comments, individuals may also provide written comments to the DOE. These should be postmarked by October 17, 1988, the end of the formal 45-day comment period, to insure that they will be considered in the preparation of the final EIS.

We will, however, consider comments received after that date to the extent possible. One final word on the role of the EIS and the site selection process. The National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, requires that environmental impacts be considered by federal decision makers in taking major federal actions with potential environmental consequences. And EIS is one of the methods used to do this analysis, provide for public comment and participation and to make the final decision that meets the NEPA requirements.

The EIS will be considered by the Secretary in making the site selection. I would like to thank you in advance for your interest and participation. Let me now introduce Mr. Roy Eiguren who will describe how we will conduct this morning's session.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Dr. Temple. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Roy Eiguren. I am an attorney in private practice with the law firm of Lindsay, Hart, Neil and Weigler, of Seattle, Portland, San Francisco and Boise. My practice and that of our law firm is heavily focused in the areas of environmental and energy law. Both in private practice as well as in prior governmental service I have had over a decade's worth of experience in either conducting or participating in a series of National Environmental Policy Act hearings such as the one we are conducting here today.

I have been retained by the Department of Energy as moderator for this and other hearings on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC project. In this role, I am not an advocate for or against the Department's proposed action, nor am I an employee of the Department. Rather, my single express purpose in this proceeding is to serve as an independent, unbiased objective individual to moderate the hearings.

I am to help to assure the Department of Energy to fully comply with the letter and spirit of the National -- the Federal and National Environmental Policy Act so as to allow all individuals, organizations a fair and equal opportunity to comment on the record relative to the Department's proposed action.

As Dr. Temple stated, the purpose of this hearing is to give all interested citizens the opportunity to comment on the record relative to the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed SSC project. In February, the Department conducted a series of scoping meetings, including one here in Illinois, to hear comments from individuals and organizations on what issues should be considered in the preparation of the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Now the Department has returned after preparing the draft EIS and is seeking comment from the public on the document itself. In particular, the Department is seeking specific comment on issues that members of the public feel are relevant and should be considered by the Department of Energy prior to finalizing the Environmental Impact Statement and selecting its preferred site for the SSC project.

I would like to indicate at the outset that this is a record proceeding. That is to say, everything that is being said at this as well as all the other hearings on the draft EIS are being recorded by a court reporter who is here in the front of the room. The court reporter will make a verbatim transcript of all comments received and submit that transcript to the Department of Energy for inclusion in the final record in this proceeding. The Secretary of Energy's decision on the SSC project will be based upon the information contained in the record.

At this time I would like to tell you what procedures we are going to follow this morning. And these are the same procedures that we followed in all the hearings conducted on the draft EIS not only here yesterday, but also in the other states. I am going to announce speakers working from a list provided to me by the Department of Energy. As I am sure most of you know, those individuals that wanted to had the opportunity to pre-register to comment. I had a list of pre-registered commenters and I will simply go down that list in the order within which they registered to comment.

Every individual will have up to five minutes within which to provide comment to us. At the end of five minutes, I will signal that your time has elapsed. Generally, and fairly liberal in terms of interpreting the five minute rule, but given the fact that we have had so many commenters in this proceeding we are adhering to it rather rigidly.

What I will do is I will just indicate that your time has elapsed and when I have done that I would ask that you bring your comments to a fairly rapid conclusion. If you have pre-registered to comment, we need to make sure that you have checked in at the registration table at the front so that we know that you are here.

As we stated earlier, as Dr. Temple stated earlier, the purpose of this hearing is to receive comment on the draft EIS. Accordingly your comments should be focused on the issues that are contained in the draft document. That is to say the environmental issues. I do reserve the right to ask individuals to focus on issues contained in the draft EIS if they wander from the topic of the session. My intent is not to limit remarks but rather to assure what comments you do provide to us are effective in achieving the objectives of the hearing.

As I have mentioned earlier, as I also indicated in all the hearings in this particular series, we are allowing any comment relative to SSC that people would like to make. But once again I reiterate the fact that this is an environmental document and the relevant comments are those dealing with the environmental effects of the proposed projects.

Written comment and oral comment are going to receive the same weight in this particular proceeding. Therefore, we would encourage you to submit written comment as well as written questions you may have about the project either before or after your presentation. If you have written comment or questions you can give them to me. I will include them in the record. If you have written comment or questions after today's hearing you may mail them to the Department of Energy at an address that is provided on a business card just like this that is available back at the registration table in the lobby.

As Dr. Temple mentioned, the record in this proceeding closes on October 17, so if you want to have your written comment considered by the Department, it must be postmarked by the 17th. Today's session here will run from 9 o'clock this morning up through 10 o'clock this evening. We are having parallel sessions, given the fact that there are so many people here in Illinois that want to comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The Department has made arrangements to do two things: one is to have parallel hearings, that is to say, a hearing here as well as in the auditorium in this building; and also to have two full days of hearings. This hearing panel at this point in time has pre-registered commenters up through 10 o'clock tonight. There is still additional room for commenters before the other panel and so if we do have any walk-in folks that would like to comment, you may do so simply by informing the registration, the people at the registration table out in the lobby.

Throughout the course of the hearing, we will take brief recesses, approximately one five-minute recess every hour to allow the court reporter to change tapes and to allow people to stand up and stretch.

We would ask that -- may as well speak about what you just heard. Unfortunately, the high school is unable to turn off the buzzer system, and so approximately every 40 minutes we are going to have a series of three buzzers that will go, as well as the fact that throughout the course of the hearing we may have some interruptions through the school's P.A. system. They are going to try to minimize that, but, unfortunately, there is simply no way to turn those devices off in this room.

The procedures that we follow in terms of public commenting is that we would ask that once your name is called to speak, we would like to have you come forward to the podium here in the front of the room, give us your name and address, and if you are speaking on behalf of an organization, please tell us the name of that organization and then once you have completed your introductions, I will start timing you -- again, you have five minutes.

The microphone system here -- there are several different ones there -- the key ones are the two that are actually on the podium itself. Those are plugged into the court reporter's recording system. The large microphone on the stand-up stand is the P.A. system microphone. So that is the one you need to talk into so everyone else can hear you.

I have been asked to make just a few brief announcements relative to the use of this facility. One is that the high school is a smoke-free building. Accordingly, no smoking is allowed within the high school. There is a snack bar for your use directly out in the lobby if you would like to either have a cup of coffee or a soft drink. Today we are holding a hearing during a regular school day at the high school, so there are students and faculty in attendance at other parts of the facility. We have been requested by the high school administration to request members of the public to restrict their use of the building to either this room, the auditorium or the lobby out in front.

The building will be open for the rest of the hearings today starting at 1:30 for the afternoon hearing and at 6:30 for this evening's hearing. We would like to thank the high school for the use of their facility here today.

Finally I would like to indicate that the members of the panel who are up with me at the front of the room: Dr. Ed Temple, who is Executive Director of the Department of Energy's SSC Site Selection Task Force; Dr. Roger Mayes and Dr. Jerry Nelsen, who are environmental specialists with the Department of Energy, are here expressly for the purpose of listening to public comment on the draft EIS.

They do reserve the right, as appropriate, to ask clarifying questions of commenters. They have been doing that throughout the course of these proceedings. Their purpose in doing so is to make sure that they fully understand the public comment as it is received so that we can build a complete record of your concerns relative to this particular project.

At this particular point in time, we are ready to commence the receipt of public testimony on the SSC project, and so for the record I would indicate that we are now beginning to receive public comment on October 7, 1988, in Aurora, Illinois. This is the series number --session F [sic] excuse me, in the public hearings being held here in Aurora, Illinois on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC project.

I will commence now with the calling of the pre-registered commenters. Our first scheduled commenter is Lorin Nevling, followed by Kristin Dean.

915 STATEMENT BY LORIN NEVLING

MR. NEVLING: I am Lorin Nevling and I have the privilege of being the chief of the Illinois Natural History Survey, a division of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, state of Illinois.

Since 1858 the survey has monitored the biotic resources of our state. Our long-standing concern of environmental issues as they relate to the plants, animals and habitat that this state places in the unique position to assemble information of the biological futures of the SSC site.

Since 1984 specialists from our staff have studied the effects that construction and operation of the SSC would have on the plants, animals and habitat in or near the proposed Illinois site. Extensive fieldwork by our highly trained staff [copy missing] support the Illinois geographic information system have enabled us to identify and characterize those areas that may be affected by construction and operation of the SSC in Illinois.

The breadth and quality of our natural history data provided to the Department of Energy are apparent in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. We believe they are unparalleled. We have examined the draft and find it to be an excellent document. We are pleased at our own conclusions that no prohibitive factors preclude locating the SSC in Illinois.

All are supported by the Impact Statement. More importantly, the Statement suggests that locating the SSC in Illinois may well provide the opportunity for enhancing the habitat of numerous species of plants and animals.

Our experience with the existing Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory supports this prediction. Written comments on the draft have been submitted to address technical issues and a few inconsistencies it contains. A few areas of the draft require clarification.

In this spirit and in order to present some additional information, I would like to address two matters: possible threats to the habitats of two species, specifically the Indiana bat and the prairie bush clover; and potential damage to the wetlands. The Illinois Department of Conservation will also comment on these matters.

Since the Impact Statement was released, scientists at the survey have conducted further fieldwork to determine if suitable habitat exists on the proposed site for the Indiana bat or the prairie bush clover. This work confirmed the previous assessment that no suitable habitat for either species occurs within the fee simple areas of the proposed site.

The Environmental Impact Statement properly notes that a number of wetland areas are found in the proposed site, but, and this is a very important point, no wetlands that have not been previously degraded by human activity lie within any of the surface sites outside of the campus area. The design, extent and location of the campus facilities will determine the degree to which the wetlands are perturbed, if at all.

Significantly, the larger series of wetlands within the site is located on the Fermilab property. Further, many of these wetlands are the product of innovative land management by Fermilab. The potential to mitigate impact on any wetland habitat clearly exists.

In summary our investigations indicate that although there may be transitory impacts on biological features during the construction phase of SSC, no substantive, lasting adverse effects during the operational phase are likely. Neither are adverse impacts likely to occur during decommission. As has been so ably demonstrated at Fermilab, a substantial improvement, an expansion of natural areas and wetlands could be realized.

Habitat expansion could lead to an increase in diversity of plants and animals inhabiting the area.

This conclusion is confirmed in the draft Environmental Impact Statement on the SSC. The Illinois Natural History Survey remains prepared to assist the Department of Energy on a continuing basis to assure that habitat enhancement and the retention of biodiversity are achieved during the periods of construction, operation and decommissioning. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comment of Lorin Nevling will be included in the record as received by the moderator. Our next scheduled commenter is Kristin Dean, followed by Charles Pajor, I believe it is. One brief comment and that is we would ask folks up in the bleachers move in and out of the bleachers only between commenters. It is terribly difficult down here to hear as it is if people are moving in and out of the bleachers. It is quite disruptive for us so we would appreciate your courtesy in following that one request. Kristin Dean.

1069 STATEMENT BY KRISTIN DEAN

MS. DEAN: Good morning, my name is Kristin Dean. I am from Chicago. I thank you for the opportunity to address you this morning. I am the director of an organization called SSC for Fermilab which is a genuine public/private partnership consisting of major corporate, institutional and academic leadership of the state along with officials of governments at all levels.

The enthusiasm and unanimity of opinion amongst these leaders about the importance of winning the SSC has made this effort an effective one. And I believe it is an enduring model of the sort of business-government cooperation that our times demand. If your Department chooses Illinois, I will be delighted to share with you a well-delineated list of commitments in areas of expertise that will considerably strengthen the massive construction and operation effort you will begin next year.

Last month my board decided that we would not subject you to hour upon hour of testimony from the area's business leadership. We could have paraded over 100 such leaders to urge you to consider our proposal. Instead we have asked many of our supporters to write to -- detailing both their responses to the EIS and their general feelings about our bid. Most of them sent their letters to me and I present their letters to you today for inclusion in the record.

But let me quickly summarize some of their thoughts. Several noted that the draft EIS revealed no environmental consequences presented by the Illinois ring location that could not be mitigated quickly and at reasonable cost to the Illinois taxpayer. Many praised the remarkable [copy missing] structure that is available to you in western DuPage and Kane Counties.

MR. EIGUREN: Kristin, just a second. I will not take that away from your time. Could we ask you to sit down in the bleachers, please. It is terribly disruptive. Thank you. Kristin, you may go ahead and proceed.

MS. DEAN: Thank you. As I was saying, many praised the remarkable [copy missing] structure that is available to you in western DuPage and Kane Counties. James O'Connor, chairman of Commonwealth Edison notes in his letter that his company is "the only electric utility in the nation that has operating experience serving a load similar in nature to the SSC." The load he refers to is, of course, Fermilab.

Many of the corporate leaders noted the Chicago region's experience in major industrial and public works construction. Franklin Cole, chairman of the [copy missing] Corporation, points out that Chicago history and record of success in building large complicated projects is unrivaled. One need only look around the city from McCormick Place to Sears Tower to Amoco Oil to the new United Airlines terminal to recognize Chicago's leadership in construction.

Vernon Loucks, the chairman and CEO of Baxter Travenol remarks, "Our tunneling expertise has been demonstrated by the remarkable TARP project." The incentive package and our proposal which offers to build the SSC tunnel for DOE is backed by TARP's success.

Gerard Kenney of Kenney Construction Company, which just completed underground tunneling projects in both Illinois and Texas writes, "The advantage from a cost, schedule and quality analysis all indicate that Illinois should be selected as the site."

Illinois has the necessary trained and skilled work force, having just completed the Deep Tunnel Project. The work force is not available in Texas to complete in a timely fashion a project as large and complex as the SSC. Others noted the talent and expertise of the Chicago worker and the resource this level of skill represents for the Department. Several others point out that Fermilab itself was completed ahead of schedule and under budget--a rare occurrence in public construction and a history lesson we must pay attention to in these budget-conscious times.

Most writers focused on Fermilab and the terrific asset it represents to DOE, the scientific community and the American people. Many cited the savings the American taxpayer could enjoy by building the SSC at Fermilab, quoting the valuation study which my organization developed last year showing total savings of $3.2 billion. Many of these leaders feel that Fermi's talent would be dissipated and in spirit destroyed if the new instrument is built elsewhere.

The president of the University of Illinois, Stanley Eikenberry, noted that "The onus of closing down a major installation has never been welcomed by the U.S. government."

That -- can be effectively avoided by locating the SSC at the Fermilab site. There is a sense in the Chicago business community that locating the SSC at Fermilab is simply common sense and good business sense. We believe that the Federal government cannot expect business people to seriously enter into future partnerships with government if uneconomical and/or political considerations are going to hold sway on important national investments like the SSC. We applaud the aboveboard and completely non-political site process you have conducted this far. However, if the economies of Fermilab are not figured in that equation and it is located elsewhere, taxpayer enthusiasm of the SSC may well wane. Charles Shaw, one of the nation's top commercial builders points out that he has agreed to lead a public/private effort to build an international village at cost on the SSC grounds to house visiting scientists and dignitaries. He concludes that Chicago is a "can do" community. When we set our sights on a goal we get the job done.

Stan Cook, the president of the Tribune company, owner of the Chicago Tribune, WGN radio and television, and the Chicago Cubs writes, "Chicago has always been and continues to be America's frontier town, a fertile center of spirit and creativity where new and exciting new ideas come to life."

MR. EIGUREN: Kristin, your time has elapsed.

MS. DEAN: Okay. Many correspondents gave us their thoughts on the socio-economic and cultural advantages of the area. We are not building a machine for the machines. We are building a tool for human beings. And human beings have needs in their lives beyond the working hours.

Let me wrap this up and tell you that, in summary, I would like to say that I represent members of the corporate, academic, scientific, labor and government communities when I say that we want the SSC to be a successful national project as much as you do. We will do everything we can to help you see that this dream becomes a reality right here in the most logical home for the SSC, Fermilab.

MR. EIGUREN: Our next commenter is Charles Pajor, followed by Jim Anderson.

1070 STATEMENT BY CHARLES PAJOR

MR. PAJOR: I am a community relations coordinator for the city of Naperville. The city of Naperville is continuing in its support for the siting of the Superconducting Super Collider of Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory. There is no direct impact of the proposed SSC on the city of Naperville because the site information available at this time does place all aspects of the ring outside both the present boundaries and our planning area.

This does not mean though that the SSC will not have an effect on our community if it is located at Fermilab. Naperville has grown along the Illinois research and development corridor along Interstate 88. The attractiveness of our city to both residents and businesses is tied in many ways to the corridor; the corridor is tied to Fermilab. Siting the SSC at Fermilab will have a spinoff would have an impact on Naperville because it would mean employment opportunities at the facility itself and in industries that would be attracted to our area because of the SSC.

Doubts about the future of Fermilab if the SSC is built elsewhere it would become doubts about the corridor and its well-being. While we would not necessarily become a ghost town without the SSC, there would be a negative economic impact. Naperville provides a positive advantage to siting the SSC at Fermilab because of our expanding housing market.

Our latest special census completed in August shows that we have added more than 4,000 housing units in the last two years, running from apartments to single family homes. Naperville has been a leader in the housing starts in the Chicago area for more than a decade. This growth allows our community to provide housing opportunities for both the temporary workers who will be involved in the construction of the SSC, and to the permanent staff that will work there when the facility begins operations.

Planning and concept meetings have been held on new residential developments that will provide thousands more growing units in the next decade. We have been and continue to plan for our growth. This expansion in our housing market will allow us to absorb the number of new workers that the SSC would attract to this area.

In conclusion, Fermilab has been a good neighbor to Naperville and we feel the SSC will also be a good neighbor. The SSC would provide positive economic impacts for our city and we in turn would provide housing opportunities and amenities for those who work on the project. The city of Naperville supports the siting of the Superconducting Super Collider at Fermilab. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comments by Charles Pajor will be included in the record as being received by the moderator. The next commenter is Jim Anderson followed by Owen Trimble.

1071 STATEMENT BY JIM ANDERSON

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you very much for this opportunity. I am Jim Anderson. I am Batavia Township supervisor. We were a family that was displaced by Fermilab some 20 years ago. I can understand the fears and the concerns of the CATCH organization. But I might add that our situation turned out very rosy. I can remember vividly the days preceding the ribbon cutting at the village of Weston. They were marked by demonstrations by those of us who had given up our property and included interviews and nightly reports on network news.

My family had lived in Batavia all our lives. My grandfather and father had run a hardware store in Batavia. I have known my mother was raised on a farm on Warrenville Road. We lived in town until in 1948 my parents built a new home on the acre on the corner of Wilson and Warrenville Road, on what is now the Fermilab property. We had about half of that property an orchard and garden.

My grandfather would leave the store every afternoon, weather permitting, to tend the garden. This was his heaven and he died of a heart attack while working in that garden.

Needless to say, when we found that the lab was coming to Batavia we could only eat crow. With much disappointment my parents bought their house back from the government for $1,000 and made arrangements to have it moved to a newly acquired lot on the east edge of town, which is by the new fire station.

On the day of the move, my father placed one of his pipes on the tongue of the moving rig. It was still sitting upright when the house was in its new location. On a new dry basement we would now have city sewer and water instead of septic and well. Some of the larger trees were moved to the new lot. Soon grass started to grow and fruit trees and new garden were put there.

Within a year or so it seemed like my parents had lived there all their lives. They were not snowbound or without power for days as in the country. It was an adjustment, but they were better off in the end.

As I look back, I realize we were not being very objective. We were looking after our own interests and maybe rightfully so. Now, though, the village of Weston is clean and neat; it was gradually becoming a slum back then. The farms have been replaced by attractive research facilities and wild prairie. Wildfowl and prairie animals now abound.

The farmers themselves have fared well. Many moved further west and bought many times the acreage that they originally had and prospered well. The lab did not destroy but added to and enhanced what was already there.

Fermi itself is one of the great research facilities of the world, delving into many fields such as cancer research. Over and above its original purpose.

We in the area have benefitted in many ways from increased fire protection all the way to seminars and lectures, not usually available away from major universities, and performing arts are in a convenient location at a fraction of the cost of commercial theaters.

Batavia has grown, sure. But we have gained a large industrial base to help keep taxes down. The green area of recreation and nature to the east and government cooperation in other areas. Without Fermi, our downtown would have gone the way of other industrial cities. We have growth, but it is very orderly and can, with continued proper planning, remain that way even within an enlarged facility. True, the SSC project will displace people and families. A lifelong dream seemingly may be ruined. What, though, is wrong with another bigger dream? One in which families who have lived as neighbors can move as neighbors to possibly a good location and better services.

The SSC project is not out to eat you out like a giant PacMan. Rather if it becomes a reality, cooperation will abound to help make your transition something other than a nightmare. The Batavia town board unanimously passed a resolution supporting the SSC. The citizens have voiced little or no opposition to this project because they realized that the SSC, like Fermilab, will become a great asset to our area.

We are looking forward very favorably to locating of this project in Illinois. As long as the SSC is to become a reality, and the monies are going to be spent, let us spend it in Illinois. Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Written comments of Mr. Anderson have previously been provided to the department. Next scheduled commenter is Owen Trimble, followed by Arthur R. Gottschalk.

881 STATEMENT BY OWEN TRIMBLE

MR. TRIMBLE: The name is Owen Trimble. I live approximately a mile north of the upper quadrant in Plato Center. And I am concerned about safety in the tunnel and access shafts, taxes and misinformation.

Up where I live a lot of methane gas is in the well shafts in my area. My third well had enough gas that I could flame it as it came out of the faucet. This would be a problem with the vertical shafts.

1 Does oxygen require vertical air shafts to protect the workers in the tunnel every 2,000 feet or so? Would they act as transponders to the digging mole? So the TVM could be directed towards them. If this were the case almost every land owner would have a hole with a pumping device and a service road to it. This would not be tolerated.

2 Taxes -- I am calling the SSC a great green tree of greed. People are so busy coveting this tree that they do not notice the forest is on fire. Our local and State government does not want to tell us the impact of the SSC. In fact, in some areas they do not tell the truth.

3 Your own report states Fermilab will not leave here if the SSC comes here -- does not come here. Being the cost of the SSC is the same whether or not Fermilab is used. People are not told in Batavia, Geneva and St. Charles that we are already overextending their water aquifers, and the SSC will compound this problem.

These cities will be forced to get Lake Michigan water and at guess whose cost. If the SSC uses up the water in the aquifers, they will use water out of the Fox River. This is in your own report.

4 Extra land maybe required south of Fermi. More land needed to build large temporary storage ponds for de-watering the vertical shafts in localized areas.

5 Basically a national lottery was created to fund and build this machine. And only half the states replied, because the other states mean that it should not be built.

6 There would be only one SSC. That means the other states will have totally lost their taxpayers' dollars. And this could amount to a sizable sum. How many tax dollars has the DOE spent so far and yet have to dig the first shovel full of dirt.

7 This state has not informed the public to the end cost to the taxpayers, State and local. Why does the State say about the SSC means jobs? This is a growing area without the SSC. Growing to the point that my local school district, Burlington Central, needs a new high school and a large addition to one of the grammar schools and funded. This means that the local taxes will be increased by one third, but a lot of the people cannot afford this.

8 We now have trailers for classrooms and next year we will loose all sports, drama, band and so on. And if the SSC comes here, I am so grateful to school your 800 children in the Batavia, Geneva and Aurora area. The county will have already built new schools with proper new tennis courts and swimming pools with bonds that have to be paid up by local taxes.

9 Kane County government will also supply extra police, fire department and buildings and equipment, and also extend its own government. Does this mean my neighbors and I will unknowingly give your children a better education in a new building while mine go to a trailer and get less?

10 Jobs very few people in this area of the ring are construction workers. That means a lot of workers who come from all over the state, the country, in fact, will come to Kane County. Like ants to a picnic, each will take their share of the green tree of greed and go back to their communities to spend it.

11 I got comments about the State buying up property at possible reduced values, even with the new law of 80 percent refund. This is still a loss to the land owners. They will raise taxes to cover Illinois share of construction, and this will grab the sales tax and generated by the SSC and place it in shoe boxes, and take all our tax dollars back to Springfield.

12 A poor job has been done to inform the public, but this is the public's fault for not getting involved, or trusting the judgment of the government officials they did not vote into office. America is so busy grasping at the green tree of greed that they will not notice until it is too late that the fires of taxation will consume them. We cannot afford more taxes. We need value for our money.

13 You the DOE, EIS can reverse this trend. Build the SSC in the cut and fill method in federal government lands. This would save taxpayers' money; a small amount of that savings could be used to advise and build local communities to welcome your people to build a total viable part of the United States. This would mean that SSC would be a good neighbor and a person to be trusted, not to take away the rights of others at the cost of the great green tree of greed. This would lead America into the 21st century as a stronger country, a country that can control its excessive waste. A country that other nations could look toward and admire. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Mr. Trimble, could we ask you to come back to the podium? We have a couple of clarifying questions we would like to ask if we could.

MR. NELSEN: Mr. Trimble, I would like to clarify the points you made about the location. You are a mile north of which access shaft, did you identify that?

14 MR. TRIMBLE: E8--I live up by the upper quadrant, off of Crawford Road, near Row B. The whole area has got methane gas. Now I did supply you with a couple of well drillers' addresses, telephone numbers, whatever, if you want to contact those people.

MR. NELSEN: Okay, that was what I was getting at.

15 MR. TRIMBLE: I have, how shall we say, been a victim of my own circumstance, moving into the area because I have drilled four wells to find good water. Any water. So water is a concern of mine. I have from dry wells to right now 700 foot well.

MR. NELSEN: Okay, that is fine. I wanted --

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Mr. Trimble. We will take one more commenter and then we will take a recess after that. I will remind members of the audience if you do have any particular questions of panelists during breaks, you can come up and visit with them and ask questions.

The next scheduled commenter is Arthur Gottschalk. Mr. Arthur Gottschalk? I would call Donna Dallesasse. I think we will go ahead and take our five minute recess now and resume at approximately 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

MR. EIGUREN: I would like to reconvene this public hearing on the draft EIS and the SSC project being held in Aurora, Illinois, on the 7th of October, 1988. Where we left off earlier, was at the 9:55 slot for this morning's session. Arthur Gottschalk? Next scheduled commenter is Darlene Violetto. Would you come forward to the podium, please and give us your name and address for the record?

1073 STATEMENT BY DARLENE VIOLETTO

MS. VIOLETTO: My name is Darlene Violetto. I am president of the Batavia Chamber of Commerce. My home address is 38W 253 Monterey, in Batavia.

The Batavia Chamber of Commerce is in full support of the SSC in Illinois. You gentlemen of the Department of Energy have to make a decision based upon what is best for the state and the SSC itself. The SSC is good for Illinois. The Batavia Chamber of Commerce wants the SSC and I want the SSC built in Illinois.

1 We are the best place, because what you are looking at in Illinois is quality. Illinois -- we are number one. I would like to address two issues regarding the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Number one, public support. The Batavia Chamber of Commerce petition drive that we carried out was a one day drive. We had 150 volunteers that day and they went door to door.

We received more than 4,000 signatures in support. Our biggest problem is finding people at home. We had no problem at all getting signatures.

2 The second issue regarding the draft Environmental Impact Statement, it did not address what happens to Fermi if the SSC goes elsewhere. Fermi becomes a second-rate facility, or worse it closes down. If it closes, we estimate a loss of 2200 jobs at Fermi, a loss of 22 indirect jobs created by Fermi. And a loss of $180 million of the annual budget.

3 Illinois has something to lose if the SSC goes elsewhere. That negative impact should be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commenter is Tom VanCleare followed by Rosemarie Dillon. Tom VanCleare? Is Tom VanCleare here? Rosemarie Dillon? Rosemarie Dillon? Tom Smith? Tom Smith? Jeff Schielke? Jeff Schielke? Richard Craig? Richard Craig? Frank Miller? Frank Miller? Howard Hammer? Howard Hammer? Albert D. McCoy?

MR. McCOY: I am here.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Going to have you step forward, sir, and give your name and address and the organization you are here on behalf of.

1074 STATEMENT BY ALBERT D. McCOY

MR. McCOY: Good morning, my name is Albert D. McCoy. I am here in behalf of the Greater Aurora Chamber of Commerce in support of the Superconducting Super Collider. I was also former mayor of the city of Aurora from 1965 until 1977, twelve years. At that time, the National Accelerator Lab decided on this location for its present facility.

Twenty-two years ago, the Atomic Energy Commission was in the same position as the Department of Energy is today. At this time in 1966, 22 years ago, final sites had been announced for the world's largest atom smasher. Discussions pro and con took place at public meetings throughout the Fox River Valley, as they should. Many of the same fears expressed in 1966 are the same here in 1988, about the Superconducting Super Collider. Mainly, water contamination, radiation, in case of war, would this be the first place to be bombed? Would men in the area become sterile?

Congestion, commonly called gridlock today, taking of land; however, at that time the Greater Aurora Chamber of Commerce, representing more than 800 members and the largest chamber in the project area, wholeheartedly --

/ MR. EIGUREN: That is just the buzzer system for the school. There will be another one in about two minutes and then another one.

MR. McCOY: Thank you. At that time in 1966 the Greater Aurora Chamber of Commerce wholeheartedly supported the project and again this year we are again wholeheartedly supporting the project for the Superconducting Super Collider.

The area from Oakbrook to Aurora has become a high tech research and science corridor of the world. We feel that the new facility would continue with the same type of project. I am presenting to you today a copy of the resolution approved by the Greater Aurora Chamber of Commerce supporting the construction of the Superconducting Super Collider here at the Fermilab location.

We feel that there will be an estimated savings of approximately $5 million in construction costs. I also would like to present to you the photo taken back on January 5, 1967, when the Fox Valley leaders here in this area met with the Atomic Energy Commission in Washington, when the formal announcement of the National Accelerator Project was given to the country. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Mr. McCoy, we did not get your address for the record, sir. I need that, if you would please give it.

MR. McCOY: 265 L-R-A, LRA Drive, Aurora, Illinois 60506.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

MR. McCOY: Thank you.

883 MR. EIGUREN: Received by Mr. McCoy for the record is a resolution from the Greater Aurora Chamber of Commerce, and attached to it is a photograph entitled, "Atomic Energy Commission, Meeting 1/5/67, Washington, D.C."

At this point, ladies and gentlemen, we are running considerably ahead of time. What I am going to do is take one walk-in registrant then I will go back to the top of the list and call those names of individuals whose name I called earlier and were not here.

At this time I would call Dennis E. Komes.

1075 STATEMENT BY DENNIS E. KOMES

MR. KOMES: I am Denny Komes, 621 Seneca Drive, Aurora, Illinois 60506. I am here on my own behalf as a private citizen.

/ I am a native of the area. My family roots go back to the land that is now Fermilab. I want to go on record as being 100 percent in favor of the SSC being located in Illinois. The SSC will improve the economy, bring jobs, bring research and enhance the growth of the high tech corridor.

When Fermilab was being considered for Illinois, I was opposed for all the same reasons I hear from the opponents to the SSC. Fermilab has been an asset to Illinois and the Fox Valley aesthetically as well as economically. The opponents of Fermilab, including me, were wrong, and I believe the opponents of SSC are wrong.

Fermilab has brought only positive to our area, and the SSC will bring only positive also. Time does not stand still. We either move forward or backward, progress or regress. Progress always involves a certain element of risk and the fear of change. We can not escape that part of life.

However, the positive scientific and economic impact of the SSC in our area make the risk worthwhile, and we will overcome our fears, as we did the fears of Fermilab. Bring the SSC to Illinois. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: We will go back to the hearing list and call names of individuals who had a prior time slot and were not here when I called their name. Arthur Gottschalk? Tom VanCleare? Rosemarie Dillon? Tom Smith? Jeff Schielke?

Sorry about that. You have your name and address for the record, sir? And any affiliation you may care to --?

1076 STATEMENT BY HON. JEFFREY SCHIELKE

MR. SCHIELKE: My name is Jeffrey Schielke, S-C-H-I-E-L-K-E, my address 101 North Island Avenue, Batavia, Illinois. I am currently sitting in my second four-year term as the mayor of the city of Batavia which is the home community of the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory.

It is my pleasure this morning to appear here before you and share some of the environmental experiences that our particular community has had with this facility, having been the home facility of Fermilab for the past 20-odd years.

Batavia, I think today, is in a very unique situation, in that our particular community has been the one that many of the other areas throughout the United States have come to visit. And the other areas research as to whether or not they would like to have the SSC in their particular region.

As a result of that, my particular office alone has had 62 separate contacts with either citizen groups, governmental agencies or newspaper reporters, TV networks, whatever, from all the other various portions of the country asking about what the Fermilab experience has been with Batavia.

I think people come to Batavia, Illinois, and they find the very different answer to what the Fermilab experience has been and what they are expecting to hear. In that I think they come to Batavia expecting to find that we will tell them that Fermilab has been a major economic impact in our particular community.

And I think from the historical standpoint we can not necessarily say that that is true. Our particular community today has an industrial park that is immediately adjacent to the north boundary of Fermilab, and in that industrial park they have about 80 industries. I am in total honesty with you today; I think I would be stretching the truth were I to tell you that all the 80 industries are located there because of their proximity to Fermilab.

However, I think what has been the real blessing that Fermilab has brought to Batavia is what we feel has been the strength of environmental protection which that particular facility has brought to our community. And when I say that Batavia, Illinois, today, I think would be a much bigger city, our problems as a community which would be much more complex, and despite any economic benefits which we could have got off the land which is now in the 6800 acre site that comprises the Fermilab Accelerator Laboratory. I think the vast majority of Batavia residents today are very thankful and appreciative that the Fermi facility is there.

Fermilab has been an outstanding neighbor to our community. In 20 years or better of life with it, it has never smoked, it has never smelled, it is never polluted, it has never forced us to be evacuated. Environmentally, it has provided us with very little, if any, negative impacts that we, as a community, can cite.

So today I think Batavia as a community shares the belief that Fermilab has had a very positive environmental impact. Our fear here today is and if the SSC is not brought to Illinois, and if this facility is not brought here, that someday perhaps the Fermi facility could go away, and that being the case I think a lot of Batavia would shudder at the idea that that 6800 acres could be opened for private development which could bring with it a lot of new problems of growth, traffic, people tapping into our water table, going into our sewer systems.

I think the adverse impact that would be created on Batavia by the SSC not coming or Fermilab eventually going away as a result of that step, could have a far more drastic impact on our community than probably any other thing that we could think of at the moment.

Fermilab has been the natural buffer in our community as far as prohibiting the westward expansion of the urbanized area coming out from Chicago, and as a result of that I think the citizens of our community really appreciate Fermilab.

The people who have worked there who have moved into our community have been outstanding citizens, they have all been very good contributors, and I think today that Batavia is very, very pleased to call itself the home community of Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, and we certainly -- I think the vast majority of the residents that I represent, and I have been the mayor of that community now for better than seven years -- are strongly in support of the SSC coming to Illinois and the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory. Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Moving forward the next commenter is Richard Craig. Richard Craig? Frank Miller? Frank Miller.

1077 STATEMENT BY FRANK MILLER

MR. MILLER: Good morning ladies and gentlemen. My name is Frank Miller. I reside at 534 Kingsway Drive in Aurora, Illinois. I am the chairman of the Kane County board and I am pleased to join you today to comment on the wide support the Superconducting Super Collider enjoys from the public sector in Kane County and surrounding areas.

As you know this project has generated considerable attention of this community, which is good. Information has been readily available to anyone who wants to have his questions answered or who wants to find out more about the SSC. The hearings you are conducting over the course of these two days are a part of that process.

As a public official, I appreciate what you are doing and I think you are taking the time to listen to what we have to say about the SSC and the Environmental Impact Statement.

The SSC in Illinois is a project that has attracted support never seen before for a public project. The entire Illinois congressional delegation, the General Assembly, both the Democratic and Republican Parties of Illinois, the Illinois AFL-CIO, and more than 200 business, labor, education, government and service organizations have endorsed the SSC.

It would be difficult to measure the number of people who belong to those groups. But it is safe to say that the number is considerable. Perhaps the most concrete evidence of the support the SSC has in Illinois is the legislation that was unanimously approved earlier this year by the State General Assembly and signed into law by Governor Thompson on August 24, 1988.

The fact that this bill gained unanimous approval is significant when you stop to consider the diversity of Illinois and how those interests are represented in the General Assembly.

From the major metropolitan areas of Chicago, the farming communities of downstate Illinois and the areas of southern Illinois, the legislators of those regions joined together to vote for the SSC bill. The SSC bill accomplishes four things, none of which we hope or think will have to be used.

In brief, as I am sure you are aware, the SSC bill contains safeguards for property values, tax revenues for local governments, farmland equity and insurance against building damage. I might add that even the Illinois Association of Realtors doubts that this bill is necessary, since it issued a formal opinion that property near a government facility, such as the SSC does not decline in value.

The Association said, if anything, that the value of the property goes up. I mentioned these facts today because the Environmental Impact Statement did not include them and I think they are important. They add to the list of the reasons why the SSC should be built in Illinois, here in the Fox Valley, at Fermilab.

Growth in this area is another issue of great concern to public officials, such as myself and the people we represent. A recent study said that among the [copy missing] surrounding Chicago, Kane County is growing the fastest of them all. Faster than even DuPage County, which has experienced tremendous growth in the 1980's. As a public official this is a matter of serious concern to me.

In my opinion, the SSC offers us a chance to control that growth, to shape it in a way that encourages economic development while maintaining the integrity of the community. Kane County and our neighbors have enjoyed the benefits of Fermilab for more than 20 years. It is a positive part of our lives.

Teachers from around the state and students from our schools have taken advantage of Fermilab and all that it has to offer. I can only imagine the things they will learn from the SSC in Illinois at Fermilab. For the sake of those students and their teachers and those who follow them, and for the future of this community, I agree with those who say the Environmental Impact Statement points to Illinois as the place to build the Superconducting Super Collider.

On behalf of the Kane County board, I thank you very much for the opportunity to add my comments to this process. I would also like to add that we have already submitted 26,124 petitions. Today I would like to submit an additional 12,566 giving us a total of 38,690 representing people who have signed petitions in support of locating the SSC in Illinois at Fermi Laboratory. And to whom should I present that box of petitions?

MR. EIGUREN: To me. We will receive for the record the petitions presented to us by Frank Miller and we will continue moving on down our witness list. Our next commenter is Howard Hammer. Howard Hammer? Steve Errede. Steve Errede? Patrick LaMaster? Patrick LaMaster? Mary Beth Striedl?

1078 STATEMENT BY MARY BETH STRIEDL

1 MS. STRIEDL: Good morning. Please bear with me. I am not a public speaker, but I am here because I have to save my home. My name is Mary Beth Striedl. My family and I live in Kaneville. We are one of the families that will be relocated if the SSC does -- is sited in Illinois. I had prepared a speech with many facts, but after sitting here yesterday for 12 hours like you gentlemen and knowing that you have been noting all these facts, I would like to hit on another subject.

First I would like to say I was here seven months ago and sat before you and listened to the speeches that the opposition gave you. I was very proud then and I am now. With the little time they have had to prepare for this they have given you very informative input to the SSC. And yesterday I am sure you noticed the amount of research that has been done on this project is mind-boggling.

We have done our homework thoroughly on the subject of the SSC and I hope when you gentlemen return to Washington, you will do your homework also. I think it is very ironic that we are telling you everything that is wrong with the EIS. You are the experts and you should be telling us the problems and
2 the health hazards involved in the SSC. But I cannot put the total blame on you, sirs, because you can only research the facts that have been given to you by each state.

And, obviously, the State of Illinois has not been upfront with all the facts. The opposition to the SSC yesterday were all from various walks of life, -- blue collar, white collar, farmers to executive, rich and poor, employed and unemployed -- and they handled themselves with class.

On the other hand, the proponents for the SSC yesterday were basically uninformed union workers, or should I say non-workers -- will be taken for this project. Last night they did not have the courtesy like they do today or intelligence to let a child speak uninterrupted. Yet, these children are aware of the impact of this project. Could you -- they know exactly what is going to happen to their lives in the community if this does go through.

As you know, not one of those union members last night or today have gotten up to speak. Could it be because they have no true knowledge of the SSC and its effect, be it negative or positive. And what about our children, sir, what impact in the long run will this have? Do you think as parents we enjoy
3 putting our children through this? If you do, you are totally wrong.

Most of the children in Kaneville have been born and raised there. For that matter, most of the parents have been born, if not in Kaneville, in the surrounding areas. We are not transients. We helped build our community and we have roots in our community and we love our community.

As many have stated before, you will have to physically force us from our homes if you dare site this farce of a project in Illinois. And if you pick Illinois as the site we will know that dirty politics is the only fair playing a part in siting the SSC here. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: We are running about 20 minutes ahead of schedule this morning, so we will be able to take one more walk-in registrant. Marjorie Hartford Anderson.

1082 [illegible]

[illegible]

2 You folks have it down as a possible place to dump stuff. My parents, my grandparents, my great-great-grandparents, my dead sister are all in Jericho cemetery. I put a plaque there to mark it as the first place in Sugar Grove Township to have a church. And I paid for most of it. I used the money that was given when my mother died.

3 I am very upset about this and I believe union people have a right, but really I do not think this is fair. They want to take our land and our hopes and our kids' futures and sell them for some jobs when we have no shortage of jobs. Now if that is fair I can not do anything about it and I was afraid I would cry if I said anything.

MR. EIGUREN: I am going to go to the top of our speaker's list for this morning and call those names of individuals that had prior time slots and were not here when I called their name. Arthur Gottschalk? Tom VanCleare? Rosemarie Dillon? Tom Smith? Richard Craig? Howard Hammer? Steve Errede? Patrick LaMaster? They are still not here so we will now resume, move it down the pre-registered list -- Mark Frech?

911 STATEMENT BY MARK FRECH

MR. FRECH: Good morning. I am Mark Frech. And I am the Director of the Illinois Department of Conservation. We are responsible -- we are the state agency responsible -- for the preservation, conservation and enhancement of Illinois' vast natural resources and providing outdoor recreational opportunity for our citizens.

Our Department manages over 365,000 acres of land, including state parks, conservation areas, state forests and nature preserves. We also provide fishery, forestry and wildlife management assistance on public and private lands. We interpret the natural resources, conduct hunting, boating, trapping, snowmobiling education and safety classes and enforce conservation-related regulations.

We review all federal and state permit applications, environmental impact statements, and provide appropriate comments and recommendations to federal, state and local agencies. In this context Conservation has reviewed the Department of Energy's August, 1988, draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Generally, from an environmental perspective, it provides some excellent information. During our review, we did, however, note several technical inaccuracies, omissions, etc. The State's written comments to the Department of Energy will elaborate on these items.

Based on our knowledge of the site, the environmental information presented in the draft EIS and our participation in the project to this date, it is still our opinion that from a Department perspective the SSC can be constructed and operated in full accordance with all environmental regulations and with minimal environmental impacts.

For these reasons, the Department of Conservation continues to support locating the SSC project in Illinois. Further, the State of Illinois is committed to employing design and construction measures that will avoid and/or minimize any environmental impacts.

And finally, where impacts do occur, they will be mitigated to the fullest extent possible. Relative to environmental impacts, the media releases that we have seen in the summary of the draft EIS are misleading relative to the project's potential and actual impact on Illinois' wetlands and on threatening endangered species.

To clear up these misconceptions, I have asked several of my staff to discuss these items in detail with you today. Immediately following my presentation, Mark Hubbell, who is the department's wetland coordinator, will discuss impacts to Illinois' wetlands. And later this afternoon, our supervisor for our natural heritage division, Mr. Carl Becker will discuss impacts on threatening endangered species, with special reference to the prairie bush clover and the Indiana bat.

The Department appreciates the opportunity to participate in this public hearing and we look forward to the consummation of the site selection process in November. Should Illinois be selected as the site for the SSC, its development will be a high priority for the Department of Conservation.

Consistent with our responsibilities of protection, and enhancement of the fish, wildlife and recreational resources, the Department will cooperate fully with the Department of Energy in the implementation of this important project. Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment. We look forward to your decision.

MR. EIGUREN: Our next scheduled commenter is Marvin Hubbell.

225-775 88 - 6 (BOOK 11)

912 STATEMENT BY MARVIN HUBBELL

MR. HUBBELL: Good morning, my name is Marvin Hubbell. I am the wetlands program administrator for the Illinois Department of Conservation. My address is 524 South 2nd Street, Springfield, Illinois.

As the wetlands program --

MR. EIGUREN: Sir, tip the mike up a little bit --the other way. Thank you.

MR. HUBBELL: As the wetlands program administrator for the Department of Conservation it is my responsibility to develop a statewide wetlands protection program. As part of that program I am also responsible for the conducting of the Illinois portion of the National Wetlands Inventory. The National Wetlands Inventory has been completed for the SSC project area. It was finished in 1985.

The inventory has been digitized, mounted on a state's geographical information system, and therefore, allows us to make an evaluation of the potential impacts of this project.

Based upon those maps and site visits, we estimate that there are approximately 1,029 acres of wetlands within the SSC project area. Of that approximately 189.6 acres or 18.4 percent of those wetlands fall to possible construction footprints of the SSC project. Of these 189.6 acres, only about 6.58 acres, or six-tenths of one percent are likely to be directly affected by construction activities.

These wetlands can be divided into two groups: those which have been altered by drainage, farming or construction activities in the past, and those which have not been previously altered.

Of these 6.58 acres of wetlands within the potential affected area, 5.69 or five and seven-tenths acres have previously been altered by activities. Less than one acre, or .89 tenths of one acre have not been previously altered, but have been impacted by sedimentation and other changes in surface water flows.

The additional 183 acres which have been identified are located in areas of potential future construction. Until such time as the location of facilities are finalized a complete assessment of whatever impacts might be made to the wetland resources are not possible.

As stated by Director Frech, the State of Illinois is committed to employing design and construction measures which will void and minimize environmental impacts, including the direct alteration or destruction of wetlands.

In addition, the construction of these activities will not result in the permanent alteration or disruption of surface water flows to the wetlands outside of construction footprints.

Based upon these comments, commitments and available resource data, I am confident that the proposed construction work for the SSC project will impact far less than the 850 acres identified in the earlier environmental assessment. In fact I anticipate the direct impacts to be only 6.5 acres, and of these 5.6 acres have been previously altered. Where impacts are not avoidable, full mitigation of wetland type and function will be accomplished. Thank you very much for the opportunity to --.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commenter is Michael Wiant. Michael Wiant.

1079 STATEMENT BY DR. MICHAEL WIANT

DR. WIANT: My name is Dr. Wiant. I am the curator of anthropology at the Illinois State Museum whose director, Dr. R. Bruce McMillan I represent at these proceedings.

The museum's role in Illinois' effort to host the Superconducting Super Collider is the identification and documentation of cultural and paleobiological sites, resources that are protected by a variety of laws and executive orders.

Specifically, we have searched historical documents, interviewed land owners and tenants, and conducted fieldwork throughout Illinois' proposed SSC site to identify cultural resources such as prehistoric and historic archeological sites, and historical and/or architecturally important standing structures, and paleobiological sites, locations where fossil bearing deposits are found.

We have continued our study since we submitted information for the Environmental Impact Statement, and I would like to take this opportunity to provide you with an update of our investigations.

To date we have examined approximately 60 percent of the land that would be affected by the construction and operation of the proposed SSC, including land affected by proposed upgrades of local infrastructure and other activities that will facilitate this project.

In addition, in an effort to maximize the flexibility of Illinois' site, if some design changes are required, we have examined buffered areas around the side of each proposed SSC facility. We have documented 79 prehistoric and 11 historical archeological sites in areas that may be affected by the SSC construction and operation. In addition our research indicates that there may be as many as 79 potential historical sites, which are locations where historically documented structures are no longer standing.

We cosponsored an architectural survey of standing structures in unincorporated areas of Kane, Kendall and DuPage counties in cooperation with the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, hereafter referred to as I.H.P.A., and the Kane County Development Department. A total of 185 pre-1945 structures were identified and their architectural character documented.

Cultural resources are protected by the provisions of several Federal laws, including section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended. This law also establishes criteria by which cultural properties are deemed significant.

A preliminary assessment of cultural resources documented thus far indicates that none of the archeological sites appears eligible for nomination in the National Register of Historic Places. Most of the prehistoric sites are spatially small scatters of stone artifacts representing short term occupations.

The historical archeological sites, mostly the remains of residential or farm structures, range in age from 1830 to the early 20th century. Documentation of the architectural character and the history of standing structures is [copy missing].

Cultural resource information gathered through the museum's efforts is forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Office, which is part of I.H.P.A. A final determination of the significance of all cultural resources is the responsibility of this agency.

If any site or structure is deemed significant, we will of course recommend avoidance of the property. Recognizing that avoidance is not always possible, the scientific and aesthetic value of cultural resources can be preserved by systematic investigation through excavation and detailed study.

Another alternative can be described as adaptive use. At the Fermilab standing structures have been used to house the laboratory's staff without significantly modifying the structure's architectural character.

The Illinois State Museum has also conducted a field survey and literature search for paleobiological resources in the SSC study area.

A total of 82 high probability areas, primarily bogs and natural depressions were visited. These sites were evaluated for their potential to produce paleoentological resources by examining natural and artificial outcrops. In addition sediment samples were collected and processed for microfaunal and macrofloral remains. Hand coring and mechanical hydraulic coring machine was used to investigate subsurface deposits.

During this survey six vertebrate sites and five [copy missing] sites were located in the study area. One 15 meter core from Nelson Lake that contains Pleistocene and Holocene vegetation record was collected. In addition we have two five meter cores from Spring and Island Lakes that contain a complex lacustrine record.

All potential construction areas within the corridor were assessed and sampled for paleobiological resources when possible. None were found to contain any paleobiological resources.

In closing, it is important to understand that the State of Illinois, recognizing the value of its scientific resources, has made every effort to insure that significant cultural and paleobiological resources will not be unnecessarily disturbed or destroyed by construction and operation of the SSC. Although our efforts are not finished, judging from what we now know, construction and operation of the SSC will not seriously impact these valuable scientific resources. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Dr. Wiant, we have some clarifying questions we would like to ask you.

MR. NELSEN: Dr. Wiant, I had a question with regard to some of the studies you have done. Have you submitted any data or graph reports that would show the date or methodologies used or anything of that sort? Or are you submitting simply what you said?

DR. WIANT: I am submitting, -- the manuscript I have prepared has been submitted to you. I can certainly back it up with additional tables and documentation. It is certainly available.

MR. NELSEN: Fine, I am just asking if you are just adding some additional documentation of the data that you suggested.

DR. WIANT: I will forward it.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commenter is Mary Bushnell.

916 STATEMENT BY MARY BUSHNELL

MS. BUSHNELL: Good morning. My name is Mary Bushnell and I am speaking today as Chairman of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce Commission. The Commerce Commission is responsible for regulating investor-owned utilities in the State of Illinois, including the three utilities that will be serving the SSC at the Fermilab site: Commonwealth Edison Company for electricity, Northern Illinois Gas Company for natural gas and for telecommunications, Illinois Bell Telephone Company.

Each will provide its own technical comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement. I would like to highlight several items in the draft EIS that concern public utilities service at the SSC site. First the draft EIS points out, and I quote, "Commonwealth Edison currently serves Fermilab, whose electrical load is comparable to that expected from the SSC. The Fermilab pulsing load has reached peak values of 200 megawatts without causing system outages or instabilities. Thus, the necessary system capability may be thought to be essentially in place."

The draft EIS also correctly notes that Illinois is the only state among the final candidates that already has the necessary electrical generating capacity available for use by the SSC. This advantage means that the SSC will not depend on the approval and construction of additional facilities. Furthermore, only two miles of new power transmission lines will be needed to serve the SSC after construction is completed.

Second, the draft EIS points out for Illinois, and I quote, "The supply of natural gas to the region is considered to be far in excess of the demands either currently placed on the service network or expected to be placed on the network for many years."

Northern Illinois Gas Company's connections with four major interstate pipeline suppliers assures an adequate supply of economical natural gas for the SSC in a manner similar to the existing service to Fermilab. The company also has a large underground storage facility only a few miles southwest of the SSC site that is used to supply natural gas during periods of peak demand.

Third, the draft EIS points out and again I quote, "Illinois Bell Telephone Company can provide telecommunications service to the SSC project. Given the status of the current equipment, no new communication lines will need to be installed for the SSC." In other words, Illinois Bell's modern fiber-optic system is ready and able to serve the site of the SSC and no major additional expenditures are required.

In sum, all affected utilities have ample capacity to serve the Illinois SSC site with minimal environmental impact. In fact, only 6 acres of land will be required for all utilities' services to the SSC.

Moreover, the Illinois utilities can meet the demands of planning for growth as also discussed in the draft. The Illinois Commerce Commission in its regulatory role will continue to plan for and mandate the coordinated cost-effective expansion of the various utilities system to meet expected demand. Through the planning process already in place in the State of Illinois, adequate utilities services to projects such as the SSC are assured.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the Department of Energy for this opportunity to comment on the draft EIS on behalf of the Illinois Commerce Commission. The Commission stands ready to facilitate any additional specific Illinois utility plans and proposals for the SSC, to insure timely implementation of this important project for this state. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, we are now at the hour of 10:55. We are going to be in recess for five minutes and resume at 11:00.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

MR. EIGUREN: Ladies and gentlemen we are going to resume this public hearing held on October 7, 1988, Session Three, Aurora, Illinois. The hour is now 11:07 a.m. in the morning. We are going to continue on down our list of pre-registered speakers. We would ask if everyone would please take their seats so that we may resume?

At this point we have two additional commenters whose names I have not called. And a number of commenters who pre-registered whose names have been called earlier that are not here. I am going to go ahead and continue on down the list, but I would first ask that everyone please take their seats. Our next scheduled commenter is Stan Yonkauski, followed by Gary Wright.

1080 STATEMENT BY STAN YONKAUSKI

MR. YONKAUSKI: Good morning, my name is Stan Yonkauski, Y-O-N-K-A-U-S-K-I. I am the general counsel for the Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources. It has been our pleasure and our responsibility, the Department, to essentially lead the State's effort to have the SSC sited in Illinois. We have put together a team of 200 experts, many of whom you are listening to and hearing over the course of these two hearings.

And these experts and we have worked long and hard to put together what we believe is a good proposal, what we believe is actually the best proposal without a doubt for siting the SSC anywhere. In all of our effort to locate the SSC, the State has been forced into or assuming several different roles. We have taken on the role of proposer. We are suggesting to the DOE that the site be located or that the SSC be located here in Illinois. And as proposer we were given specific criteria by which we had to put together our proposal. We were given a template. We were given the specific size and location of the SSC.

The land requirements. We were given technical requirements. Mary Bushnell talked about the utilities required. We were giving information about geology and we provided back a proposal based on research, based on information that was developed and prepared by our staff and the staffs of the State Department and state contractors over approximately five years.

That expertise and that information is without a doubt the best of any state, the most reliable, the most in depth of any state that is suggesting that the SSC be located there. Proof of that is that Illinois made the BQL list. There were only eight that did, one dropped out.

A second role that we assume is as a representative of statewide interests. It is in this role that we chose to suggest that the SSC be located in Illinois. A review of the technical merits prior to the submission of the proposal and a review of the politics behind pursuing this project led us to believe that it was good for Illinois. That the jobs, the prestige to academia, the retention of Fermilab was important to the state of Illinois, important enough for us to pursue this project.

1 In our last role and perhaps our most important role, we have assumed the responsibility of representing the citizens in the area of the SSC.

MR. EIGUREN: We all have agreed -- we will not have that.

MR. YONKAUSKI: My cheering section has come out. As a representative of the citizens in this area, perhaps a small exception.

The Department has been responsible for making information available about the SSC. The staff of the Department has been making speeches in this area for three or four years. We have been meeting with government leaders at least for three years. We have been -- we have had opened a local office for two years. And we have recently, through the assistance and direction of local government leaders, the county boards developed a mitigation advisory task force, whose responsibility it is to advise the State on issues relating to the environmental impact of this area.

This task force will provide us information which we can forward to the Department of Energy on the environmental impacts that are important to the citizens who are aware of the SSC and who have taken the time to recognize the benefits and the potential costs of the SSC to this area.

We have also been responsible for legislation, legislation that has been described by -- I did not know that I was that much of a comedian. Chairman Frank Miller already described what we would call the SSC Good Neighbor Bill, which is legislation that was designed and passed without the assistance of our jeering green-clad neighbors here to mitigate some of the concerns of these specific people.

Now another role that we are assuming as representative of the area is to suggest some strategies for mitigation. It is logical to assume that a project of this size is going to have some invariable impacts. We can quibble over the numbers of wetlands, the numbers of wells, that kind of thing. We are providing information, specific information on that. I am not a technical expert in that area. We had technical experts presenting information on that.

But from a -- in a simplistic sense, the environmental impacts that are remaining that are not very specific stem from the surface uses of lands associated with the building of the SSC. If it is possible to eliminate or minimize some of the surface uses of the lands, it may be possible to eliminate
2 or minimize environmental impacts associated with this project.

Therefore, the State of Illinois would urge the Department of Energy review the land requirements for the SSC.

MR. EIGUREN: Stan, your time has elapsed.

MR. YONKAUSKI: Okay. That review has already taken place. Part of the process that we would like to have seen was the Department of Energy consider minimizing or eliminating land specifically in the western campus. A study by Leon Lederman and Mr. Tang indicate that the efficacy of a single campus that would be one possible solution.

Another one would be to eliminate portions of the western campus that would directly affect Kaneville. Is that effort that we are hoping the DOE to review.

Last, the SSC is an important project. It is a project that deserves our curiosity. It is a project that deserves our intellectual stimulation and deserves our intellectual attention. It is not, as CATCH would have us believe, welfare for the overeducated. It is a project that needs to be built and it is a project that is best built here in Illinois where it will be warmly welcome.

MR. EIGUREN: Stan, this just goes to prove that everyone loves a lawyer. I would like to move on now to Gary Wright. Gary Wright is our next commenter.

Folks, I really request that you would eliminate the heckling, at least give him an opportunity to give his comments, and you can do whatever you want when he is finished. Mr. Wright?

1081 STATEMENT BY GARY WRIGHT

MR. WRIGHT: Good morning. My name is Gary Wright. And I am the Senior Nuclear Engineer for the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety. The department's headquarters are located at 1035 Outer Park in Springfield, Illinois. The primary responsibility of the Department is the protection of Illinois citizens from the hazards of radiation.

The Department has participated as a member of the state's SSC task force since early 1984. During this period the Department has kept abreast of radiological issues relating to the construction and operation of the SSC. More recently, the Department has been actively involved in helping the state task force assess the environmental impact that would result from the construction and operation of the SSC.

This assessment included a thorough review of the projected radiological impact of the SSC as set forth in the draft Environmental Statement.

In order to assess the radiological impact, it is necessary to compare projected radiation exposure resulting from operation of the SSC against recognized safety standards. The primary standards-setting body in the U.S. is the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. U.S. EPA standards applicable to the SSC provide that no member of the general public shall receive a radiation dose equivalent of more that 100 milligrams annually.

Of that total no more than 25 milligrams per year can be due to radioactivity in air and no more than 4 milligrams per year may be due to radioactivity in water. These limits are consistent with State of Illinois standards. The design goal that has been set for the SSC limits radiation exposure to any member of the general public to a maximum of 10 milligram per year.

Now in order to place these dose levels in perspective, it is important to note that it is impossible to escape some exposure to radiation, since it is in the -- it occurs naturally in the air that we breathe, the soil we walk on, the food that we eat and the water that we drink. As well as from extra-terrestrial sources.

This natural background radiation averages some 300 milligrams of exposure per year in the United States, and the background exposure rates in Illinois are close to that national average.

There are three potential modes of radiation exposure to the public from operation of the SSC: Exposure to direct radiation, breathing contaminated air and drinking contaminated water. In Illinois, the primary ring will be located some 400 feet beneath the ground surface. This extensive amount of earth shielding provides significant protection from exposure to any direct radiation from the SSC.

The draft Environmental Impact Statement estimates that the maximum dose to any member of the public from the direct exposure mode in Illinois will be less than 0.001 milligrams. The total estimated worst case dose to any member of the general public in Illinois from all of these modes, is estimated to be 0.004 milligrams. This represents less than 1.000th of one percent of the dose received by members of the general public from just natural background radiation.

The Department found the draft Environmental Statement's analysis of the potential radiological impact to be both rigorous and thorough. The Department will be providing written comments to DOE regarding suggested changes for incorporation in the final statement.

However, those comments will not have any significant effect on the overall conclusions of the analysis. Based on our review of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, as well as other documents relating to the design, construction and operation of the SSC, the Illinois Department of Safety concludes that it is unlikely that any member of the general public in Illinois will receive any measurable radiation exposure from operation of the SSC. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes our list of pre-registered commenters. I am going to go back to the top of the list and call those individuals that were pre-registered that were not here earlier. This will be the fourth time I have called these names. Arthur R. Gottschalk, Tom VanCleare, Rosemarie Dillon, Tom Smith, Richard Craig, Howard Hammer, Steve Errede, Patrick LaMaster.

1082 STATEMENT BY PATRICK LA MASTER

MR. LaMASTER: My name is Patrick LaMaster and I teach physics at the Illinois Math and Science Academy. I have also taught at Naperville Central High School and at West Chicago Community High School. My interest in the environmental impact is basically how it is going to affect the educational environment in this area.

1 And I see the SSC as being commissioned as a tool to teach us something. And I hope that it is understood that this educational preciousness is very far-reaching. Beyond those people that touch the machine, there are people that come to see things that happen there and people that can learn through programs that will offer.

I hope it is located somewhere where it has as many people available to touch it and learn from it as possible. I am not sure of the other sites, but I know that in this area there is an extensive network of teachers who meet, I know, in terms of physics teachers, that meet on a regular basis and try to provide for their students the maximum educational possibilities available to them.

I know in terms of physics that there are three groups in this area: Physics West meets once a month, Physics Northwest and the Chicago section of the APT. Once a year all three of those groups gets together in an evening to sit around and have pizza and talk about things. And usually we have upwards of 120 physics teachers that get together, which represents approximately 25 percent of those that would attend the national meeting of physics education. So you can see that science education in this area is very important.

I know other disciplines such as chemistry and biology have similar turnouts. Just one week ago today Illinois held the Illinois Science Teachers Association Meeting. Had more than 4,000 science teachers
2 meet. Annually the national science teachers convention draws approximately 9-10,000. So you can see that Illinois is very much involved in science education.

Fermilab presently offers upwards of 30 different educational programs that affect students from all ages and all interests. In terms of how I use it, I have attended workshops that they have provided. I am able to call up people over there and if they are doing something my students might find interesting, they will arrange tours for them to come and visit, see what is going on. I also have had some gifted students that I have been able to arrange mentorships with people that have worked there and have been very pleased with their willingness to work with my students.

Fermilab and the SSC are a very different sort of phenomenon in this area. We are very lucky to have so many high tech resources along the I-88 corridor that support education. Fermilab is different in that it is not for people to build a better mousetrap or to have patents. It is a very open environment. I have always found that the people that work there very willing to bend over backward to help myself and my students to get the most we can out of what we are interested in.

In conclusion, I would just like to say that when you decide to place it somewhere you think about that. That it is not placed out in the middle of a desert, where no one will come to see it and students will not have the opportunity to see and feel and touch science, that they will only find out what goes on there by reading about it in books. I would be very pleased to have it located in this area because we have so many students that could benefit from it. And it has such a tremendous impact on what we do as teachers. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: That completes our list of scheduled commenters for this morning's session. I ask the question, is there anyone who is pre-registered to comment before this hearing panel that has not had the opportunity to comment?

There not being anyone in that particular circumstance, and given the fact that we have committed to be here until noon today, I am going to go ahead and recess this morning session subject to the call of the moderator. In the event that we have someone that is pre-registered that does show up before noon we will reconvene. If we do not have anyone appear that is pre-registered, we will recommence or restart this hearing at 2 p.m. in this gymnasium this afternoon. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

MR. EIGUREN: It is now 11:35 a.m. on October 7, 1988, and we are reconvening our morning hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement on the SSC project. As we mentioned before we went off the record, we had called four times the names of all pre-registered commenters and took all those individuals who were here for inclusion on the record. At this point, we have two additional commenters, one pre-registered and one walk-in who requested the opportunity to comment on the DEIS before the hearing panel. So with that we will resume the receipt of public comment on the DEIS and we will first call our walk-in registrant, Brian Cross.

1083 STATEMENT BY BRIAN CROSS

MR. CROSS: Hello, my name is Brian Cross. I live at 1100 Chelsea Lane in Aurora. I came last night only to listen, but then felt compelled to take the day off and comment on this. I cannot help but notice in looking over the list of speakers that they are all from a very small area in the SSC site. I live near here in one of the underground easement areas.

We have 12,000 people who live in the Fox Valley Villages area of Aurora, which surrounds the school. Almost all of it is underground easement area. And I am the only one from that area who showed up. I think that shows their level of concern over the SSC: that in probably the area that represents the most populational [sic] site only one person shows up.

1 CATCH claims to represent thousands of people, but I think at best they had 200 people last night. My impression is that there--the opposition is much more shallow than they would like to make it appear. They repetitively used water shortages as the primary reason for opposing the Illinois SSC, but then recommend siting in a desert. That does not make any sense to me.

I think the people are confused because the desert is so harsh, they think it is a sturdy ecology. But if you go into a desert, and turn over a shovel full of dirt, you can come back years later and the hole will still be there. You do that in the Midwest and three days later the hole will be gone. The Midwest ecology is the sturdiest on the continent, and the desert ecologies are the weakest.

2 Another environmental issue that needs to be considered in the EIS is the impact of not placing the SSC here. It is unrealistic to believe that there will be funding for two large institutions like this. I can not help believe that Fermilab will close if the SSC goes elsewhere.

Fermilab is in reality the largest park in northern Illinois. On any weekend it appears to be the most used public recreation facility in the area. I often take my children and guests there. Fermilab has Illinois' largest Canadian goose population, and an ornithologist I met there has sighted 215 of Illinois' 305 species of birds, neither [sic] of them threatened or endangered.

3 All of this with the concurrently operating accelerator and a construction which is always going on at that site. The land locked up in this lab is not lost but instead it is preserved. When I went to the February scoping meeting at Fermilab, I went to the CATCH table to see what I could learn from them. When I walked up, Bill Tardy, who is head of the opposition was being coached by a man, who I learned later on that evening was a professor of physics at Michigan State University, and supporter of the Michigan SSC.

There are a lot of forces at play here that you should understand. Bill Tardy is making a run at public office and you have handed him his first political issue. The SSC is like fluoridation of water, a project that was researched right here in Aurora in the '30s. A project so obviously right, correct and beneficial, but still opposed by some people as some kind of government plot.

I live in the affected area and I welcome the SSC to my neighborhood.

MR. EIGUREN: Our next commenter who has now arrived is Richard Craig. You sure you still want to comment, Mr. Craig?

1084 STATEMENT BY RICHARD CRAIG

MR. CRAIG: My name is Dick Craig.

MR. EIGUREN: Can you give us an address, sir, for the record?

MR. CRAIG: 2N587 [copy missing] Road, West Chicago 60185.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

MR. CRAIG: You folks want to yell, [copy missing] I like those kind of discussions. I went down to Fermilab and listened to the testimony down there by a lot of politicians. I am kind of disgusted with what I heard. See, I did not hear anybody talk about the cause. After a time I got up and said my peace and talked about a friend of mine that was cured of cancer, Ed Doyle. He had a tumor on his heart that had grown onto the lung.

He went down there and in a few treatments he was healed. With no knife, with no Band-Aid, with no blood transfusion. He did not even lose his hair. It was quick and it was easy. And after that the meeting was over and I learned more. I learned more about people that have been cured down there. A lady with a tumor in her head. Blood was coming out of her ears. And she went down there for treatment and she survived it.

1

I found out about the new machine -- the first of its kind in the world -- and it is being built right now to be installed in Loma Linda, California, in the university out there, to treat cancer, on a production line basis.

And I was humbled because it would not exist without the cause. I am a little disgusted that I was born so soon because my father died of brain cancer. He had a tumor. He went in the hospital and they cut a hole in his head and took it out and he laid there a vegetable until he died.

I just wish that that machine had existed to cure him. There is people in this room that oppose Fermilab. Well, I am going to loose 189 acres of farmland, it is probably going to destroy my way of life. I am getting a little old to go out and start over again, but I guess that is what I will have to do. But that is okay because it is for the cause.

2

I certainly hope that the technology that they have developed out there will continue to benefit mankind. I have known too many families and too many people that have suffered from the surge of cancer and the other diseases that can be treated by proton and neutron therapy, and if that place did not exist, and if the collider did not exist, we would not have that now. The new frontiers that we are going to open up with the technology that will be developed by increasing the size of that ring and employing the use of superconductivity that has been developed at Argonne Labs, they are going to benefit mankind, and that is in the interest of the cause.

Sure some people are going to have to move but not too many, not as many as thought they would. Because that is merely a plan for everybody to bid on. And when it is finally drawn, it could be entirely different. That cause is kind of important because I know of a fellow that sat in prison for what he was the kind of fellow that gambled everything he had, his home, his fortune -- in fact he gambled so much it was his name that kept the United States government going. And they were called long bobs and short bobs. And they were traded in lieu of money that the Federal government could not produce that nobody wanted.

3

His name was Robert Morris. George Washington went to see him and they did it all for the cause. I hope they build this thing, I hope they build it here. And I think this is the best place to put it based on everything that I have seen. And that cause, sir, is the cause of free men. That is what our country is for. I certainly hope we cut out this monkey business and get on with this thing because our technological edge is the only thing we have going for us, and the sooner we get on with it the better. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: We were only aware of two individuals that wanted to comment at this point that had either pre-registered or walked in and registered at the desk. Is there anyone else here that is registered to comment that has not had the opportunity? That being the case, the hearing panel will be here until the hour of 12:00, in the event that we do have additional individuals come in to comment. If we do not have anyone else commenting this morning, we will resume our hearing here this afternoon at 2 p.m.

(Discussion was held off the record.)

It is now 11:47 a.m. and we will once again go back on the record to resume the morning session of our public hearing on the DEIS for the SSC project. We have one additional walk-in registrant, Mary Totz.

1085 STATEMENT BY MARY TOTZ

MS. TOTZ: Hi, my name is Mary Totz. I am from Batavia, Illinois, and first of all I would like to thank you gentlemen for holding these hearings. Because were it not for you gentlemen I do not think all the facts would be out on the SSC. From the various information you will receive over these few days, I am sure you will see that additional facts are being brought up all the time. And being members of the scientific community, you deal in facts.

1

And I know that you are very interested in knowing the facts on all the sites and basing your opinions on that.

One of the first things that concerns me about the whole SSC project is that it is a very expensive project and it is coming out of our federal funds. And I am sure we all know we have a very large federal deficit right now, and we really can not afford to add on to it. And I admire the last speaker who came up and is all for the research and the advances to humankind that are coming out of the Super Collider or that expect to come out of it. And I feel these advances could be made at any site and not necessarily here in Illinois.

And I am for the Super Collider. I am not for our money being spent on it if it was funded by private funds, I think it would be very commendable. And if you add up all the funds that go into the advertising and promotion by all the states, we could have probably paid for it by now.

I live in Batavia, we live in the center of the ring and I do not think it would not affect us directly. I know it would affect my taxes for increased schools. I know that our landfill is beyond projections by ten years. And we are not accepted [sic] to receive any more landfill material from DuPage or Cook County, and I know that the traffic is very bad. And these are all issues that I believe have been brought before you.

But one of the things that really bothers me the most is when I see the people speaking for it and against it, I notice that the large majority of the people speaking for it are either the businessmen in the area or the politicians. And I notice that the people that are speaking against it are the people that live here.

My question in the end is is the Super Collider meant for the good of mankind and is it meant for the good of the people in the world and in the United States? And if so, we have the tevatron, it is the largest in the world right now. If bigger is better, why are the Nobel prizes going overseas? I do not know that it is necessarily in the size of the experimental material as it is in the ingenuity and the genius of the scientists themselves.

Just considering all these things, and also considering that we are the most prosperous point in the nation here, in Illinois. This is one of the arguments our politicians have used. They said that our funds, our tax monies are the largest given to the Federal government and we receive the least amount in return. We should be thankful for that, we should not be piggish and want to receive something that we do not need. If there is someone really in need and if this country is going to fund this kind of a project, give it to the people who need the jobs. Give it to Texas, or increase things out in Arizona. I do not feel it belongs here. I do support it, but not in Illinois. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: It is now 11:57 a.m. Given the fact that we have now concluded receipt of all public comment for this morning's session, Session F [sic], the DEIS public hearing in Aurora, Illinois, we will formally adjourn this morning's public hearing and we will once again take up with our afternoon session for this panel at 2:00 p.m. this afternoon here in the gymnasium. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 11:57 a.m., the session was recessed, to reconvene at 2:00 p.m., the same day.)

FOURTH SESSION

(October 7, 1988: 2:00 p.m.)

DR. TEMPLE: Good afternoon. I want to welcome you to the Department of Energy's public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, EIS, for the Superconducting Super Collider, SSC.

My name is Ed Temple and I am the Executive Director of the Department's SSC Site Task Force. I am also the presiding official for this hearing.

The purpose of my brief remarks is to tell you why we're all here. After my remarks, I will ask our session moderator, Mr. Eiguren, to outline how we will conduct our meeting this afternoon.

The purpose of this meeting is to give interested citizens an opportunity to comment in person on the Department's draft EIS on the SSC.

This hearing is not your only opportunity. You may also send us your written comments which must be postmarked by October 17, 1988.

We want you to know that we are sincerely interested in hearing your comments on this document, and that each of your comments will be considered and responded to in the final EIS.

Let me refresh your memories regarding the SSC Site Selection Process. In January, 1987, President Reagan's decision to proceed with the SSC was announced, and construction funds were requested from Congress. In April, 1987, the Department issued an invitation for site proposals.

We subsequently received 43 proposals and 36 of these were found to be qualified. These qualified proposals were forwarded to a joint committee of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering for further evaluation.

Based on the criteria in the invitation, the Academies recommended a best qualified list, sometimes called BQL, of eight states to the Department. One of these proposals was later withdrawn by the proposer.

Following a review and verification of the Academies' recommendations, Secretary Herrington announced the best qualified list, including the Illinois proposed site, on January 19, 1988. Three days later, on January 22, the DOE formally announced that it would develop an EIS on the proposed SSC. This announcement followed an advance notice of intent which had been issued in May of 1987.

In February, 1988, we held scoping meetings in each of the seven states to obtain public comment on the nature and scope of the environmental issues to be considered in the EIS. Scoping meetings were held in Illinois at the Fermilab Auditorium. The DOE received approximately 2,200 comments on the scope of the EIS. These comments were considered in the preparation of the draft EIS.

Following public hearings here and in the other six BQL states, we will develop a final EIS to be issued in December, 1988.

The draft EIS evaluates and compares four types of alternatives: site alternatives, technical alternatives, programmatic alternatives and the no-action alternative. The site alternatives address the seven locations identified in the BQL.

Technical alternatives considered were different technologies, different equipment, or different facility configurations.

Programmatic alternatives meant the possibility of using other accelerators, international collaboration or project delay.

And the no-action alternative meant the option not to construct the SSC.

This draft EIS identifies and analyzes the potential environmental consequences expected to occur from siting, constructing and operating the SSC as any of the seven site alternatives. These sites are located in Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee and Texas.

The draft EIS provides as much information as possible at this stage of project development regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed construction and operation of the SSC at each of the alternative sites. However, the DOE recognizes that further review under NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, is appropriate prior to constructing and operating the proposed SSC.

Accordingly, following the selection of a site for the proposed SSC, the DOE will prepare a supplement to this EIS to address in more detail that impacts of constructing and operating the proposed SSC at the selected site and to identify where possible alternatives for mitigating these impact.

Let me tell you a little about the draft EIS. This is a large document containing more than 4,000 pages. It is organized into four volumes.

Volume I is entitled, "Environmental Impact Statement." Volume II is the comment resolution document and is reserved for our response to public comments and for publication in the final EIS only.

Volume III describes the methodology for site selection. And Volume IV contains 16 appendices providing detailed presentations of technical information which back up the conclusions in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Comments received at this hearing will be used by the DOE to prepare a final EIS to be issued in December. This document will identify the Department's preferred site. No sooner than 30 days after the final EIS is distributed, the Department will publish its Record of Decision, which will include the final site selection and complete site selection process.

This afternoon, we will use a professional moderator to assure and fair and orderly proceeding. Measures have been taken to permit the maximum opportunity for interested citizens to utilize this session for expressing their comments. We urge all participants in today's meeting to focus their comments on the draft EIS and to avoid or minimize statements aimed solely at expressing opposition or support for the State's proposal.

While all comments will become part of the formal record of this proceeding, those specifically addressing the draft EIS will be most useful to DOE in preparing the final document.

As I noted earlier, in addition to this opportunity for oral comments, individuals may also provide written comments to the DOE. These should be postmarked by October 17, 1988, the end of the 45-day formal comment period, to insure that they will be considered in the preparation of the final EIS. We will, however, consider comments received after that date to the extent possible.

One final word on the role of the EIS in the site selection process. The National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, requires that environmental impacts be considered by Federal decision makers in taking major Federal actions with potential environmental consequences, and EIS is one of the methods used to do this analysis, to provide for public comment and participation, and to make a final decision that meets the NEPA requirements. The EIS will be considered by the Secretary in making the site selection.

I'd like to thank you in advance for your interest and participation.

Let me know introduce Mr. Roy Eiguren, who will describe how we will conduct this afternoon's session.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Dr. Temple.

My name is Roy Eiguren, an attorney in private practice with the law firm of Lindsay, Hart, Neil and Weigler, which has offices in Seattle, Washington, Portland, Oregon, San Francisco, California and Boise, Idaho. My firm's practice, as well as my own, is heavily concentrated in the areas of environmental and energy law. Both in private practice as well as prior governmental service, I've had over a decade's worth of experience either conducting or participating in a very significant number of *National Environmental Policy Act hearings, such as the one we're conducting here this afternoon.*

I have been retained by the Department of Energy to serve as a moderator for this and other hearings on the draft EIS for the proposed SSC project. In that capacity, I am not an employee of the Department of Energy, nor am I an advocate for or against the Department's proposed action in the proceeding. However, my single express purpose is to serve as an independent, unbiased, objective individual to *moderate these hearings.*

My role is to help assure the Department of Energy fully complies with the letter and spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act so as to allow all individuals and organizations a fair and equal opportunity to comment on the record relative to the DEIS.

As Dr. Temple stated, the purpose of his hearing is to give all interested citizens an opportunity to comment on the record relative to the Department of Energy's draft EIS for the proposed SSC project.

In February the Department conducted a scoping meeting here as well as in other States to hear comments from individuals and organizations on what issues they felt should be considered in the preparation of the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Now that the Department has prepared the EIS, it seeks comment from the public on it.

In particular, the Department seeks comment on issues that members of the public feel are relevant and should be considered finally by the Department prior to finalizing the EIS and selecting its preferred site for the SSC project.

I would like to indicate that this is a record proceeding. That is to say, everything that is being said here today, as well as at all the other hearings in this series, are being recorded by a court reporter who is with us here in the front of the room. The court reporter will make a verbatim transcript of all comments received and submit that transcript to the Department of Energy for inclusion in the final record in this proceeding.

The Secretary of Energy's decision in this matter will be based upon the record that we develop here as well as elsewhere.

At this time, I would like to tell you the procedures that we are going to follow in the conduct of this afternoon's hearing, which are the same procedures that we have used both here in the earlier hearings in Aurora as well as in the all the other states where we have been conducting hearings on the draft EIS. I am going to announce speakers for this afternoon's hearing based upon a list provided to me by the Department of Energy, so I am sure most of you know, the Department, prior to today, received through telephone conversations, a list of individuals who wanted to testify at this particular hearing. That is to say, we have a series of pre-registered commentators. Each of those pre-registered commentators will have up to five minutes within which to make comment.

The same is true for anyone who was a walk-in registrant, that is to say if you've come in here today, have not pre-registered to comment, but would like to do so, you may speak either here or at the parallel hearing being held in the auditorium also in this building.

If you would like to speak, we need to first have you register at the registration table back in the lobby.

At the end of the five minutes for both pre-registered as well as walk-in registrant commentators, we ask that you end your comments, and I will signal you when your five minutes are up.

As Dr. Temple stated earlier, the purpose of the hearing is to receive comment on the draft EIS. Accordingly, the comments you give us should be focused on the issues that are addressed in the draft document itself. We do reserve the right to ask individuals to focus on issues contained in the draft EIS, if they wander away from the subject matter of the session.

My intent is not to limit remarks but rather to assure what comments you do give us are effective in achieving the goals of this particular proceeding. However, it has been our practice to allow individuals to comment on whatever issues they feel they would like to comment relative to the SSC project itself.

Written comment and oral comment receive the same weight in the record of the proceeding, so therefore, we would encourage you to submit any written comments as well as written questions you may have, either here at the hearing today or by mailing them to the Department of Energy by no later than October 17, 1988. There is an address card back at the registration table that gives you the proper address to mail in comments or questions, if you would like to do so.

If you do have written comments or questions with you today, you may leave them with me either after you comment or at any time during the hearing.

Our session has commenced at 2:00 o'clock this afternoon and will run until 5:00 this evening or this afternoon. It will reconvene at 7:00 p.m. this evening. I'd like to indicate that those of you who may have been pre-registered to speak in the auditorium for the evening session will be asked to provide your comments here, in the gymnasium, in that we have a greater capability to handle people in this facility.

Throughout the course of the hearing, in order to allow the court reporter to change the tapes and recording system, we're taking recesses about once every hour for five to ten minutes.

I would ask that when your turn comes to comment, you'd please step forward to the front here to the podium, give us your name and address, give us the name of any organization that you might be representing here at the hearing, and then once you've completed your introductions, I will begin timing of your five minutes.

In addition to that, I would also like to indicate that the high school has asked that we make a number of announcements related to the use of this facility. We'd like to remind you that this is a smoke-free building. Accordingly, there is no smoking allowed anywhere in the building. There is a snack bar available for your use out in the lobby, if you are so inclined. Throughout the course of the hearings this afternoon, as well as this morning, we'd like to indicate that the high school is in regular session, so students and faculty are using other parts of the building. We would like to request that those of you in the public who are here today restrict your movement to either this room, the auditorium, or to the lobby area in front.

The building will open again after this hearing this afternoon at 6:30 for this evening's session.

Finally, I'd like to indicate that the members of the panel who are with me in the front of the room are here for the express purpose of listening to your comments and asking as appropriate, clarifying questions on comments that you make. The purpose in asking clarifying questions is to help develop a complete record of your concerns relative to the environmental issues on this project.

With me on the stage is Dr. Ed Temple who spoke earlier. Dr. Temple is the Department of Energy's Executive Director of the SSC Site Selection Task Force. With him is Dr. Roger Mayes, Dr. Jerry Nelsen, both of whom are environmental specialists with the Department of Energy and have a major responsibility in completing the final EIS in this proceeding.

At this point, ladies and gentlemen, we will now go to our list of pre-scheduled or preregistered commentators. For this, the afternoon session, Session H[sic], of the DEIS hearing on the SSC project being held in Aurora, Illinois, on October 7th.

Our first scheduled commentator is Bernard P. Killian, followed by Lisa Schramer.

921 STATEMENT BY BERNARD P. KILLIAN

MR. KILLIAN: Thank you. I'm Bernard Killian. I'm Director of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.

I appreciate the opportunity to participate on the Superconducting Super Collider draft Environmental Impact Statement and to discuss the role of the Illinois in the preparatory work that will lead to the Department of Energy's selection of a site the SSC.

I would like to provide a very brief overview of the Illinois EPA's authority and responsibilities and a summary of our review of the draft EIS.

In Illinois, administration of the State's environmental programs is shared by the Illinois EPA, the Pollution Control Board, the Department of Energy and Natural Resources and the Attorney General.

Created by the Environmental Protection Act, EPA is empowered to perform inspections, conduct monitoring, answer complaints and process grants. We are also the State's environmental permitting and enforcement agency, and we have the primary responsibility for carrying out the programs that are delegated to the State under the major Federal environmental laws.

Each of those laws, the Clean Water Act, the Clear Air Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and the Safe Drinking Water Act includes some form of partnership structure under which the Agency has met the requirements to become a front-line manager of the national program.

Thus, while we continue to carry out our duties in the State environmental programs, we have also been delegated various authorities in the management of the national Safe Drinking Water, Air Pollution, Underground Injection Control, Water Pollution and Hazardous Waste programs.

The result is a blending of complementary Federal and State elements which work in concert to protect the environment in Illinois.

The agency's primary, and perhaps the key to effective implementation of our environmental requirements, is the permit process. Our review of the draft Environmental Impact Statement and supporting documentation has therefore focused on applicable State and Federal permitting requirements for all aspects of the proposed SSC.

In general, Illinois EPA technical staff review plans and specifications for proposed pollution sources and pollution control facilities. These reviews are conducted to insure that the processes and equipment that will be used in the project with meet the Federal and State regulations and requirements for pollution control.

If a project cannot meet those requirements, a permit cannot be issued.

Our conclusion is that several Federal and State permits will be required before construction and operation of the SSC and associated projects can begin.

Briefly, they are: A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System will be required during construction for tunnel dewatering. Ongoing water removal from the tunnel and discharge cooling water will also require permits. State construction and operating permits will be necessary before any new waste treatment or water treatment facilities may be built.

Section 401, Water Quality Review and Certification, will be required if a Federal permit is necessary for construction in the wetlands areas.

And finally, State Air Pollution Control Construction and Operating permits will be required for the gas-fired boilers that will be used to heat the facility.

In addition, there have been several issues raised concerning construction dust and air quality in the Batavia area and Terry Schweitzer, who is the permit manager of our Division of Air Pollution Control, will discuss these two matters in subsequent testimony today.

While we have not received permit applications that we would need to see and it would be necessary for us to make final determinations on any of these questions, based on our review of the draft EIS and the supporting documentation, we have concluded that the project presents neither unresolvable issues nor threats to the area's environment in the areas that I have mentioned.

We believe that the environmental controls that will be necessary can be implemented successfully with available and proven techniques.

And finally, I should add that our regulatory responsibilities in Illinois would not stop when construction of the SSC had been completed. We would continue to exercise our duties through inspections in monitoring throughout the life of the facility.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commentator is Lisa Schramer, followed by Terry Schweitzer.

920 STATEMENT BY LISA SCHRAMER

MS. SCHRAMER. My name is Lisa Schramer and I'm from Aurora. My comments concern Appendix 15 of the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Appendix 15 concerning paleontology is fraught with language that is not specific enough to insure protection of our undiscovered prehistoric past.

The research in Appendix 15 is also too superficial to accurately predict pre-Quaternary resources within the proposed SSC site. In Appendix 15 it is stated that important resources are only ones that have demonstrated scientific importance.

One interpretation of this is, if we don't know about it, then it isn't important. This stance might mean the loss of important clues to northern Illinois' ancient past.

The DOE admits that, "further research may be desirable" after stating that the report information was based on the individual State's proposals. The writer of Appendix 15 knows that the research is incomplete. The impression is given that Appendix 15 expresses the importance or lack thereof attached to Illinois' prehistoric heritage.

It is mentioned that, "evaluation procedures will be performed as necessary." It is not mentioned who will decide when it is necessary. With the deplorable lack of protective legislation for paleontological resources and the DOE's speed requirement, many potential, but yet undiscovered, paleontological sites may be deemed unimportant and destroyed to save time during construction.

Appendix cites several issues that after citing, "could be pertinent." It is also said that, "paleontological resource activities could include..." Use of the word "could" in these instances implies that items may be added or subtracted. This leaves too much interpretation up to government officials concerned with speed, not historic preservation.

"Contingency procedures" are mentioned to handle fossil remains. In light of the lack of legislation protecting fossils, these procedures could be subject to great interpretation. Much valuable resources would be compromised if the decision to site the SSC in Illinois such unspecific language.

In relation to paleontological resource activities during pre-construction, many items are mentioned that are unclear. Nothing is mentioned about who will determine "resource characterization." Perhaps a physicist or an administrator will decide which resources are significant.

Also mentioned in this context are consultations, "with concerned groups and individuals." It is not mentioned in relation to Illinois, if any local groups or experts have been contacted. Or perhaps the DOE intends them after resources have been uncovered and perhaps partially destroyed by a bulldozer.

Mention is made of developing "paleontological research as necessary." Also, "report preparation for agencies as necessary." One must ask, who will decide what is necessary. This language leaves too much open for interpretation. It is admitted in Appendix 15 that, "the area has not been systematically surveyed." Nothing concerning when it will be systematically surveyed, if at all, is mentioned.

In describing what was to mapped in a geologic time sense, it is stated, pre-Quaternary localities were not mapped because they lie within bedrock. This statement seems very strange because the SSC tunnel will lie in the bedrock.

The bedrock contains very old fossils of vertebrate animal life. This is where it will be likely to find the remains of dinosaurs and mastodons. But the paleontological survey in Appendix 15 concerns itself with just the most recent geological period -- the Quaternary. This period produces mainly fossil-like plants and invertebrate animals, according to an expert in the field.

While these are important, the fact that the tunneling in the bedrock was dismissed so easily leads one to believe that found in the bedrock will not be handled appropriately.

The research concerning the other states' paleontological evaluations involves itself with much deeper, and therefore, much older periods of time. One must ask why Illinois did not map older geologic strata present at the proposed site.

It is very obvious that the SSC will disturb strata much older than the Quaternary Period. There have been mastodons found in the area of the proposed ring.

This is a glaring omission in Appendix 15.

MR. EIGUREN: Your time's elapsed.

MS. SCHRAMER: One more paragraph?

MR. EIGUREN: Please. Go ahead.

MS. SCHRAMER: Language that is not precise in a report concerning irreplaceable resources could imperil our unlocated prehistoric legacy. Perhaps the quality of research presented to the DOE and the public should be amended and updated before site selection.

How can a responsible decision be made using incomplete and inappropriate information?

Keep the SSC out of Illinois.

MR. EIGUREN. The next commentator is Terry Schweitzer, following by Franklin Coffman.

We will include in the record the written comments of Lisa Schramer as received by the moderator.

Your name and address for the record, sir.

1086 STATEMENT BY TERRY A. SCHWEITZER

MR. SCHWEITZER: My name is Terry A. Schweitzer, Manager of the Permit Section of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, located in Springfield, Illinois.

I am testifying today on behalf of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's Division of Air Pollution Control and for its review of the air quality assessment portions of the SSC's draft Environmental Impact Statement. As indicated in the draft EIS, the construction and the operation of the SSC would result in emission in all six of the criteria area pollutants.

Our assessment of the air quality impact of these emissions is consistent with the findings for the Illinois site in the draft EIS; that for all pollutants except total suspended particulates, there would be an insignificant of the project on air quality.

With respect to total suspended particulates, during the construction phase of the project, fugitive
1 dust emissions could impact the localized area. It would be envisioned, however, that standard industrial practices would be required to minimize fugitive dust emissions.

These mitigation measures would include maximized use of paved roads, watering of the construction site and unpaved roads, controlled excavation activities, for example, wind screens, enclosures, application of dust suppressants and heavy duty covers, use of covers on vehicles hauling and construction scheduling.

The proper application of these measures would reduce off-site concentrations to an extent necessary to achieve compliance with the ambient air quality standards. Under normal operation, the SSC would have insignificant emissions of total suspended particulates and therefore, have a negligible impact on their quality.

One issue raised in a draft EIS concerned the location of the SSC, its sites in Illinois, Michigan and Tennessee within areas that are designated non-attainment for ozone and carbon monoxide and that commuter traffic emissions could degrade air quality.

2 The metropolitan Chicago area is classified as non-attainment for ozone. However, the location of the proposed Illinois site is well outside of the urban traffic corridors and lies over 30 miles from downtown Chicago.

Ambient air monitoring data collected around the proposed site over the last five years has not shown a violation of the ozone air quality standard. An analysis of the SSC emissions, with its associated vehicular traffic, consistent with the information contained within the draft EIS would show an insignificant on ozone air quality, both at the SSC and on a regionwide basis.

With respect to carbon monoxide, this area of Illinois has an unclassified status. Unclassified areas are treated the same as attainment, and available information would indicate that carbon monoxide concentrations around proposed Illinois site are well below the standard.

3 The draft EIS provided an air quality assessment for carbon monoxide which projected a small concentration above the background. These worse-case contributions by the SSC project would still provide ambient concentrations of carbon monoxide well below the standard.

In summary, the Illinois EPA finds that the construction and operation of the SSC in Illinois could be accomplished with adequate protection of the ambient air quality standards.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Mr. Schweitzer. We have a clarifying question to ask, sir, if we could ask you to return to the podium.

MR. MAYES: Have you submitted those data for the last five years?

MR. SCHWEITZER: Excuse me?

MR. MAYES: Have you submitted the data for the last five years that you mentioned for the ozone?

MR. SCHWEITZER: The information was submitted to the folks putting together the draft EIS, yes.

MR. MAYES: Okay. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commentator is Franklin B. Coffman, followed by Terry Lash.

1087 STATEMENT BY FRANKLIN B. COFFMAN

MR. COFFMAN: Good afternoon. My name is Frank Coffman. I'm the Chairman of the Kendall County Board. Kendall County has reviewed the draft Environmental Impact Statement and we had some very real concerns about some of the data and the assumptions outlined in both these documents.

1 And in the draft Environmental Impact Statement, namely, Volume 1 and 3, Volume 4, Appendix 4, promulgated by the United States Department of Energy.

Our primary concerns with the socio-economic assessments relating to the assumed impact on the public finances of Kendall County and on existing and projected baseline population figures for Kendall County.

Concerning the assumed impact of the SSC project on the public finances of our county, there is data presented in the draft EIS that would indicate that Kendall County would experience negative annual impacts throughout the life of the SSC.

This statement for Kendall County is based upon the data shown that Kendall would experience cumulative loss in public finances of $400,000, excuse me, in 1989 and $300,000 in the 11 subsequent years throughout the year 2000.

This data is apparently based upon the statement in the draft, Volume IV, Appendix 14, which states, "Annual direct tax revenue losses in the county of $400,000 would result from the loss of real property
2 tax collections for land transferred to Federal ownership. Further data shows that while Kendall County is realizing indirect revenue increases of approximately $100,000 per annum, the assumed real property tax loss of $400,000 per year puts the county in a negative condition by a cumulative sum of $300,000 per year."

We've been advised and it has been stated to us that the SSC project would require no more than 15 to 16 acres of land in the county. The only property required would be for one or two service areas, each requiring a maximum of about 5.7 acres and one or two intermediate access areas each requiring the maximum of .9 of an acre. This would be a total acreage required of the county of about 13.2 acres.

We cannot conceive the formula being used that would show Kendall County losing $400,000. The direct real property tax revenue with a transfer of that acreage required, 13 to 15 acres, to Federal ownership, we would anticipate a total real property loss of no more than $15,000. We feel that the Good Neighbor Act would probably offset that.

Concerning the population figures and projections that show any different for Kendall County, we feel that the State of Illinois projections and estimates are considerably below the realistic figures. The population of Kendall County, according to Federal Census, has consistently increased, from 17,540 in '60 to 37,202 in 1980.

Kendall County is located in one of the most dynamic and fastest growing, [copy missing] and residential and commercial areas in the State of Illinois. These building permits have increased from 38 to over 400 from '82 to '88.

3 We feel that the County will realize an indirect revenue increase of approximately $100,000 per year if the SSC is located in Illinois, and that we will have a gain rather than loss.

The Kendall County Board endorses and has passed a resolution of support for the SSC.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: I neglected to mention at the outset, I apologize for the interruptions with the buzzers and whatnot, but unfortunately, the school can't turn them off here in the gymnasium.

Moving down our list of pre-registered commentators. The next commentator is Terry Lash, followed by George Schramer.

1088 STATEMENT BY MOLLIE SCHMIDT

MS. SCHMIDT: My name is Mollie Schmidt and I'm Federal legislative liaison with the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety. Today, I am here to testify on behalf of Terry Lash, Director of the Department of Nuclear Safety.

The Department headquarters are located at 1035 Outer Park Drive in Springfield. Director Lash sends his regrets but this afternoon is bringing his wife and newborn son home from the hospital and it was something that schedule-wise could not be foreseen and he was sure you'd understand.

Because of its heavy concentration of nuclear and radiation facilities, the State of Illinois established a separate cabinet-level agency mandated to protect the Illinois citizens from the hazards of radiation.

That agency, the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety, currently employs a staff of over 200 people. The staff includes many nuclear scientists, engineers and other radiation specialists involved in programs designed to insure that Illinois citizens employed at radiation facilities and members of the general excessive exposure to radiation.

1 Many of the Department's programs, such as the remote computerized monitoring of the operation of nuclear power plants employs state-of-the-art technology.

The Department of Nuclear Safety has participated as a member of the State of Illinois' SSC Task Force since early 1984. During this period of time, Department personnel have had the opportunity to become familiar with the technological challenges and the radiological safety aspects of the proposed Superconducting Super Collider.

More recently, the Department personnel have been involved in evaluating the potential radiological impact of the proposed SSC. As set forth in the draft Environmental Impact Statement, and other
2 documents associated with the design and operation of the proposed SSC, department staff found the radiological impact assessment sections of the draft Environmental Impact Statement to be both comprehensive and rigorous.

Natural background radiation averages some 360 millirems of exposure per person per year in the United States. Background exposure rates are close to that national average.

3 In order to place these dose levels in perspective, it is important to note that it is impossible to escape some exposure to radiation, since it occurs naturally in the air we breathe, the soil we walk on, the food and water we drink and from extraterrestrial sources.

The draft Environmental Impact Statement estimates that the total worst-case dose to any member of the
4 general public in Illinois from the operation of the SSC could be .004 millirems. The Statement evaluates production doses due to the transportation of low-level radioactive waste.

I am pleased to report on behalf of Dr. Lash, that based on our technical analysis of the draft
5 Environmental Impact Statement and other documents, the Department of Nuclear Safety concludes that the construction and operation of the proposed SSC in Illinois will not have any measurable radiological health impact on Illinois citizens, nor will it pose any radiological danger to the environment.

Although the Department of Nuclear Safety has no regulatory authority over Federal facilities, such as Argonne, Fermilab and the proposed SSC, the Department has, for many years, worked closely with personnel from Argonne and Fermilab.

The Department has found the personnel at these Federal facilities to be professionally competent and highly conscious of the need of maintaining a high level of radiological safety for both employees and the general public.

6

The Department is confident that the operation of the proposed SSC will be no different in this regard. In our opinion, through cooperation between Federal and State personnel, we are further assured that the SSC located in Illinois would be operated safely and without any radiological threat to the public or to the environment.

The Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety is looking forward to working with the United States Department of Energy to assure general public safety and environmental protection for the citizens of Illinois when the SSC is located in Illinois.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: *The next commentator is George Schramer, followed by Donald Schindlbeck.*

918 STATEMENT BY GEORGE SCHRAMER

MR. SCHRAMER: My name is George Schramer, Aurora, Illinois. The Illinois proposed site is not favorable for the Superconducting Super Collider.

Northern Illinois has the most nuclear radioactive operating plants, the second highest number of NRC licenses, the worst radioactive soil contamination and the only nonoperating thorium plant dump, thus, making this area the biggest radioactive producing site of all the sites proposed.

In the draft EIS, Table 4-14, ten nuclear energy power plants exist and are online. They are Dresden 2 and 3, LaSalle Port 1 and 2, Braidwood 1 and 2, Zion 1 and 2, and Byron 1 and 2.

The Illinois NRC licenses for radioactive material is up to 125. The list of locations for these licenses was left out of the draft EIS. Why?

Did the State of Illinois feel this was too sensitive of a topic for this area? Perhaps.

The Kerr McGee thorium plant is classified as NF2; however, the State of Illinois and the DOE failed to inform the public of the 4 million 8 hundred cubic feet of low radioactive waste stored openly at Kerr McGee plant. This is located about two miles from the beam aboard area.

Also, no mention was made regarding the Cress Creek contamination. This creek flows from the northeast corner of the Fermi Laboratory property where it exits into a subdivision adjacent to Fermilab. According to the transcript of proceedings of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC, before the Atomic Safety Commission Licensing Board in the matter of Kerr McGee and Crest Decontamination, Docket No. 40-206 ASLBP No. 48-50201, dated January 8, 1984, on page 40, measurements were taken at the off-site location near the National Accelerator Laboratory by Argonne National Laboratory in 1977 and 1978.

Additional surveys were made by the Environmental Protection Agency in 1981.

The results show land adjacent to Cress Creek and west branch of the DuPage River contaminated with thorium and daughter products of thorium decay.

Attachment 4 to my report clearly shows that thorium soil concentrations ranging from plus ten to plus 50 microcuries per gram.

The concentrations presented in this report are not necessarily the maximum levels as no samples were taken from the bottom of Cress Creek to locate the areas of maximum direct radiation.

The EPA has stated, "These standards are appropriate for cleanup. Therefore, cleanup of the radioactive contamination in the environment is required."

In the draft EIS, Volume 1, Chapter 5, page 5.1.2-13, the proposed J site encroachment of Cress Creek will cover the entire width of the flood plane. This encroachment is only 2.5 feet -- filameters, kilometers upstream, from the start of the contaminated area.

The DOE admits this is a measurable impact with some potential for mitigation through design layout or channel diversion.

I say this will require years of mitigation before the EPS allows channel diversion that may cause flooding downstream and only before the contaminated area of Cress Creek is cleaned up.

Because of the open dump of low-level radioactive waste at Kerr McGee, the contaminated Cress Creek and the west branch of DuPage River, and the nuclear power plants -- 125 NRC licenses -- we don't need the SSC site here, in Illinois, adding more radioactive contamination to our soil, water and air.

In closing, my home is not on the proposed ring, but my place of employment is located directly on J3. And according to the draft EIS, this property qualifies for takeover by the DOE. Would you gentlemen of the DOE like to have the honor of informing my fellow 1,000 employees that they must relocated? Especially those who already have been relocated at my plant from far away as California and New York.

I don't want wasteful Government high tech projects to replace efficient private-sector leading edge technology enterprises.

Keep the SSC out of Illinois.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comments of George Schramer, along with accompanying exhibits will be received for the record and included in the transcript.

The time our next commentator is Donald A. Schindlbeck. At the conclusion of his comments we'll be in recess for a brief time.

Mr. Schindlbeck.

910 STATEMENT BY DONALD A. SCHINDLBECK

MR. SCHINDLBECK: My name is Donald A. Schindlbeck. I reside at 610 Route 25, Oswego, Illinois 60543.

I am employed by Commonwealth Edison and I function as Division Vice President.

Electric power for the proposed SSC site will be supplied by Commonwealth Edison, one of the largest systems in the country.

Generating capacity at the end of September, 1988, was over 22,500 megawatts, which is well above the estimated 200 peak load of the SSC. Also, the Edison system more than fulfills the requirement that generating capacity twelve times rates peak site load or 2,400 megawatts.

The transmission system consists of 765-kV, 345-kV, 138-kV and 69-kV lines.

Commonwealth Edison generating plants may be summarized as follows: Six nuclear stations providing 11,487 megawatts; eight coal fired stations providing 7,005 megawatts; one oil-fired station at 2,698; small diesel and other fossil units totalling 1,331 megawatts.

Edison's generating capacity will be split almost equally between nuclear and fossil fuels. However, lower cost nuclear power will account for a larger proportion of megawatt hour generation.

This is because larger, more efficient nuclear units supply base loan. In other words, permanent around-the-clock loads. While the less efficient units are used to follow daily load fluctuation.

Edison plans to provide electric service to the proposed SSC via 345-kV and 138-kV lines at two locations. These two points of service will provide power to each substation from separate grids so that essential loads are maintained in the event either line is out of service.

The 345-kV service to SSC substation 1 will be from the same location providing service to the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory now in Batavia. No new facilities will have to be installed to provide service to substation 1.

Substation 2 will be fed by a tap from an existing 138-kV grid. The backbone of the Edison transmission system encompasses more than 2,350 circuit miles of 345-kV lines. The typical capacity of a 345-kV circuit is 1,400 MVA. The voltage is stepped down at transmission substations to 138-kV through 300-MVA transformers. Typical normal capacities of 138-kV circuits are from 200 to 350 mva.

Commonwealth Edison is a member of the Mid-America Interconnected Network call MAIN, one of nine regional councils that make up the North America Electric Reliability Council. Edison has a total of 28 high voltage MAIN connections at 765-kV threaded 45-kV and 138-kV.

These ties provide access to all power systems in the Midwest and help insure the reliability and adequacy of electric supply in northern Illinois.

The highest peak load on the Edison system was 17,459 megawatts recorded in August of 1988. The planned additions to capacity are expected to provide adequate reserve capacity until the late 1990's. It is anticipated that coal fired capacity will be installed at that time to maintain a target 15 percent reserve margin.

The power requirements of the SSC are not expected to materially change Edison's forecast for long-term growth or requirements for new capacity. If the SSC peak loan comes on line in 1994, and reaches level of 200 megawatts, generating capacity will still be substantially greater than the estimated peak load requirements.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comments of Donald A. Schindlbeck of Commonwealth Edison will be included in the record as received at the podium.

At this point, we will be in recess until 3:05.

(Whereupon, the hearing was recessed until 3:05 p.m.)

MR. EIGUREN: Ladies and gentlemen, I will once again resume the hearing.

The hour is now 3:07. We're ready to resume this, the afternoon session H[sic] hearing, on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed SSC project.

We left off with the name of Howard Decker, so our next scheduled commentator is Howard Decker, followed by Jim Thrall.

1089 STATEMENT BY HOWARD DECKER

MR. DECKER: Good afternoon. My name is Howard Decker. I am a principal in the architectural and urban design firm of Decker and Camp, located in Chicago. Our office has been acting as consultant to SSC for Fermilab and others involved in the project team in studying the means by which the visual and aesthetic impact of the SSC can be managed and mitigated in the most appropriate fashion.

I would like to describe briefly for you this afternoon some of our activities and comment on some of
1 the recommendations we have made as part of our preliminary work.

As you are well aware, the conditions of the surface facility varies widely from north to south, from east to west, across the area of the site.

And we have tried to investigate the generalized and technical nature of the schematic designs that we have investigated from DOE and find means by which they can be made specific and rooted to the various locations in which they ultimately will be sited.

We believe that in looking at some of the documents we examined at first, there is good reason for the neighbors to be concerned about the character of the building. They're very generalized buildings. They're highly technical in character. They're unattractive and they have the possibility of being dissident features in the landscape.

As a result, we have tried to find a means by which the impact, the visual and esthetic impact of these facilities can be mitigated to the greatest extent possible.

Our early steps caused us to make a full investigation of all of the sites on which surface facilities will be located throughout the ring and to identify resources which could be brought to bear in mitigating visual and esthetic impact of the facilities.

Some of the resources which we have investigated and have drawn upon as we have done our work have
2 included a full aerial photographic survey of agricultural facilities throughout the region of the ring -- the proposed ring.

Historic surveys which illustrate and document all of the historic architectural and landscape features throughout the region and other resources which describe the specific building types, landscape forms and other features which are -- vernacular [sic] features local to the site area which could become resources.

What we have done then is to investigate mitigation in four categories and I'd like to share those four categories with you very briefly.

First, we've looked at the category of land use and we have investigated the extent to which the facilities can be located in parcels in which can also accommodate uses such as recreational facilities, public parks.

In the agricultural region where surface facilities are to be located, we have looked at the possibility of leasebacks where the facility could be located on a farm and in an area where its location will not disrupt agricultural activities adjacent to it.

The next thing that we looked at is the character of the landscape and landform across the site. As you know, on the northern portions, we have a hilly site with morainal -- with certain morainal character; on the western and southern portions, flat, agricultural land. And we believe that the landscape treatments and the landform treatments in mitigation should directed to the specific character of each of the sites and that the landscape treatments be generated from the local characteristics of the sites.

The draft EIS suggests a berm and evergreen treatment for many of the facilities. Some of the recommendations that we have made, include a much greater level of specificity with respect to the resolution of these problems, including the uses of natural, local and vernacular landscape materials and plant materials. Natural landform such as -- or cultured land form such as hedgerows, tree groves and other kinds of landscape forms which are native to our region and are specifically related to the adjacent character of the various of the surface facilities.

Next, we have looked at building arrangement. I have brought with me today six sketches which we prepared which I am prepared to offer to you which indicate the architectural treatment and building arrangement of the [copy missing] features, the technical structures of each of the surface facilities.

We believe that in looking at the way in which the buildings can be arranged on the site, there are ways of stating the site plan and the relationship that will aid site circulation, that will allow the buildings to screen parking and other technical activities. These are very minor adjustments in the arrangements of the buildings on-site, and we think that they allow the buildings to root themselves more specifically in each of their various sites.

We have also investigated the possibility of handling the technical matters of cooling towers, transformers, tanks and other support kind of facilities in various ways. The sketches show some of the means by which that matters can be handled.

We believe that there are an enormous number of alternatives which can be explored which will mitigate the strong technical character of the -- of each of the facilities.

And finally, we've looked at the architecture of each of the generalized kinds of surface facilities that will be required. We believe that what we have seen in sketches is a very, standard kind of a metal building. It's easy for us to imagine that some of the buildings could be designed in a way -- they could be made of masonry. They can use local building materials. They can be arranged architecturally and massed in such a way so that they appear to be residential in character in areas where there is a great deal of residential development. They can be arranged and treated architecturally as agricultural buildings in the areas of great agricultural activity and there is an enormous range of alternatives available for mitigating the visual appearance of the structure.

MR. EIGUREN: Your time is up, sir.

MR. DECKER: Can I just finish the one?

We've also tried to include a small scale features of windows, dormers, silos, other kinds of features to introduce scale-giving elements so that when each of the features is seen on the landscape, they do not appear to be obtrusive and root themselves in a satisfactory way as one's eye sweeps the horizon.

Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: Mr. Decker, do you have something for the record?

Mr. Decker has submitted for the record a series of illustrations entitled, Decker and Kemp Architects, 410 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago.

Next commentator is Jim Thrall, followed by Jeff Kehoe.

1090 STATEMENT BY JIM THRALL

MR. THRALL: My name is Jim Thrall. I am head of the Environmental Sciences Department at Harza Engineering Company and I have been acting as a consultant to the State on environmental matters for the SSC.

I'd like to comment today on two closely related issues pertaining to project alternative evaluations.

The first comment is the need for the EIS to more fully explore the differences between the Illinois site as proposed by the State and all other sites. Because Fermilab is an integral part of Illinois, proposal, only about 3,700 acres of land need be purchased and given to the Federal Government in fee simple title in Illinois.

This is only about one-half the acreage at most other States. As land acquisition is one of the impacts for concern for this project, this is a significant difference between the Illinois site and other sites.

Illinois already has 6,800 acres of land dedicated for use in high energy physics research at Fermilab. Maximization of this land would greatly enhance the project. Further, all the offices, laboratories, shops, roads and other supporting infrastructure of Fermilab are available for the SSC and will not have to be duplicated and as you have recognized in the DEIS, the Tevatron can serve double duty as the injector for the SSC without affecting its current function as a proton-antiproton collider.

The DEIS however, does not make any attempt to optimize this available resource and it does not recognize appropriately the attendant conservation of cement, glass, steel, asphalt, wood and other nonrenewable natural resources possible with Fermilab.

Neither are the associated cost savings which optimal use of Fermilab would allow, are discussed in the DEIS. Now, I have been involved in the environmental planning business long enough to know that most experienced economists can arrive at a number of conclusions given the appropriate starting assumptions.

2

But it is possible for me to believe, and I think most reasonable people as well, that maximum use of the existing Fermilab facility, that with maximum use of the existing Fermilab facility, you will not find Illinois to be clearly the least expensive alternative.

This leads me to my second and related point. Although the states which are competing for this project were required by DOE to propose on a standard design, other designs are possible.

In fact, DOE recognizes this reality in the draft EIS on Page 3-24 of Volume I, where you speak of potential future design changes and the possible supplemental EIS.

The DOE has the unusual opportunity to develop what is obviously the most efficient, least-cost and environmentally best alternative here in Illinois.

That is the use of Fermilab with a single campus design. I say unusual, because it is not common in environmental assessments to find that least-cost, technically best alternative is also the best environmental project.

3

A single campus design would accomplish this, however. No less of an authority than Mr. Leon Lederman has published a paper describing the single campus design as technically possible, more efficient and more cost-effective to operate. With Fermilab serving as the single campus, thus greatly reducing or even possibly eliminating the west campus, the Department of Energy could significantly reduce costs both in land acquisition and in operation and maintenance and could reduce the number of acres of land to be purchased down to a few hundred. Almost all major impacts would be eliminated, including most of the relocations of people.

Although the State, as a competitor for the project, must meet your criteria for a two-campus design of the SSC in its offer, it appears clearly in the natural interest that you, the DOE, who are not so constrained, recognize and evaluate this technically feasible, environmentally superior and least-cost single campus alternative.

If the DOE develops such an alternative, it will turn what is presently a very good project into an excellent one.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next commentator is Jeff Kehoe, followed by Warren Brigham.

Jeff Kehoe, followed by Warren Brigham.

1091

STATEMENT BY JEFF KEHOE

MR. KEHOE: Hello. I'm Jeff Kehoe. I've come here to address this panel as a private citizen. I'm not a member of any of these groups, but I believe my home will be affected by the construction of the SSC in Illinois and I have found that the proposed project raises several questions from a homeowner's point of view, and I'd like to pose them today.

1

First, how would you like to live on top of something described in the following words? "This machine would be capable of two beams of subatomic particles or protons to an energy of 20 trillion electron volts. The two beams would then be made to collide at 40 trillion electron volts, and the result of these collisions would be studied by scientists."

2

I found these words in the Environmental Impact Study, and I'm worried. Now, assuming such experiments are perfectly safe, and I have some doubts, why would anybody want to live on top of one?

If two homes of equal of size and value were for sale, and one of them is located atop this experiment and the other isn't, I think it's easy to see that the majority of prospective buyers would prefer the home that is not located in a questionable area.

The only way that they might consider purchasing there would be if the home were offered at a considerably lower price than the one in the safe area.

So, in other words, the SSC, I believe, will reduce the property value of homeowners in its path, homeowners such as me.

There are those in favor of this thing because they think they will directly or indirectly reap some kind of financial benefit from it, and they are acting in a selfish manner.

I realize my interests are also self-serving, but I stand to lose something, I believe, from the SSC coming to Illinois.

Those in favor of it, I think, are trying to enrich themselves at the expense of homeowners like me and
3 long-time residents of this area.

I think, if you were in a position like mine, you would fight for your home, and we're not against progress, my neighbors and myself, but we'd want to preserve the way of life that we value and a home that we value and a neighborhood that we value.

The SSC is not like a new expressway that's needed because the traffic flow must go through. There are other areas where the SSC could be built.

Better sites are available in other States.

What about the removal of local property from tax rolls and the lowering of the value of other property?

4 This will place a financial strain on the already overburdened budgets of our local school districts. If the SSC is built in Illinois, I know I won't be the only taxpayer looking for tax relief due to the devaluation of my home. Where land has to be taken by the Government for the location of helium compressor stations or service areas, as the DOE report calls them, that property will be lost forever to the local tax rolls.

From the drawings I have seen of the surface areas, they appear to be a collection of buildings totally
5 out of place in any residential area.

Construction of one in the middle of a subdivision like mine will do nothing but lower the value of existing homes. I don't think anyone would want to live next to an SSC service area.

Lastly, I'd like to quote from the Environmental Impact Study again. "Over the long term, the State in which the SSC is constructed would gain economically from the presence of the SSC." " However," and
6 here is the important part, "at some locations, a short term economic decline would occur initially as lands are removed from the local tax base and the communities accommodate additional infrastructure impacts, such as increased vehicular traffic, increased attendance at local schools, or increased sewer facility requirements."

From what I have been able to learn from local sources, Kendall County, where I live, would be one of
7 the locations where the economic would take place.

Certainly, no one wants to see that happen, but what about the last three factors I just mentioned?

What about increased vehicular traffic? Just recently, we were told that one of the major highways out here, that's Route 34, is already at 100 percent capacity use, and there are no plans to widen it until
8 a lengthy study has been done.

The SSC will bring increased traffic that we can't accommodate.

What about increased attendance at local schools? In District 308, we're already overcrowded and
9 another referendum needs to be passed this spring. We can't afford still higher taxes the SSC will bring.

As for increased sewer facility requirements, the Aurora Sanitary District was unable to handle
10 rainwater runoff in storm sewers in 1983, resulting in flooded basements in my area. They need decreased, not increased usage.

Will growth come to this area without the SSC? Of course it will. This is far from being an
11 economically depressed area. The front page of last Tuesday's newspaper told of super university to be located in this area at some future date. Five of our major universities would be part of it. Why can't we have safe, clean, rational growth like this for northern Illinois?

In closing, I'd like to say that politicians from the Governor of this State on down viewed the SSC in
12 terms of how much money and how many jobs it would bring to Illinois, and it's nice that they want to attract new people. But what about protecting the rights of the people who are already living here?

Illinois is the Land of Lincoln and it was Lincoln who said, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people" and we have not had that when it comes to the SSC.

I hope this panel will remember Lincoln's words and try to deal with this problem in a fair manner, one which reflects the will of the people.

We don't want the SSC in Illinois.

MR. EIGUREN: Mr. Kehoe, would you give your address for the record? You didn't give them when you came up.

Thank you.

MR. KEHOE: That's 45 Brockway and that's Oswego.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, sir.

The next scheduled commentator is Warren Brigham, followed by Peter Conroy.

982 STATEMENT BY WARREN BRIGHAM

MR. BRIGHAM. My name is Warren Brigham. I'm with Illinois Natural History Survey in Champaign, Illinois.

MR. EIGUREN. I'm having a hard time hearing you. Could you take that center mike there and just pop it up a little bit. There you go.

MR. BRIGHAM. My name is Warren Brigham. I'm with the Illinois Natural History Survey in Champaign, Illinois.

As a biologist with the National History Survey and its manager for natural resources with the Illinois Geographic Information System, I have worked for four as a member of the team charged with producing a technically sound proposal for the State of Illinois which was at once environmentally compatible, economically sound, sociologically acceptable and responsible to the requirements that the Department of Energy has set forth in your request for proposals.

Some of you may remember me from your visits to Illinois earlier in the EIS process. At that time, we drove the entire proposed ring corridor, including visits to all proposed surface facilities.

Along the way, we had the opportunity to see into the nature of the database upon which our geographic information system rests, and to see how that system truly optimized placement of the complex footprint of the proposed SSC onto the Illinois landscape.

In a later meeting, we discussed at some length the specific capabilities of our geographic information system, how it had been used to date, and how it might be used to fine tune many components of this final siting and construction phase.

In the final analysis, however, it is not computer wizardry but the depth and quality of the database which makes us unique.

At this point, it would seem useful to go into some detail regarding two of the more than 60 data sets specifically used in the siting process.

For example, the files of the Natural History Survey contain the general the distribution for all and specific point localities of collections and/or observations of most of the animal and plant species which occur in this State. Specific localities are available for all vertebrate animals and all species listed as endangered or threatened in Illinois or Federally, including proposed and candidate species.

These distribution files are tied to extensive tabular files containing as appropriate life history, food habit and the habitat requirement information, details on beneficial existing and harmful management practices, status and abundance as well as the actual records of collections and/or observations of the species.

Wetlands data have been obtained as part of the Illinois component of the National Wetlands Inventory being conducted jointly with the Illinois Department of Conservation and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

This inventory, completed in August of this year, has located, mapped and classified all wetlands in Illinois with a resolution of approximately one quarter of an acre.

The classification scheme is the one used nationally by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Among many options, it allows for discrimination between natural and artificial wetlands, permanent and intermittent wetlands, and/or undisturbed wetlands versus those affected by draining or agriculture.

You might recall that we recall that we stopped at an intermittent wetland affected by agriculture during our tour of the proposed ring corridor.

We have done our job well. There are no fatal flaws. There are no snail darters. This year marks the 130th anniversary of the Illinois Natural History Survey.

Thus, it should be no surprise that our records include nearby collections for many species now considered endangered or threatened in Illinois. Most have been extirpated, but some still survive on isolated of patches of suitable habitat. We know where these patches are, and we have avoided them.

Our data show many wetlands, but they also show precise location and geometry and can separate degraded wetlands from those which remain high quality.

These are claims which others cannot make. In short, we know what is out there. Knowledge leads to sound planning. Planning can avoid unacceptable adverse impacts. It can include mitigation. It can provide for enhancement.

Without or with limited knowledge, planning must include contingencies. Contingencies cost time, contingencies cost money.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comment of Dr. Warren Brigham, manager of the Illinois Geographic Information System will be included in the record as received.

Next scheduled commentator is Peter Conroy, followed by Joe Ligas.

981 STATEMENT BY PETER CONROY

MR. CONROY: My name is Peter Conroy. I'm a resident of DuPage County and a licensed professional engineer in the State of Illinois.

I am Vice President of Harza Engineering Company. We are consultants to the State of Illinois on the SSC.

My comment is in reference to the relative cost of the SSC at the seven alternative sites.

The draft EIS acknowledges that cost estimates were made for each of the seven sites, but presents a project cost only as the average of the seven sites. The invitation for site proposal states and I quote, "Cost considerations are important to the selection process and will be used in conjunction with the technical evaluation criteria in selecting the most desirable site."

The Council on Environmental Quality, citing 1502.23 states, "If a cost benefit analysis relevant to the choice among environmentally different alternatives is being considered for the proposed action, it shall be incorporated by reference and appended to the statement as an aid in evaluating environmental consequences." The same citation also states, "An Environmental Impact Statement should at least indicate those considerations, including factors not related to environmental quality which are likely to be relevant and important to a decision."

Since cost is a consideration in the site selection process, the cost estimates for each of the sites should be provided as an aid in evaluating the environmental consequences of selecting a specific site. If the Department has any cost studies on which they intend to rely in making the final site selection, these studies must be made public as part of this process.

In developing these site-specific cost estimates, it is requested that the DOE utilize the data supplied to them in February, 1988, in the A. T. Kearny Inc. Report entitled, "Siting the Superconducting Super Collider at Fermilab, an Independent Cost Study."

In presenting this cost analysis, the DOE should evaluate the possible cost savings from: First, the use of the tevatron as the injector for the SSC without in fact interfering with other tevatron functions; Second, maximizing use of a Fermilab campus and associated infrastructure to serve the SSC; Third, use of Fermilab's scientific technical and support staff to support both the SSC and the tevatron; and Fourth, faster startup time for the SSC due to in-place staff and infrastructure and operating injector facility.

Further, it is requested that DOE also recognize the cost savings that is associated with decommissioning only a single site, Fermilab, rather than two sites should Fermilab not be selected.

It is also requested that the DOE recognize benefits realized by the extension of the useful life of Fermilab by siting the SSC at this existing facility.

It is also suggested that the DOE both the quality and the completeness of the geotechnical data base and the amount of tunnel construction experience available for each site and adjust each cost estimate by using appropriate contingencies reflecting the degree of uncertainty which exists for each.

In summary, it is in the national interest to construct the SSC at the site which has the lowest economic cost. A cost comparison of the seven alternative sites should be included in the final EIS.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Submitted for the record are Mr. Conroy's written comments as well as an appendix entitled, "Siting the Superconducting Super Collider at Fermilab, An Independent Cost Study," dated February 12, 1988.

The next scheduled commentator is Joe Ligus, followed by Richard Smonin.

980 STATEMENT BY JOE LIGUS

MR. LIGAS: My name is Joe Ligas. I am Deputy Director of the Chicago Area Transportation Study.

On behalf of Chicago Area Transportation Study, I am pleased to have the opportunity to offer testimony regarding the transportation impacts of the proposed Superconducting Super Collider project.

In the way of background, Chicago Area Transportation Study, commonly referred to as CATS, is the transportation planning agency for the six-county northeastern Illinois region. For over 30 years it has been the agency with responsibility for planning the region's transportation network.

1 The Study's efforts are guided by a policy committee made up of representatives of local government, the private sector and transportation agencies.

Chicago Area Transportation Study is also the designated metropolitan planning organization though which Federal transportation funding is coordinated. CATS is a recognized leader in transportation planning and modeling.

Our review of the Environmental Impact Statement concentrated on the transportation impacts of the project. We found the analysis to be an unbiased report of the impact. The traffic impacts to the project were reasonably assessed and the report provides an acceptable comparison to sites under review.

However, reports such as this which attempt to compare numerous sites with significantly different demographic profiles must be carefully used. The rural nature of many sites analyzed cannot easily be compared to sites in a more urban or suburban setting. Traffic impacts on two-lane rural roads are significantly different from those on an established system of urban expressways and arterials. In the case of the Illinois site, the analysis deals with rural, suburban and urban areas.

Given the complexity of analyzing the impacts in this environment the report must, of necessity, generalize some findings.

2 Examples of this kind of generalization occur in the analysis of level of service operation on the road network. The report indicates a low level of service along two major roadways in the area. The level along Route 64 for a three mile segment from Kirk Road to Randall Road reflects a very localized problem in the center of St. Charles.

In the same vein, the level of service for Route 34 between Route 31 and Route 59 reflects a localized capacity problem approaching the regional shopping center.

In each case, a problem exists; however, the magnitude may be overstated.

There are a number of minor discrepancies in roadway names and descriptions that were previously transmitted to the Department of Energy. In addition, the EIS failed to recognize the existence of a ride-sharing program in the area.

CATS, in cooperation with the East-West Corporate Corridor Association, has sponsored an active ride-sharing effort with all major employers. Fermilab is an active participant in this program.

The development of the SSC project at the Fermilab site is consistent from a transportation perspective with the overall development in the area.

The general trend towards office and research facilities in the vicinity has resulted in an aggressive transportation planning efforts in Kane and DuPage Counties.

We have seen the results of these efforts in the construction of the North-South Tollway through the center of DuPage County. Planning is also being undertaken to review the feasibility of a major new highway facility along the Kane-DuPage corridor. As the area grows, new transit services can be anticipated.

Transit services in the Naperville-Oak Brook corridor are being significantly upgraded and extensions to the west are feasible as demand grows.

In conclusion, from a transportation perspective, the report indicates the site offers excellent access. Further, the proposed development will have minimal impacts for future operations of the transportation system. These findings are consistent with CATS studies in existing plans and programs.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commentator is Richard Smonin, followed by Krishan Singh.

1093 STATEMENT BY RICHARD SMONIN

MR. SMONIN: Thank you very much. My name is Richard Smonin. I'm Chief of the Illinois State Water Survey, which is a division of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources.

The Water Survey has been monitoring the quantity and quality of water in Illinois for nearly a hundred years. We have assisted and continued to help individual homeowners, municipalities and industries to
1 solve their water problems in this are since 1895.

Quite naturally, our long-term records have provided technical information for the Illinois SSC proposal and to address some of the environmental impact issues.

The draft EIS makes numerous references to the potential impacts that the tunnel will have on the regional groundwater resources at the Illinois site. While the text of the report generally dismisses the magnitude of these impacts, and rightfully so, as being negligible, a review of only the summary tables would leave the casual reader to draw nearly the opposite conclusion.

The table suggests that the project would an incremental increase to a regional overdraft. At least three points ought to be made in order to put these statements into perspective.

First, there is indeed a regional overdraft of the Cambrian-Ordovician or deep sandstone aquifer system in the eight-county area.

Pumpage from this huge aquifer system has exceeded the estimated safe yield for about 30 years. As a consequence, water levels have fallen more than 900 feet since 1860, in deep wells in northern and western Cook, northeastern DuPage and northwestern Will Counties. These three counties, incidentally, account for about 70 percent of the regional deep pumpage.

In 1985, for the first time since detailed water levels have been recorded, a significant number of
2 wells in the Chicago region showed a rise in water levels. Some of this rise has been the result of declines in industrial pumping rates. In addition, however, recent studies by the Water Survey indicate that Lake Michigan allocations will also result in large recoveries of water levels as deep wells are shut off.

Projected deep pumpages for the area, although still in excess of the safe yield, will be reduced substantially because of the lake allocations and the situation in the deep system will clearly be one of improvement.

A second observation about the deep sandstone aquifer, is that in the SSC area, the trend is away from dependence on that system and toward utilization of both surface water and shallow aquifers.

Elgin, for example, now procures about half its water supply from the Fox River, while Aurora is proceeding toward a three-source system that includes the Fox River, glacial and shallow bedrock aquifers and the deep sandstone.

The State Geological and Water Surveys are concluding a study of the shallow aquifers of Kane County that suggests that substantial quantities of groundwater can be developed from these shallow aquifers.

Secondly, there is also a local overdraft in the shallow dolomite aquifers in DuPage County, to the east of the SSC site. However, Lake Michigan allocations will soon begin to improve the situation there also, as the pipeline from Chicago is completed.

Water from the lake will be distributed under the administration of the DuPage Water Commission and the DuPage County Public Works to 34 public water supply systems in the county.

Finally, as for the SSC itself, Fermilab derives its potable water supply from wells finished in the shallow dolomite aquifer and can easily meet future potable water needs from these wells.

Cooling water at the lab comes from the Fox River. Cooling needs around the ring, about 125 gallons per minute, will initially be provided from the anticipated groundwater seepage into the tunnel. Eventually, as the seepage rate declines, cooling water supplies will be supplemented by shallow wells and from three public water supplies.

In summary, the total water resource picture for the SSC area is excellent, both at the present time and as projected into the next four decades. Water supplies from shallow aquifers are relatively undeveloped in the area, and the needs for the SSC can be easily met.

As the draft EIS itself states in the text, "The impact of the project, both during construction and operation, will be negligible."

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Following Mr. Singh will be Adrian Visocky.

978 STATEMENT BY KRISHAN SINGH

MR. SINGH: My name is Krishan Singh, Principal Scientist, Illinois State Water Survey. I am here to offer my comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement that may be considered by the DOE in preparing their final Environmental Impact Assessment.

My comments specifically address the potential floodplain impacts at sites identified in the DEIS. The draft Environmental Impact Statement, DEIS, acknowledges that FEMA maps are available for the entire SSC site in Illinois. They are not available for four of the seven BQL sites. These maps are wide delineations of the hundred-year floodplain boundaries.

The DEIS identifies four surface facilities, F5, K4, J3 and J6, that may have some potential for floodplain encroachment. The proposal issue of the sites and the relevant floodplain boundaries, as taken from Figure 7-4 to 7-7 in the DEIS, are shown in my written comments as Figures 1 and 2.

Facility service area F5 is proposed to be located east of Government Road and just to the east of the floodplain boundary of Kress Creek. Even a small encroachment of five percent of the floodplain or other the flood fringe, as mentioned in the DEIS were not [copy missing]. The DEIS does say that any impacts to the floodplain will be negligible and the final project design may indicate no floodplain modifications.

Facility service area K4 lies entirely out of the Kress Creek floodplain, and therefore there is no potential for floodplain encroachment at this site.

The proposed location of facility service area J3 is in the southwest corner some distance away from Hawthorne Road and Kress Road and loads.

The DEIS states that J3 would extend 350 feet on to the 2,500-foot wide floodplain of Kress Creek or would encroach onto the floodplain fringe.

However, the DEIS Figure 7-6 with the proposed location as delineated in Figure 2 shows no encroachment onto the floodplain.

Site J6 lies wholly in the Fermilab area which is Federally owned. About 54 percent of the proposed site area is in the floodplain of Kress Creek and its tributary. However, only about 13 percent of the area lies in the floodway as defined by the Illinois standards.

The floodway is that portion of the portion of the floodplain as shown in Figure 3 in my little comments that must be kept free of encroachment to limit the increase in the hundred-year flood stage or surcharge to 0.1 foot.

The Illinois limit of 0.1 foot is much stricter than the Federal limit of one foot. Thus, a small portion of D6 is in the floodway. Its impact on the floodplain can be mitigated through flexibility provided by the arrangement of surface structures in this 40-acre site by channel diversion by movement of the site about 200 feet to the south.

The absence of FEMA maps or their partial existence for the proposed site may result in no identification of some surface facilities that might impact the floodplain.

The only other site with full FEMA map coverage such as that in Illinois is the Texas site where the DEIS possibility identifies four major surface facilities, J2, J3, J4 and J6 as entirely covering the full width of the floodplains of the area stream.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Mr. Singh's written comments will be included in the record and the transcript of the hearing is received by the Chair.

The next scheduled commentator is Adrian Visocky.

979 STATEMENT BY ADRIAN VISOCKY

MR. VISOCKY: Thank you. My name is Adrian Visocky. I am the senior hydrologist with the State Water Survey.

The DEIS indicates that as many as 320 wells could be impacted because of their locations within the corridor surrounding the proposed SSC tunnel. The report states that 320 is the number of wells that are located within this zone and then goes on to say, "Only a portion of these wells may be directly affected."

My comments are to bring to this discussion numbers which we feel reflect the more likely impact scenario.

During the fall of 1987, the State Water Survey undertook a special study to estimate the number of wells that potentially could be impacted by the construction and operation of the tunnel.

The study was divided into three parts: a file inventory, a field inventory and a statistical analysis.

A search of the files at the Water Survey was made to determine the number of wells within the tunnel corridor, experimental areas on the Fermilab campus for which records were available. For the purposes of our study, the tunnel corridor was defined as a strip of land extending one quarter mile on either side of the SSC tunnel.

Well locations in our file as usually known to within a ten-acre plot, a tract of land one-eighth of a mile on a side. Well depths were converted to bottom hole elevations for comparison with a target reference elevation.

The target reference elevation was determined by assuming a safety buffer zone above the tunnel. Guidelines for such a buffer have used a 35-foot radius around the center point of the tunnel shown in Figure 1 in my written comment, as the primary shield.

Since the center of the tunnel has a proposed elevation of 325 feet MSL, this translates to an upper limit of 360 feet for the top of the primary shield.

As an added measure of safety, the study assumed a buffer of 50 feet above the crown of the tunnel, or a protective reference elevation of 380 feet. All wells within the corridor were considered impacted if their bottom hole elevations were at or below 380.

Wells within the experimental area were considered impacted regardless of bottom hole elevation because excavations at these sites will extend from laying on the surface.

The search of the files located records of 773 water wells within the corridor in experimental areas. When the critical bottom hole elevation criterion to these wells, 14.4 percent of the wells were found to meet the criterion. In other words, the vast majority of the wells are finished well above the tunnel limits' buffer zone.

This statistic was later applied to the results of our field inventory.

The purpose of the field inventory was to determine the number of wells that exist within the corridor and in the experimental and Fermilab areas.

The survey, itself, was done by making a count of houses and buildings within the corridor and assuming one well per house. No wells were actually measured for depth during the field inventory. Houses and buildings served by public water supplies were not counted in the survey.

The inventory located 1505 wells, including known wells on the Fermilab campus. The number of wells that could be potentially impacted was estimated by applying the statistics from the file inventory to the results of the field inventory and using multipliers to take into account the widths of the buffer zones around the tunnel.

Thus, within the 300-foot width of the restricted zone, approximately 25 wells would potentially be impacted; that is, the U. S. Department of Energy would have the option of requesting that these wells be relocated on an individual basis. In the 70-foot primary shield zone, six wells would likely be impacted. We assume that these wells would be relocated.

In summary, our study indicates that the assertion made in the draft EIS as to the number of potentially impacted wells is in error by at least an order of magnitude and therefore reflects improperly on the likely consequences of construction and operation of the SSC.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Now, a very special moment, a ten minute recess.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

MR. EIGUREN: Ladies and gentlemen. We are ready to resume the hearing. May I ask you, please, to take your seats.

We'll now formally go back on the record for this Session H of the public hearing in Aurora, Illinois held on the 7th day of October, 1988 on the DEIS for the SSC project.

We, ladies and gentlemen, have 13 commentators in this session, and so it would be our intent to move straight through the remaining list of commentators, which would put us somewhere around 5:15 or 5:20 as the close of our session this afternoon.

The next scheduled commentator is Carl Becker, followed by Michael Divine.

988 STATEMENT BY CARL BECKER

MR. BECKER: Good afternoon, my name is Carl Becker. I'm of the Chief of the Division of Natural Heritage with the Illinois Department of Conservation in Springfield, Illinois.

Our Division is responsible for, amongst other things, the management of endangered and threatened species in Illinois. I wish to comment to you today on two of the species referenced in the DEIS, and that is the Federal endangered Indiana bat and the Federal threatened prairie bush clover.

The Indiana bat, myotis sodalis, is a highly migratory species that is known to occur in Illinois since it was first described as a new species. For any given site, the potential for occurrence is dependent primarily upon two factors: the time of the year and the availability of suitable habitat.

During the winter, mid-October through early April, Indiana bats are restricted to a few sites in Illinois that provide suitable locations for hibernation. There are no such sites in the proposed project area.

During the remaining portion of the year, this species is generally considered to occur statewide in Illinois, although accepted records are limited to 28 counties. The closest record of occurrence to the project areas for Cook County, where a single specimen was collected in September of 1928. Until recently, the consensus of opinion held that Indiana where a single specimen was collected in September of 1929. Until recently, the consensus of opinion held that Indiana bat habitat consisted primarily of riparian zones and associated vegetation. Data generated by the Illinois Department of Conservation and the Illinois Natural History Survey biologists, studying Indiana bat habitat, indicate that local populations also extensively utilize sites for roosting, foraging and maternity activities.

A review of the project proposal, given the above, has lead my staff expert and his coresearcher to the conclusion that no immediate to the Indiana bat population in Illinois will result from the construction activities associated with the project.

Now, I'd like to turn to the Federal threatened prairie bush clover, lespediza leptostachya. The prairie bush clover is restricted to northern Illinois, where seven native populations known from five counties, Lee, Ogle, McHenry, Cook and DuPage. These populations occur west, north and east of the SSC project area, but not within it.

All sites have been censused in 1988 and they contain 267 plants. The absence of plants from the home and Union Railroad prairies is attributed to the drought, as is most of the decline at the other sites.

The species occurs in dry upland prairie and heavy, coarse soils and in dry, mesic sand prairie along railroads. It can persist and disturb prairie and is inconspicuous in appearance. It may occur in remnant prairies and disturbed open habitats within the project area.

Primary potential for impact of this species is direct soil disturbance by construction. While there are no known sites for this species in the SSC project area, construction sites and areas scheduled for disturbance should be searched for this species during August and September so that plants can be located and avoided.

Disruptions of local hydrologic conditions could impact adjacent populations, although some current populations do exist along railroads where drainage disturbance has occurred.

The reasons for the rarity of the species and its absence from many prairie remnants is not well understood. It appears related to very soil and soil moisture requirement. For this reason, it is unlikely that the establishment of new populations at sites that visually appear to be suitable habitat would be reasonable mitigation action.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Next scheduled commentator is Michael Divine, followed by Thomas Emerson.

We will include in the transcript the hearing the written comments of Carl Becker of the Illinois Department of Conservation.

Next scheduled commentator is Michael Divine, followed by Thomas Emerson.

1094 STATEMENT BY MICHAEL DIVINE

MR. DIVINE: Good afternoon. I'm Mike Divine. I am the Director of the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency. We serve as the State Historic Preservation Office for the State of Illinois. Under Federal regulations promulgated as part of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Illinois Historic Preservation Office is responsible for the cultural resource management within the State and insures that undertakings by Federal agencies comply with historic preservations laws, regulations and guidelines.

The agency also conducts an independent survey program designed to inventory and evaluate Illinois
1 archeological sites and standing historic structures to determine their eligibility for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

In addition, the State Historic Preservation Office works in close cooperation with a number of State agencies, such as the Departments of Conservation and Transportation, that have voluntary plans to protect archeological and historic resources.

The Illinois Historic Preservation Agency has been deeply involved in the Illinois Superconducting Super Collider project. Working in conjunction with the archeological staff of the Illinois State Museum, the Illinois Archeological Survey and historians with the Kane County Development Department, the State Historic Preservation Office has compiled extensive documentation on the archeological sites and historic structures within the potential siting area.

This documentary research has included examination of the Illinois Archeological Survey's site files, published and unpublished archeological reports, county histories, plat maps, atlases, Government Land Office plat maps and surveyors' notes and the Illinois Historic Landmarks' building survey, the Illinois World Structure Survey and private and public artifact collections.

A comprehensive survey of the standing structures has also been completed, and the State is currently conducting field reconnaissance for archeological sites within the potentially affected construction area.

2 The results of all these cultural resource investigations demonstrate that the majority of the archeological sites thus far discovered represent small, diffuse, scatters of prehistoric lithic artifacts or historic period materials. These sites can easily be mitigated, if need be, through small-scale excavation efforts.

The importance of archeological resources is their information and site excavation at the site affected by the Superconducting Super Collider will provide important data. Comprehensive surveys of pre-1945 standing structures revealed that there are some historically significant structures within the siting area, but avoidance of these structures can be easily accomplished.

The outcome of the extensive documentation to date, demonstrates conclusively that the siting of the SSC within the proposed area will have no adverse affect on Illinois' important historic and archeological resources. In fact, the efforts to date have made, and will continue to make, a positive contribution to the understanding of the history and prehistory of the northeastern part of the State.

3 In closing, I would like to note that Illinois Historic Preservation Agency has a record of excellence on the national level in the comprehensive management of our cultural resources and we feel we can competently insure solid resource management as this project continues.

Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comment of Thomas E. Emerson, head of the Illinois Historic Preservation Office will be included in the record -- or the transcript of the hearing. Excuse me. Mr. Divine, we have a clarifying question, sir. If I could ask you to come back to the podium.

MR. NELSEN: I am interested in the documentation that you have provided. What have you submitted?

MR. DIVINE: A copy of my comments.

MR. NELSEN: Okay. Does this reference any of the data that you have tagged -- also you said there was some other data that is referenced in here?

4 MR. DIVINE: This particular document that I have brought with me today is simply the summary of my comments here today. But we have provided extensive in the siting proposal that has been submitted. We have a number of supplementary reports. In our proposal, we cite the various resources and collections that are available to be examined.

MR. NELSEN: Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Mr. Divine. I now ask Thomas Emerson to speak, followed by Keith Sherman.

987 STATEMENT BY THOMAS EMERSON

MR. EMERSON: As noted by Dr. Divine, the State Historic Preservation Office in Illinois resides within the Historic Preservation Agency. This office is responsible for insuring that Federal undertakings comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended.

The Illinois staff forms the Preservation Services Division of the Historic Preservation Agency. This division includes seven cultural resource management professionals who are responsible for providing the technical evaluation of Federal projects and the impact on historical, architectural and archeological resources in Illinois.

Their technical evaluation of the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC has indicated that this project will have no adverse affect on either the prehistoric or historic resources in Illinois.

In Illinois, the State Museum has taken primary responsibility for performing the necessary fieldwork, like title research and data compilation for the cultural resources in the area of the SSC's potential effect.

During the entire data collecting process, the Museum has consulted on a regular basis with our office. This ongoing dialogue has resulted in a comprehensive treatment of the resources in the EIS. The presence and distribution of archeological resources was approximated prior to field work through a modeling program that evaluated the role of soil type, distance to water, surficial geology and vegetation as determinants in prehistoric settlement.

The creation of this model has provided a unique on prehistoric utilization of the area and can be used to guide future work.

This effort was followed by the initiation of comprehensive field reconnaissance that is designed to cover 100 percent of the project area.

To date, less than 100 prehistoric sites have been discovered. As predicted on the basis of past research and the model, these sites primarily consist of small temporary campsites that have been occupied over the past eight millennium.

The SSC's potential effect on such sites can easily be mitigated through data collection and excavation or through minor avoidance. The area of potential effects has also been surveyed for the presence of structures constructed prior to World War II, utilizing standards and methodology approved by the State Historic Preservation Office.

Approximately 171 structures have been identified. None of these structures are currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places; however, based upon densities of National Register structures in similar areas of northeastern Illinois, we anticipate that approximately five percent will be found eligible after further documentation and evaluation is conducted.

For those that cannot during project implementation, we look forward to exploring other alternatives, such as adaptive reuse.

Our evaluation, however, has discovered several minor technical that were introduced into the EIS during the draft preparation.

These errors include the failure to insure the agreement of numbers given in the text with those included in the tables and the misuse of terminology.

We have prepared a more detailed report outlining the required corrections, and these are being forwarded to the Department of Energy.

Overall, we wish to commend the excellent and highly professional of the SSC area of potential effect conducted by the Illinois State Museum and foresee no obstacle in concluding successful compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, should Illinois be chosen as the SSC site.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

225-775 88 - 7 (BOOK 11)

MR. Eiguren. The written comment of Thomas E. Emerson from the Illinois State Historic Preservation Office will be included in the transcript of proceeding.

The next scheduled commentator is Keith Sherman, followed by Steve Schlickman.

1095 STATEMENT BY KEITH SHERMAN

MR. SHERMAN: Good afternoon. My name is Keith Sherman and my address is 2300 South Dirksen Parkway, in Springfield, Illinois 62764.

1 I am here representing the Illinois Department of Transportation and wish to discuss briefly ways to reduce the impact of heavier truck traffic congestion during the construction of the SSC.

Specifically, the most significant concerns will be the safety impacts related to the increase of heavy truck traffic that will occur when transporting excavated materials from the construction sites.

Although the construction schedule is not known at this time, if the worst case is chosen, ten TBMs will be operating at any one time, as shown in Appendix 10.2.3 [sic].

While we recognize that this scenario is unlikely, it does illustrate the need for mitigation at all levels of construction. The most significant factor influencing these impacts will be the rate of material deemed appropriate by the U. S. DOE.

Since any plan for the removal of excavated material should enjoy the support of local communities, the State recommends that U. S. DOE solicit and include public input in the final analysis and implementation of such plans.

2 In addition, the State recommends several other mitigation actions to be included in the construction phase. Wherever possible, State highways should be used to route trucks instead of local roads. In addition, local truck traffic should be directed away from residential areas and schools.

Since some local roads must be used to haul material from the sites to the nearest State highway, a plan has been committed by the State to strengthen these roads prior to the SSC construction.

These improvements will last beyond the construction of the SSC project.

Additionally, traffic controls and speed limits will also be installed to aid the traffic flow and maintain safety. In order to act against the increased traffic level impacts during construction, several options are available.

For example, restrict the daily number of truckloads that can be hauled from any one site by more on-site storage.

Two: Develop off-peak oriented disposal schedules to avoid normal urban congestion.

3 Three: Increase the number of disposal sites from the listed four in the draft EIS to the 17 which the State has already reached agreements with. This would allow spoils disposal to be done at the closest site possible. Further, there are additional 29 disposal sites that have been identified in the area that could be used.

Four: Optimize the removal of excavated material through remotely located shafts by transferring tunneled material through already-bored segments of the ring.

Although the increased traffic during construction will have impacts on some State roads, additional traffic from operational staff and visitors, once the SSC is completed, will have only minimal impacts on the State transportation system.

4 Through normal State investment over the next twelve years, the capacity of the highway system will readily accommodate all current development as well as that of the SSC.

As has been noted earlier in testimony, the State has proposed to make significant investments to improve the quality of area roads.

5 In closing, I just would say that the Illinois Department of Transportation is supportive of the SSC. These comments will be submitted along with other written comments at a later date, and I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commentator is Steve Schlickman, followed by Bob Cahill.

Can I have your name and address for the record, sir?

1096 STATEMENT BY STEVE SCHLICKMAN

MR. SCHLICKMAN: Thank you. I'm Steve Schlickman, Director of Intergovernmental Affairs for the Regional Transportation Authority of Chicago.

We're located at One North Dearborn in Chicago.

I would like to thank you for the opportunity of testifying today, and inviting comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have a written testimony that I would like to submit for the record.

First of all, let me describe the RTA to you. The RTA is a Regional Transportation Authority that is focusing on the funding and planning and service coordination of the six-county region of Chicago.

We have three operating agencies. The Chicago Transit Authority provides services primarily for the City of Chicago and immediately adjacent suburbs.

Metra, the commuter rail division of RTA, provides extensive commuter rail service throughout the six-
1 county region.

Pace, the suburban bus division of the RTA, provides comprehensive bus service to the suburban region.

We have a rapid transit, commuter rail and suburban bus network that is well integrated. We have the second largest transit system in the United States. We feel that our transit system is superior to any of the other proposed sites for the SSC.

I would like to state emphatically that the RTA, Metra and Pace, our suburban carriers, are firmly supportive of the SSC in its location at the Fermilab site. We are firmly committed to addressing the transportation needs of the suburban region, and in particular, this location.

We will develop services that are necessary in reaction to the development of the SSC.

We are concerned about the draft Environmental Impact conclusion that there will be increased within the area. Traffic is projected to exceed the existing road network capacity. We feel that the Environmental Impact Statement fails to fully reflect our commitment and ability to mitigate that effect and the negative consequences thereof. The RTA has a very strong financial ability to provide operational services.

We have one of the highest farebox recovery ratios in the nation, we have a stable funding source in a regional sales tax and a State operating grant match. State law requires that 85 percent of our sales tax revenue that is generated within the suburban counties must be expended on suburban services.

The conclusion, therefore, is that as development occurs in the suburbs, and in particular this area, we will have the revenue necessary to provide new and cost-effective transit services.

The RTA Board has a strong focus on suburban services. It is the Board policy to aggressively pursue innovative services for suburban growth areas. We recognize the need for transit solutions to reduce the negative impacts of auto congestion.

2 As evidence of that, within the last year, we have convened three suburban transportation workshops in conjunction with local officials and private industry to address transportation needs.

We have funded two transportation management associations within the suburbs. We are engaged in a major van pool subsidy demonstration project that is underwriting van pools for workers to trip to work.

We are funding new reverse commuter services from the city of Chicago into the suburbs so that the suburban region has access to the Chicago labor market.

There are extensive existing services in the Fermilab area. They are detailed in our written testimony. The Aurora bus system can easily be expanded to serve Fermilab and new facilities that will be constructed in conjunction with SSC. In addition to four existing stations, a new commuter rail station will open four miles from Fermilab. A feeder bus line can be provided to connect that station to the new site.

We have a commitment to new transit service, in particular, for Fermilab and the SSC. RTA is committed to an array of specialized services to link the existing network to that area.

Furthermore, the Metra commuter rail board is currently studying new rail corridors that would serve the western region of the region.

3 In conclusion, I would just like to emphasize that three boards have supported this project. We are firmly committed to using our resources to the extent possible to provide necessary transit services to meet the transportation that will result from this development.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comments of Steven Schlickman on behalf of the Regional Transportation Authority will be included in the record as received by the Chair.

The next scheduled commentator is Bill Cahill, followed by Mary Wall.

1097 STATEMENT BY BILL CAHILL

MR. CAHILL: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Cahill. As President of the Illinois Association of Realtors it is my privilege to address you concerning the effects of the Superconducting Super Collider on the property owners and real estate market in general.

1 First, the Illinois Association of Realtors does support the effort to locate the Superconducting Super Collider in the State of Illinois. The benefits of such a project for the State of Illinois are tremendous. The Super Collider project will result in hundreds, perhaps thousands of new jobs in countless industry.

It has been estimated the project will generate $100 million in tax revenue for the State government. Locating the Super Collider west of the Fermilab facility and using existing accelerator as an injector for the new ring makes sense both economically and operationally.

Much thought and planning has accompanied Illinois' bid for the project with potential savings as much as $400 million by building the SSC adjacent to the Fermilab.

2 Fermilab gives us a glimpse of what major scientific development might mean in the real estate in the vicinity. In the 20 years since Fermilab was conceived, surrounding areas have enjoyed economic development and growth unprecedented in that region's history.

Economic improvements were felt in several communities with the positive effects on the quality of life in the region. Housing, schools, unemployment and a variety of businesses and industries have all benefitted from the Fermilab development. The SSC offers an even greater perspective of positive benefits for the people in the vicinity. Its development will serve as a catalyst for many forms of enterprise, perhaps even new industries that have not yet been considered.

3

The scope of the Super Collider installation will be enormous, yet its physical impact on the real estate market will be comparably small for such a major installation. Government acquisitions of 5,000 acres of property does represent a substantial presence, but the product of such scale even very often require much more extensive land acquisition.

4 There is, however, no escaping the inconvenience and emotional difficulties for owners whose property is acquired for the project. This is probably the most salient negative factor to be considered in any major governmental program that requires property acquisition. It is unfortunate, but a fact that any major installation in a populated area will necessarily cause relocation of existing homes and businesses. Please note, however, that displaced owners will received financial compensation and will be treated fairly in the full accord with the laws of eminent domain and the Federal statutes providing for relocation assistance.

Underground easements will be established for another 10,000 acres. The State of Illinois will be required to provide compensation to property owners whose property is taken for underground easements. The prospect that the SSC has caused some individuals to express concern that property values in general may decrease throughout the vicinity is not true.

5 While any prediction of values is best speculative, experience and other governmental and scientific programs give many indications that overall values generally would be increased by the presence of the Super Collider.

To protect property owners in the unlikely event that property values do decrease, Illinois Association of Realtors supported the enactment of legislation this spring to provide compensation to property owners if the values of their property decrease as a direct result of the Superconducting Super Collider. The Super Collider will likely be a good neighbor in the area.

6 The nature of its purpose and operation should cause it to be free of environmental hazards and contaminants and other negative effects sometimes associated with other types of property use.

The method of excavating, construction and physical facility for the Super Collider are established and have proven successful in other projects.

The advantages associated with the SSC are vast. The Illinois Association of Realtors believes that the economic effect of the Super Collider be of great benefit to the adjacent communities and to those of neighboring areas as well.

7 Instead of dwelling on the potential drawbacks for locating the facility in Illinois, perhaps we should consider instead the consequences of the Superconducting Super Collider being located in another state.

Communities around the site would see hundreds of millions of dollars infused into the distant economy. Hundreds, perhaps thousands of jobs would be created somewhere else.

In the worst case scenario, locating the SSC somewhere else could mark the beginning of a decline of Fermilab's current position at the pinnacle of scientific research in the high energy physics.

8 For all those reasons, the Illinois Association of Realtors reaffirms its full support for bringing the SSC to Illinois and adjacent to Fermilab. It is a necessary goal to be achieved for the continuing advance of our State and the well being of its citizens.

Thank you for your time.

MR. EIGUREN: Our next scheduled commentator is Mary Wall, followed by Robert J. Raymond.

985 STATEMENT BY MARY WALL

MS. WALL: Good afternoon. My name is Mary Eleanor Wall. I am Chairperson of the DuPage County Regional Planning Commission, presenting a statement on behalf of the Planning Commission.

The offices of the Planning Commission are at 421 North County Farm Road in Wheaton. The statement was adopted at the meeting on September 14, 1988.

The DuPage County Regional Planning Commission was established in 1969 by the County Board to develop and execute planning programs that guide the growth and development of DuPage County in an environmentally sound manner.

The major functions of the Commission include providing for the present and future needs of the County, managing harmonious development of the County, and encouraging the joint cooperation of the political subdivisions within the County. In fact, the Planning Commission is a intergovernmental body with County Board, municipal and citizen representatives. I am one of the public citizen representatives.

DuPage County, along with Kane County, is a location of Fermi National Accelerator Laboratories, one of the seven site locations evaluated in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. The research conducted at this facility has made the United States of America the world leader in high energy physics for at least three generations.

Siting the SSC at Fermilab with its present tevatron accelerator would save the Federal government millions of dollars. The Fermilab complex is estimated to be worth more than $1.4 billion. The draft EIS did not provide a table comparing costs at each of the seven sites, as previous speakers have commented upon. And in summary, let me just pick up some of the highlights here that we do acknowledge.

There are credits for this site, including credit for the Fermilab facilities, the reduced costs for utility systems and campus facilities and reduced operating expenses due to cost-sharing with ongoing funded Fermilab research program. What we do think, that the savings could amount, if it were located here, to as much as $400 million over construction at other locations, and computations indicate that we would save $60 million in annual operating costs because of the infrastructure that we have. The statement goes on to comment on the socio-economic characteristics of this location in northeastern Illinois. We think we live in a highly developed location where we have all kinds of cultural advantages and many outstanding industrial research facilities, such as Allied Amphedol (phonetic), Amoco Laboratories, AT & T, Bell Laboratories, GCA Corporation, Nalco Technical Center, Sunbeam Appliance Company and many others.

In addition, DuPage County has Argonne National Laboratory, a Federally-funded multidisciplinary research facility with over 3,000 employees. Argonne conducts research in the areas of engineering, basic sciences, biomedicine, and environmental science and technology.

The corridor is also the location of corporate headquarters for many Fortune 500 firms. The intrastructure with our educational institutions I am sure has been commented on. We believe that we have the public service personnel and the teachers to handle the increase in student enrollments, but it appears that the increase would only be .1 percent to meet the demand, so we have educated people here to handle the teaching requirements.

Housing needs could also be served in this area. We have in our region between 1980 and 1987 -- regional housing industry constructed an average of 23,000 units annually. Clearly, we have that capacity.

We do have world-class cultural opportunities with the wonderful Chicago Symphony, which we think may be the greatest in the world (and others think so too, by the way), museums, theatrical productions, and we do have recreational facilities. Now, my paper doesn't mention it, but we also have the Bears, the Bulls, the Cubs, the Sox, and the Hawks.

So, there are all kinds of cultural and recreational opportunities.

Construction of the SSC would not overwhelm constructions projects in northeastern Illinois because we have a large capacity there.

In regard to Fermilab, the residents within the Fermilab area, we do view the research facility not only as an economic benefit, but also as a good neighbor. The facility is a showplace for the visual and performing arts, a prairie restoration project, a cancer treatment center, an educational institution, and it is a tourist attraction.

People trust and support the laboratory's activities. The good neighbor relationship that has already been established in Illinois is an important consideration. Since siting the SSC at Fermilab would further the overall growth and development of northeastern Illinois, including DuPage County, in an environmentally sound manner, the DuPage County Regional Planning Commission supports and encourages the selection of the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory as the site for construction of the Superconducting Super Collider facility.

Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: The statement of Mary E. Wall, Chairperson of the DuPage County Regional Planning Commission, will be included in its entirety in the transcript of this proceeding.

The next scheduled commentator is Robert J. Raymond, followed by Steve Shard.

Is Mr. Raymond here? Robert J. Raymond? Steve Shard? Following Mr. Shard will be Robert Sabolich.

1098 STATEMENT BY STEVE SHARD

MR. SHARD: Good afternoon. My name is Steve Shard and I represent the Illinois Department of Agriculture. The Department is located in Springfield, Illinois.

1 The Illinois Department of Agriculture has carefully examined the draft Environmental Impact Statement that has been prepared for the proposed Superconducting Super Collider project. Hence, it is our desire to express the following remarks.

With regard to the long-term viability of agriculture in the northeastern region of Illinois, it is obvious that encroaching nonagricultural development is rapidly changing the character of many rural areas within this region.

DuPage County has experienced a level of growth in recent years that is essentially unparalleled by any other county in the nation.

It is envisioned that growth of this magnitude will continue at least for the immediate future. A consequence of this intensive growth scenario will be the transformation of thousands of farmland acres to nonagricultural purposes. While the degree of farmland that would be acquired is significant, the potential exists for the acquisition to generate positive benefits. We believe it is logical to
2 predict that the areas encompassing central and western Kane County will encounter extensive development pressures in the not-so-distant future.

In accordance with the information presented in the draft EIS, large tracts of farmland would be purchased in western Kane County for SSC operations, future expansion, a needed buffer from incompatible land uses. However, farmland that is not devoted to SSC operations could be leased back to agricultural producers for farming purposes.

Based on this initiative to lease back farmland that is not essential for immediate SSC utilization, it is conceivable that the longevity of this farmland will be enhanced.

Simply put, the SSC may act as a mechanism to protect farmland from local residential, commercial, industrial development.

3 It was also gratifying to note that various mitigation strategies that were discussed within the draft EIS. These mitigation proposals would serve to minimize the adverse impacts of the SSC project that would be inflicted upon the agricultural and ecological resources within the project area.

One very noteworthy scheme refers to the proper control of surface water runoff and erosion. We understand that the appropriate techniques will be implemented to retard surface runoff during the construction and post-construction phases, thereby reducing the opportunities for soil erosion to occur.

Of course, soil erosion has a direct bearing upon the water quality of our rivers, streams, lakes and ponds. The Illinois Department of Agriculture has formulated numerous progressive programs that pertain to soil conservation and erosion control.

4 These programs are not only geared toward agricultural practices but urban construction scenarios as well.

Therefore, we have a keen interest in these resource issues as they relate to the SSC. While it is not possible to identify the precise surface runoff and erosion control methods until the final ring configuration is announced and the affiliated design work is completed, it is apparent that the measures will be implemented to protect the environment from needless degradation.

The Illinois Department of Agriculture is also fully supportive of the mitigation component that defines the manner in which spoils from the tunnel will be disposed. Undoubtedly, the use of farmland for spoil sites would render that land useless for future agricultural endeavors. Placement of the
5 spoils in abandoned quarries or selling the material as aggregate is indeed an innovative approach to the disposal dilemma posed by the generated spoil materials.

If it is eventually necessary to utilize surface areas for spoil disposal, sites should not comprise productive agricultural land.

6 If, in fact, Illinois is selected for the SSC, our agency will be in a position to lend the necessary assistance to the Governor's SSC Task Force Agencies and if appropriate, to the Department of Energy in the identification and mitigation of the secondary AG impacts that are indirectly related to the SSC.

7 Unquestionably, the local AG resources will be affected by the highway improvement and utility projects that are associated with the SSC. Impacts to existing farming operations and the agricultural infrastructure such as tile drainage systems, are very relevant issues that must be addressed as the project proceeds.

8 The Illinois Department of Agriculture is fully committed to volunteering its services to our sister task force agencies and the Department of Energy to insure that the SSC and the associated spin-off projects are fully compatible with the agricultural environment.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commentator is Robert Sabolich.

1099 STATEMENT BY ROBERT SABOLICH

MR. SABOLICH: My name is Bob Sabolich. I am a CPA and I live in St. Charles, Illinois.

The purpose of my speech is to state my conviction that the SSC should not be built in Illinois. I wish to preface my remarks by saying that I am not against the SSC project and have no qualm with the recommendation that the project be pursued. I simply believe that Illinois is a poor choice for a proposed site.

1 A significant disadvantage is that the citizens of Illinois, more than any other State, don't want it. If Texas or some other State wants to be the SSC's site, why not direct it to them?

As you know, Illinois citizens have been the most vocal in their opposition to our State as the SSC site. Therefore, please honor our request and site the project elsewhere.

I also wish to comment concerning various points in the draft of the EIS, all pertaining to items in Volume IV of the EIS.

2.1: The land acquisition cost is not included in the cost estimate. I recognize that land will not be a Federal cost; nevertheless the cost picture would be much more accurate if shown detailing the total cost, including land acquisition. I believe doing so will result in Illinois looking much less attractive as a site due to the higher land value in the Chicago metro area, when compared to other
2 proposed sites such as Texas.

State land acquisition cost is a significant factor and will come out of the pocketbook of the Illinois taxpayers. Not to disclose this cost, this represents the total project cost by site.

Then 2.4.3. The EIS should disclose the cost by state for each site and not as an average or a range.
3 Hundred million dollar swings are important enough to be disclosed on a state-by-state basis. Why was a cost breakdown by state considered unnecessary? I don't know. I would like to see that breakdown.

4 Then 3.1 to 3.4: The decommissioning discussion makes no mention of returning areas to their pre-SSC habitat. For example, will a former building site be reseeded along with the planting of trees and shrubs? Or will it be left with concrete pads? This must be addressed.

5 1.1.2.10: The bulk of the landscaping is going to the campus and injector areas. Exactly how much is going toward the service areas? My home is only 300 yards from a proposed service area, and I refuse to stare a huge storage tanks with only a handful of shrubs to hide their grotesque sight.

6 14.1 2.E to B. Travel time for migrant workers for Illinois is based on the typical distribution of Fermilab employees. There is no reason to believe that the same distribution is to be accurate. No evidence was given to conclude the distribution to be reasonable. Therefore, the distribution should have been determined as it was for the other test sites. I am confident that the result would be a greatly increased travel time and cost since most Fermilab employees live close to Fermilab whereas most SSC construction workers would be coming in from the farther reaching Chicago metro area.

Moreover, Fermilab is on the eastern edge of the ring, further distancing Chicago area workers from the work site.

7 14.1.2.3. E.2. C.3: Public service employment impacts are based on 1982 data. This is old data considering that booming growth and resulting increased public service needs in the DuPage and Kane County areas. Therefore, the conclusions concerning the impact to public service employment appears to be understated.

8 14.1.3.3.E: A "survey" performed in 1987 is cited in which Illinois residents allegedly responded favorably concerning as a proposed SSC site. The study appears grossly inaccurate. 1987 was a premature period to perform the study inasmuch as the ring location, let alone service facilities, et cetera, was not even known by the public until 1988. I seriously doubt the randomness of the samples, the objectivity of the questions they asked, and the interpretation of the results. It should be thrown out. A new survey should be conducted by an independent pollster.

9 In conclusion, the SSC is not for Illinois, Illinoisans are not for the SSC. I hope this helps lead you to a similar conclusion.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Do you have a written submission for the record? We were --

MR. SABOLICH: I mailed it in to Mr. Hess.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. We'll note that for the record. We wanted the specific sites that you're referencing.

The next scheduled commentator is George Fleming, followed by Jeannette Wampach.

288 STATEMENT BY GEORGE FLEMING

MR. FLEMING: I am Dr. George Fleming. I'm on the County Board and my district is District 15, which encompasses the rural half -- west half of St. Charles Township and almost all of Campton Township, except the precinct around Eltman.

At the last County Board meeting in September, I made a statement and I am here this afternoon to make sure that this same statement, verbatim, is in your records.

About 35 years ago, our family, my wife, children and myself, moved to rural St. Charles Township because of its bucolic pastoral setting. We did not move here for any economic gain. The love of natural beauty and peacefulness was all we wanted.

Natural growth of the Chicago megapolis has offered this to some extent, but fortunately, the people who did move out to Campton and St. Charles Townships held the same ideals to their environment as we did. All of us just wanted to be left alone, to enjoy the beauty of the Fox River Valley.

Now comes the Super Collider. Can the United States Government guarantee that there will be no harmful radiation or that our water supply will not be endangered? Can the ventilation and access shafts really be camouflaged so as not a blight on the landscape? Will the property values ever return to normal for those right on top or the ring?

And the one thing that the State of Illinois and the United States Government cannot gloss over in any manner whatsoever, in spite of all the assurances, is that the construction phase will destroy and make vestigial the peace and cleanliness of air that we now enjoy.

A few months could be tolerated, but we are talking about years. Yes, several years of heavy truck traffic, noisily tearing up our roads, blocking traffic, plus creating dust and dirt which by any urban standards will be intolerable.

Whether the Super Collider is a boon or a bust to Kane County, as the Tribune poll by the League of Women Voters queries, is not the issue.

The most affluent townships, like Kane County, could care less about personal, financial gain from this obliquitous project. As the County Board representative of these people, I can do no other than to object to the construction of the Super Collider in Kane County.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comment of Dr. George Fleming of the County Board, County of Kane, will be included in the transcript of the hearing.

The prior received written comment of Steve Shard of the Illinois Department of Agriculture will also be included in the transcript of the hearing.

The next scheduled commentator is Jeannette Wampach, followed by Mike T. Brown.

1100 STATEMENT BY JEANNETTE WAMPACH

MS. WAMPACH: I am Jeannette Wampach. I would like to correct the spelling, W-A-M-P-A-C-H. I am a lifelong resident of Kaneville, having spent a few years of my life as a resident of Big Rock.

I come to you today with many concerns but very little time to speak. I would like to speak as a resident who will be displaced, whose home will taken. I could speak to you as a sister, as a daughter, to other families who will be displaced. As a neighbor, to my aunt, our entire family will displaced by this project.

I could also speak to you about my parents' business of five generations, the oldest blacksmith shop in
1 Illinois, that will be displaced by this project.

I could speak to you as a nurse educator who is greatly concerned with the health of the residents of the entire Fox Valley area. I have great concerns about the radiation, safety, noise, stress, air pollution, water pollution, but these have been well delineated by former speakers, so I won't take my time with that.

What I have chose to address, since it seems that the committee is much more concerned about physical environmental impact, that is the focus of my discussion.

I find it very interesting that the gentleman from the Illinois Department of Agriculture made a passing reference to the impact of the tile drainage systems. I assume he is referring to the tile drainage systems along the lower arc of the ring that lie between the Townships of Kaneville and Big Rock.

I would hope he is referring Big Rock District Drainage No. 2 -- 3,000 acres of land -- because this has not been addressed. It has not been addressed by the State in their environmental assessment report, Volume 3. It has not addressed by the Environmental Impact Study of the Department of Energy nor have I heard it addressed other than this one passing comment.

His comment was, that if this comes, we must address it as the project proceeds, and I present to you, gentlemen, that this is too late. This must be addressed now, and I would think the Department of Energy would have a great deal of interest in identifying the impact not only to the members of the community and the farmers, but also to some of the structures that you plan to build in this very area of the Big Rock District Drainage No. 2.

2 I got my information that I am presenting to you today from Jim Scott, who is President of the Drainage District. He's a lifelong resident farmer. His family has farmed this land, the very land that we are talkings about, since the Civil War. They have witnessed the floodplain concerns. The entire area of Big Rock is located in a floodplain. The entire between Kaneville and Big Rock where a good share of the ring will be constructed, many access points, F sites, E sites, interaction points, all lie within this very area.

This has not been -- let me back up. My presentation today, I had hoped to be able to use an overhead that I have depicted the structures, the geography, the concerns that I have relative to the water runoff situation. In lieu of not being able to have an overhead, which I understand was ruled not to be done, I would like to the panel at this time a map that depicts the comments I would like to make.

If you could focus your attention to the blue outlined areas. This is a rough approximation of the Big Rock District Drainage No. 2 that I have alluded to. It's approximately 3,000 acres that lies directly between Kaneville and to the south down to the community of Big Rock.

To the western border delineated in blue is Welsh Creek. To the eastern border is approximately the margin which is bordered by Dugan Road and Hire Road.

If you will notice in the middle, depicted in green, this is a very quick approximation of some of the major tile systems that presently lie in this land. These tile systems vary anywhere from six inch, 12 inch, even up to 20 inch in diameter. If you will notice, these tile systems are being transsected in several critical interaction points. F5 in the Kaneville area. K4, K3, E5, all are directly interacting some of these key drainage areas.

The heavy green line to the right depicts a former "crik" which no longer exists because, in 1912, it was tiled. This entire area between these two boundaries is drained only by the existing tile systems.

Now, when you start putting these access shafts and interaction points along these sites, you are going to critically impact the continuity, the integrity of these tile drainage systems.

This water presently runs into Welsh Creek. If that continuity is interrupted, it will have no means to get there. It will become surface water and render this prime farmland no longer prime farmland. It will become wetland.

I would draw your attention to the red line down the middle of this District. This is the railroad spur that you gentlemen proposed to place right in the middle of this land.

If the tile systems are disrupted, I propose that this would not be a very wise place to put this railroad spur. It may not have a very firm foundation.

And if it isn't already destroyed by the disruption of the tile systems, I am sure that the weight and the hauling of these heavy magnets will do it in quite quickly.

My other concern relative to the balance of this entire drainage system, the sewage treatment plant which I have delineated near the F5 site, which Illinois proposes to build at the far cluster, I have indicated it with a little blue star, near Kaneville. This is directly on the Welsh Creek, the creek that receives the water drainage from all this area.

And by the way, all of the land to the west of Welsh Creek also drains into it. I just don't have firsthand data on it to speak to you on, and those tiles probably wouldn't be as directly affected.

MR. EIGUREN: Jeannette, your time is expired but go ahead and bring it to a conclusion.

MS. WAMPACH: When the sewage treatment is built and the water level elevates and we add all the water from the tunnel to it, surely it will raise the water level.

Currently, only six inches of water level from the average level, will cause the tiles to be flooded and the existing tiles will no longer be able to drain the fields.

3 I would quickly like to draw your attention to the bottom to the green double lines near Big Rock. These are two 20-inch tiles. They drain the entire north part of the town of Big Rock, the school, homes and businesses. If this crik raises even six to 12 inches, Big Rock will not drain. It is all encompassed in floodplain. I have experienced personally having sewage sitting on the surface of the land because of the poor evaporation of the tiling from septic systems with any major rain. Big Rock is in a big mess.

The State mitigation plan is to make this into a recreational area. You won't read that in your report; the only way we know it is because they submitted to the Kaneville Library depicting the land use in the future as a recreational center.

4 I wonder how many of the residents of Big Rock know that they are slated to be a recreational center, perhaps for the enjoyment of the scientists and their families.

I believe that this needs to be looked into and investigated much more thoroughly than it has.

Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. EIGUREN: The diagram provided by Jeannette Wampach will be included in the record as received. It has your name and address on it, so we appreciate that.

Our last scheduled commentator is Mike T. Brown.

990 STATEMENT BY MIKE T. BROWN

MR. BROWN: Good afternoon, gentlemen. My name is Michael Brown. I am the Director of General Services for the Tooling and Manufacturing Association.

1 I am here representing the precision metalworking industry in the Chicago area and to persuade you to build the Superconducting Super Collider here, in Illinois.

Why? The reasons are simple. First, it is in the Department of Energy's best interest to build the SSC here because this area is the precision metalworking center of the world.

Chicago six-county area can provide you designers and engineers, a vast network of tooling, machining and production plants using the latest technology in machining procedures.

Residing in this area are over 10,000 journeymen-level tool, die and mold builders, over 20,000 precision machinists, over 5,000 contact precision metalworking companies, which include special tooling, special machine builders, precision machining and fabricating companies.

These metalworkers and metalworking firms are some of the best that you will find throughout the world.

This vast local network will provide your SSC designers and engineers with easy supplier access, consultation assistance, reduced delivery times, transportation savings, increased communications and the latest in metalworking technologies.

The second reason for choosing this area is the commitment of the Tooling and Manufacturing Association. The TMA is a local trade association of approximately 1400 companies throughout the Chicago area.

We were established in 1925 and we have trained thousands of tool builders and precision machinists through our highly regarded apprentice training program. We are currently planning for the future by training nearly 700 craftsmen in our program.

TMA would be pleased to provide your designers and engineers with vendor capability information.

The third reason is actually an illustration of how Chicago metalworking community has already worked through our association on a special project.

Over the last two years, member of TMA have cooperated to help Dr. Albert Crew of the University of Chicago Physics Department build the world's most powerful electron microscope.

Over 25 of our members donated their time and expertise to produce the component parts necessary to build the subangstrom microscope. Once completed and functioning, the microscope will resolve to .5 angstroms. In Dr. Crew's words, equivalent to magnifying a beach ball to the size of the earth.

The Tooling and Manufacturing Association and its members are proud of the Chicago area's metalworking capabilities. Although I cannot commit that TMA would donate their services to the SSC project or their members would donate their services to the project, I am sure you would be pleased with their performance.

In conclusion, my statement is simple. If you build the SSC in Illinois, you will have the resources of the best local area metalworking companies available anywhere.

Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: We will include for the record a document provided to us by Mr. Brown entitled, "Purchasing Guide", along with supporting information.

At this point, that concludes our list of pre-registered commentators for this session. The only individual whose name I called and got no response to was, Robert J. Raymond. Is Mr. Raymond here?

Is there anyone else who was in the room who was registered to comment this afternoon who has not had the opportunity to do so? There not being anyone in that category, it is now 5:15, I will formally adjourn this Session H public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed SSC project being held on the 7th day of October, 1988, in Aurora, Illinois.

Thank you for your patience and courtesy. We will resume our hearing this evening at 7:00 p.m. in this room. I should mention that those of you that are scheduled to comment this evening in the auditorium, a decision has been made to have the comments received here before this Hearing Panel at 7:00 p.m.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 5:15 p.m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 7:00 p.m., the same day.)

FIFTH SESSION

(October 7, 1988: 7:00 p.m.)

MR. TEMPLE: Good evening. I would like to welcome you to another session of the Department of Energy's public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, EIS, for the Superconducting Super Collider, SSC. My name is Ed Temple and I am the executive director of the SSC Site Task Force. I am also the presiding official for this hearing.

The purpose of my brief remarks is to tell you why we are all here. After my brief remarks, I will ask our session moderator, Mr. Eiguren, to outline how we will conduct our meeting this evening.

The purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens an opportunity to comment in person on the Department's draft EIS on the SSC. This hearing is not your only opportunity; you may also send us your written comments, which must be postmarked by October 17, 1988.

We want you to know that we are sincerely interested in hearing your comments on this document and that each of your comments will be considered and responded to in the final EIS.

Let me refresh your memories regarding the SSC site selection process. In January 1987, President Reagan's decision to proceed with the SSC was announced and construction funds were requested from Congress. In April 1987, the Department issued an invitation for site proposals. We subsequently received 43 proposals and 36 of these were found to be qualified.

These qualified proposals were forwarded to a joint committee of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering, for further evaluation. Based on the criteria in the invitation, the Academies recommended a best qualified list, BQL, of eight sites to the Department. One of these sites was later withdrawn by the proposer.

Following a review and verification of the Academies' recommendations, Secretary Herrington announced the best qualified list, including the Illinois site proposal, on January 19, 1988. Three days later, on January 22, the DOE formally announced that it would develop an EIS on the proposed SSC. This followed an advance notice of intent to prepare an EIS which had been issued in May of 1987.

In February of 1988, we held scoping meetings in each of the seven states to obtain public comment on the nature and scope of the environmental issues to be considered in the EIS. The scoping meeting in Illinois was held in Fermilab Auditorium.

The DOE received approximately 2,100 comments on the scope of the EIS. These comments were considered in the preparation of the draft EIS. Following public hearings here and in the six other BQL states, we will develop a final EIS to be issued in December of 1988.

The draft EIS evaluates and compares four types of alternatives: site alternatives, technical alternatives, programmatic alternatives, and the no-action alternative.

Site alternatives address the seven locations identified on the BQL. Technical alternatives meant considering different technologies, different equipment, or different facility configurations. Programmatic alternatives addressed the possibility of using other accelerators, international collaboration, or project delay. The no-action alternative was the option not to construct the SSC.

This draft EIS identifies and analyzes the potential environmental consequences expected to occur from siting, constructing, and operating the SSC at the seven site alternatives. These sites are located in Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas.

The draft EIS provides as much information as possible at this stage of project development regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed construction and operation of the SSC at each of the alternative sites.

However, the DOE recognizes that further review under NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, is appropriate prior to constructing and operating the proposed SSC. Accordingly, following selection of a site for the proposed SSC, the DOE will prepare a supplement to this EIS to address in more detail the impacts of constructing and operating the proposed SSC at the selected site, and to identify where possible alternatives for mitigating these impacts.

Let me tell you a little bit about the draft EIS. This is a large document containing more than four thousand pages. It is organized into four volumes.

Volume I is entitled "Environmental Impact Statement." Volume II is the comment resolution document and is reserved for our response to public comment and for publication only in the final EIS. Volume III describes the methodology for site selection. And Volume IV contains sixteen appendices for writing

detailed presentations of technical information which back up the conclusions in the Environmental Impact Statement. Comments received at this hearing will be used by the DOE to prepare a final EIS to be issued this December. This document will identify the Department's preferred site. No sooner than thirty days after the final EIS is distributed, the Department will publish its record of decision which will include the final site selection and complete the site selection process.

Tonight, we will use a professional moderator to assure a fair and orderly proceeding. Measures have been taken to permit the maximum opportunity for interested citizens to utilize this session for expressing their comments. We urge all participants in this evening's meeting to focus their comments on the draft EIS and to avoid or minimize statements aimed solely at expressing opposition or support for the state's proposal.

While all comments will become part of the formal record of this proceeding, those specifically addressing the draft EIS will be most useful to the DOE in preparing the final document. As I noted earlier, in addition to this opportunity for all comments, individuals may also provide written comments to the DOE. These should be postmarked by October 17, 1988, the end of the formal forty-five day comment period, to insure that they will be considered in the preparation of the final EIS. We will, however, consider comments received after that date to the extent possible.

One final word on the role of the EIS in the site selection process. The National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, requires that environmental impacts be considered by federal decision makers in taking major federal actions with potential environmental consequences. An EIS is one of the methods used to do this analysis, to provide for public comment and participation and to make a final decision that meets the NEPA requirements. The EIS will be considered by the Secretary in making the site selection.

I want to thank you in advance for your interest and participation. Let me now introduce Mr. Eiguren who will describe how we will conduct tonight's session.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, Dr. Temple. Good evening ladies and gentlemen, my name is Roy Eiguren. I'm an attorney in private practice with the law firm of Lindsay, Hart, Neil & Weigler, with offices in Seattle, Washington, Portland, Oregon, San Francisco, California and Boise, Idaho.

Our firm's practice, as well as mine, is heavily concentrated in energy and environmental law. Both in private practice as well as in prior governmental service, I've had over a decade's worth of experience in either participating in or conducting National Environmental Policy Act hearings such as the one we are conducting here tonight.

The Department of Energy retained me for the purpose of being a moderator for this and other hearings being held in this series. Under the terms of my retention with the Department, I am not an employee of the Department, nor am I an advocate for or against the Department's proposed action in the proceeding.

Rather, my single, express purpose is to serve as an independent, unbiased, objective individual to moderate the hearings. My role is to assure that the Department of Energy fully complies with the letter and spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act by allowing all individuals and organizations a fair and equal opportunity to comment on the record relative to the Department's proposed action.

As Dr. Temple mentioned, the purpose of this, as well as the other hearings in this series, is to give all interested citizens an opportunity to comment, on the record, relative to the Department of Energy's draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC project. In February, the Department of Energy conducted a scoping meeting here in Illinois as well as other states under consideration for the project, to hear comments from individuals and organizations on what issues they felt should be considered in the preparation of the draft EIS.

Now that the Department has completed the draft EIS, it seeks comment on it from the public. In particular, the Department seeks specific comment on issues the members of the public feel are relevant and should be considered by the Department prior to finalizing the Environmental Impact Statement and making its final choice as to a preferred site for the SSC.

I would like to indicate that this is a record proceeding. That is to say, everything that has been said at this as well as all the other hearings in this series have been recorded by a court reporter. We have a court reporter here with us in the front of the room. The court reporter will make a verbatim transcript of all comments received as well as any written comments that we receive here, and submit that transcript to the Department of Energy for inclusion in the final record of this proceeding.

The Secretary of Energy's decision relative to the project will be based upon the information contained in that record.

At this time, I would like to tell you what procedures we are following both in this as well as all the other hearings in this series. I have been announcing speakers from a list provided to me by the Department of Energy. That list was compiled of pre-registered speakers by individuals in advance of this evening's hearing calling the Department and indicating their desire to participate in the hearings.

Accordingly, we have a list of a number of individuals who have signed up in advance who will comment tonight.

In addition to that, because of the large number of commenters here in Illinois, the Department has done two things to accommodate those people. One, is we have been having parallel hearings; that is to say, there has been another hearing panel in the auditorium in this high school for the last day and a half hearing comment. That panel is scheduled to meet this evening and hear comment for those individuals who have come to the door and signed in.

However, we have had very few folks at this point arrive for the evening and so, what I would like to do at this point is: if anybody is here that has not registered a comment and would like to comment, we would ask that you would go back to the registration table and so indicate, so that we know whether we are going to have to have another hearing panel tonight or whether we can accommodate everybody here before this hearing panel.

The other rules that we are following in terms of the conduct of these hearings have been such things as following a five-minute rule. That is to say, every individual that would like to comment is given up to five minutes within which to provide their oral comment to us. At the end of five minutes, I have been signaling individual commenters that their time has expired.

As stated earlier, the purpose of this hearing is to receive comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Accordingly, your comments should be focused on the issues that are addressed in the draft document itself. We do reserve the right to ask individuals to focus on issues contained in the draft EIS if they wander significantly from the topic of the session. We are not intending to limit remarks but rather we are seeking to assure that what comments you do provide us are effective in achieving the goal of the proceeding.

However, I have mentioned before at all the hearings that I have conducted we are allowing comment on any issue that individuals feel they would like to speak to relative to the SSC project. Written comment and oral comment receive the same weight in the record of this proceeding. Therefore, we have been strongly encouraging individuals to provide written comment as well as written questions to us, either by submitting them to me at the conclusion of their comments here or to me at any time during the course of the hearing, or by mailing them to the Department of Energy by the close of the record in this proceeding.

If you would like to provide written comment after tonight's hearing or written questions, you may do so by mailing them to this address, which is contained in a business card that is available to you at the registration table in the back of the room. It must be postmarked by the close of comment, which is October 17, 1988.

This session has started at 7 o'clock. We intend to continue on as long as necessary to accommodate all commenters who would like to speak here this evening. Our intent is to first take all pre-registered speakers and to the extent that we have walk-ins that are not accommodated by the other hearing panel, we will accommodate them here.

Throughout the course of the hearings, approximately once every hour for five minutes or so, we take a brief recess to allow our court reporter to change the tapes. That's fairly important.

The other rules that we are following for this proceeding are as follows: When it comes your turn to speak, we would ask that you would step forward here to the front of the room to the podium where the microphones are at. We would ask that you give us your name and address, and if you are speaking on behalf of an organization, tell us the name of the organization that you are speaking on behalf of.

Once you have completed your introductory material, name, address, and organization, I will start timing you. As I say, you have up to five minutes. Because we have had a large number of commenters throughout this entire proceeding, we have been adhering to the five minute rule rather strictly. So when your five minutes expire, we would ask that you would quickly bring your comments to conclusion.

A few other rules I would like to mention relative to the use of this building: the high school is a smoke-free building and, accordingly, there is no smoking allowed anywhere in the facility. We would like to thank the high school for their allowing us to use these facilities; they have been most accommodating in that regard.

I would like to once again mention the fact that we are planning, if necessary, to accommodate walk-in registrants by having a panel conduct a hearing in the auditorium. If there is anybody here that has not pre-registered to comment and would like to comment tonight, you need to go back to the registration table and tell us so that we can accommodate you accordingly.

I would also like to indicate that the hearing panel that is with me here in the front of the room has been, throughout the course of these hearings, asking clarifying questions of members of the public who are commenting. The purpose in doing it is to make sure that they fully understand your comments so that we can make a complete record of your concerns relative to this particular project.

The panel that is with me is Dr. Ed Temple, who spoke earlier, Dr. Temple is the presiding official over this hearing, he is also the Department of Energy's Executive Director of the SSC Site Selection Task Force. With him also is Dr. Roger Mayes and Dr. Jerry Nelsen, both of whom are environmental specialists with the Department of Energy and who will have the senior responsibility in the completion of the EIS in this proceeding.

Final comment is that, throughout the course of the hearings, particularly here in the great State of Illinois, there is a high degree of emotionalism associated with the issue. We have people who are supportive of the project, we have people who are not supportive of the project. We respect that and we are very pleased that you are here to speak from either point of view this evening.

However, we do want to make sure that everyone has the opportunity to fully exercise their First Amendment rights and so when individuals are commenting here at the podium, we would ask that you would refrain from applauding, heckling, crying, screaming, yelling or other types of things. During the intervals between commenters, you may do anything that you would like within reason relative to the exercise of your First Amendment rights.

I do want to tell you, quite a few of you have been in the room earlier throughout the course of the hearings; I do appreciate the fact that you have given me the courtesy and the panel the courtesy of following those rules.

So with that, at this point in time, I will go ahead and formally commence this, the final hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed SSC project, being held in Aurora, Illinois, on October 7, 1988.

This is session I [sic]. And we will now begin at the top of our speaker's list for the evening. The first individual scheduled to comment is Greg Gullickson, followed by Themis Klotz.

Yes, sir, if you would come to the podium and give us your name and address.

1114 STATEMENT BY GREG GULLICKSON

MR. GULLICKSON: My name is Greg Murray Gullickson. I live at 39 W 851 Prunetree Lane, Campton Township.

If this information is being shared with the State of Illinois, I think they should make note of my presence. They did not know about me or my neighbors when letters to affected homeowners were supposedly sent out. That convenient oversight fits the State's pattern in this matter: the pattern of withholding or delaying information to prevent organized opposition.

1 You have heard many concerns over the last two days about homes and businesses lost, wells, water, traffic and safety. I would like you to add my name to those list of people that are concerned about those. But I want to talk specifically about wells and then go on to something else.

2 The EIS states that 320 wells will be lost. State officials have commented on numerous occasions that that number will be less than fifty. How can I have confidence that living above a facility that is twenty times more powerful than Fermilab, that is and I quote, "the largest scientific instrument ever constructed", is safe when you people cannot agree on something as simple as the number of wells that are going to be lost?

3 In Appendix 14 of the EIS, a 1987 telephone survey is cited as an example of an overall favorable attitude toward the SSC by residents in the area. In 1987, I moved to this area. I asked the owner of a real estate office in St. Charles if there were any controversial projects planned that might affect property values, such as landfills, etc. and was told no. 1987. I did not hear a single comment about the SSC in 1987, I've lived here the whole year. To the general population it was an unknown issue.

4 The writer goes on to say in Appendix 14 that an important ancillary finding of this report is that concerns over potentially adverse effect diminish as knowledge of the project increases. However, in Appendix 5, page 110, it is stated that community values and attitudes concerning the SSC are quite mixed. The writer in that section documents that eighty-one percent of the letters received by the DOE after the scoping meetings, were against siting the SSC in Illinois. Eighty-one percent against is not, in my opinion, diminished concerns.

5 One thousand one hundred and ten letters have been written by May against the SSC to the DOE. Over twenty thousand people have signed petitions against this project. These letters and petitions are the outcry of a group concerned about the quality of life in the Fox Valley. A quality of life that is good and decent and deserves to be saved. The people that have signed these petitions and written these letters have nothing to be gained by the SSC. We are only trying to save.

6 The majority of proponents of this project are motivated by personal gain, either monetarily or increased political stature. Greed has destroyed too many things in the past, please don't let it happen here. I urge you to listen to the affected people and their message is clear as the twenty thousand signatures on petitions and over one thousand letters. We don't want the SSC in the Fox Valley. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commenter is Themis Klotz followed by Ed Myszka.

1101 STATEMENT BY THEMIS KLOTZ

MS. KLOTZ: My name is Themis Klotz. I live at 1188 Carol Lane in Glencoe, that's Illinois, in Cook County on Lake Michigan, a mile from Lake County and about fifty miles from the Wisconsin border.

I also live at 14 Jacques Road in Woods Hole, Massachusetts, an international scientific center that includes study sessions by the National Academy of Sciences, the summer homes of presidents of the National Academy of Sciences, the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, which has a joint PhD program with M.I.T. and more.

I am a retired scientist and have spent all of my adult life in this divided residency. I am sixty-three years old, which means I have known life before Enrico Fermi's successful chain reaction at the University of Chicago. My degrees in chemistry, B.S. 1946, M.S. 1951, are from Northwestern University, historically the location of one of the three original material science centers, the other two being Cornell and Stanford.

1 Before I run out of time, let me start by saying I favor the no-action option. I guess that makes me disorganized opposition. That is, do not build a Super Collider. Second choice, programmatic alternative, that is, international cooperation. I won't attempt a full defense of those recommendations.

It would be hard to avoid being focused on the DEIS. There is a reference to eighty years of physics history and history of man's curiosity about the fundamental nature of the universe back to ancient times. And stops in between and off to the side.

2 I received the document Saturday, read the foreward, summary and part of the appendix on decommissioning. I immediately started in with my red pencil; the result was filled in margins in just a few pages like that large role presented earlier in these hearings.

I noticed a Morris pennant on the wall there and recall, perhaps with you, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission hearings in nearby Morris, Illinois, regarding decommissioning of Dresden 1; they were memorable hearings. Decommissioning SSC would probably only have an on-paper solution.

So I shall focus less in the document then about it as a whole. I have never in decades of living among scientists heard for such reports praise. On the contrary, the assessments have created--I shall use some d-words--disillusion, disgust, depression, among some of our finest scientists and engineers. Students are even more vulnerable.

3 I have some little inserts here. Indeed, since the DEIS invokes physics history back eighty years and we keep hearing the name Fermi, let's review some historical biography. In his wife's biography published in 1956, she points out that the new young quantum physicists in Italy in the twenties did physics to escape the depressing politics of Mussolini.

My experience tells me that that is still a powerful driving force as much as irresistible curiosity as to what happened in the first forty-five seconds after the Big Bang or hunger for a unified field theory.

MR. EIGUREN: Ma'am, your time has elapsed.

4 MS. KLOTZ: Before coming here to oppose the Super Collider anywhere for a primary reason I shall come to, I wish to point out that I have no knowledge of the group CATCH, no knowledge of the siting details; their behavior here reminds me to mention that there probably has been a paradigm shift. I am pleased to find the opposition is.

UNKNOWN MAN: Excuse me, your time is up, ma'am.

MR. EIGUREN: Sorry sir, I'm in control of the meeting, you can sit down. Ma'am, go ahead and just bring it to a conclusion.

5 MS. KLOTZ: You've got discretion. All right, the paradigm shift: I am pleased to find the opposition is not in a state of psychological numbing, a condition that has received international recognition through the work of Dr. Helen Caldecott, recently of Harvard Medical School. They exhibit normal protective behavior; to do otherwise in their predicament would not be normal.

MR. EIGUREN: Ma'am, I'm going to have to cut you off here, well over your time. I'm sorry.

6 MS. KLOTZ: All right, I would just like to point out that what I have here is the Constitution with Article 1, Section 8, that deals with the progress of science and I want to recommend page 9 of Mortimer Talby's Computers and Common Sense in which he outlines possibility as a criterion for research activity. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commenter is Ed Myszka, followed by Jack Pool.

1102 STATEMENT BY ED MYSZKA

MR. MYSZKA: Good evening. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to comment on the draft of the Environmental Impact Statement for the siting of the Superconducting Super Collider here in Illinois. My comments result from the review of the draft Environmental Impact Statement of the Superconducting Super Collider, Volumes I, III, and Volume IV, Appendix 4, dated August 1988.

Still to this day, I am somewhat unclear as to the exact location of the ring with respect to my house. In Figure 3-12 within that volume I and III, very little detail is given to some of the side streets in the development where I live. I'm assuming that I do not reside above E7 or F7, or someone would have contacted me by now, but I am not sure.

1 UNKNOWN VOICE: Don't count on it.

MR. MYSZKA: That's true. It's a mystery to me where this information is or how to obtain it. For a project of such scope, I'm disappointed in the amount of detailed information which is lacking and this is the kind of information that should be readily available to anyone within that community that this will affect.

2 In Table 3-7, you state that 350 water wells will be lost. Is this due to the physical location of the ring, or does it include the possible contamination of the wells from contaminants such as radiation that do not reside directly within that ring? Will there be someone monitoring my drinking water for contaminants? If my well is contaminated, what type of contingencies will the state provide me?

3 In 3.6.1, you imply that public radiation exposure levels will increase, yet in 3.3 you state that the proposed site is developing rapidly as a suburban community; does this make sense to you? Increased radiation hazards should not be met with the reduction of possible exposures, it should be met with an increase. The radioactive materials which are found in rocks beneath the surface are the same materials which you intend on excavating and relocating in four local quarries. Again, which four, you don't state anywhere. I don't know, maybe that's in my backyard as well.

This radiation, if ingested, for example, by contaminated drinking water, will remain in a person's body and that person will become a source of radioactivity. Must we wait until our children and grandchildren develop abnormalities or birth defects, whether you are someone that's residing and living in this area or whether you are part of a construction team working on creating this?

4 As mentioned above, the Illinois site is currently developing rapidly as a suburban community. Under the Clean Air Act, this region has been designated as a nonattainment for both ozone and carbon monoxide. How can the increase in traffic due to construction help to reduce this already unwanted problem?

5 Another item which I would like to comment about is the first gentlemen who had spoken mentioned when he was first relocating to this area, he had spoke to the realtors back in 1987 and had asked them the question are there any hazards, any landfills, or any type of plans in the future of this area, the Fox Valley area, such as that. Well, I relocated to this area about nine months ago, and asked the same question and no one knew anything about the SSC at that time.

6 The intent of this letter is to neither support nor reject the building of the Superconducting Super Collider but to bring to your attention uncertainties, health hazards and dangers associated with having the Collider located in a densely populated region of Illinois. The Fox Valley region for the Superconducting Super Collider is a bad choice. Please do the right thing and locate the Collider elsewhere. Thank you very much.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comments of Edward G. Myszka of St. Charles, Illinois, will be included in the record of this proceeding as received by the Chair. A number of the individuals might not be here, they are pre-registered to speak, if I call someone's name and I don't get a response, we'll call your name one more time before the end of this evening's hearing. Jack Pool?

Can I have your name and address for the record, sir?

1103 STATEMENT BY JACK POOL

MR. POOL: My name is Jack Pool, I live at 2 S 432 Cedar Court, Alban, Illinois. I'm actually a resident of the village of Kaneville, but I have an Alban mailing address. I'm an employee of the State of Illinois but I'm not here in that capacity. I'm here as a homeowner and as a resident and a citizen.

After reviewing the Environmental Impact Study, I was going to go through it section by section and pick out the areas that I found that were evidence that Illinois was an inappropriate site for the SSC, and I only got as far as Section 3 and my five minutes is gone. So, let me speak to that.

In Section 3.3, that section states, there is a table there dealing with separate modifications that would be necessary, state-suggested modifications to the original DOE plan. Illinois would include
1 five separate modifications that need to be made in order to accommodate the Illinois site. In contrast to that, Colorado would require no changes in siting, in technical systems or conventional facilities.

Another section dealing with water supply, as per the state-proposed sites' specific adaptations to SSC, Illinois would be required to provide water from on-site municipal groundwaters and to expand the Fermilab well field. This seems ironic to me that we would even consider Illinois for this because, if you will recall, people in the audience, last summer we went through a very hot summer and a severe drought. This is at a time when the entire northeast section of the State is searching for alternative water supplies in the rivers and the Great Lakes. Local deep wells are radium contaminated and shallow
2 wells are running dry. This past summer we experienced drought and widespread severe water shortages. If we further deplete our groundwater wells with this monstrous project, the ability of the areas to support Illinoisans with a decent quality of life will diminish.

We cannot deplete and loot the aquifer beneath our land and not pay a terrible price. Water is one of our most precious resources. We cannot overuse it without destroying it forever. It is a renewable resource but we must be very careful in how we tap it. Abuse it and we lose it forever.

Referring to Table 3-6, Summary of Site-Specific Land Acquisition Plans-Parcels, this would indicate to me, looking at this, that Illinois is inappropriate, that are other states that were far more appropriate for siting of SSC.

3 Illinois has 3,305 affected parcels. I must condition this by saying, or amend it by saying, that this is information given by the State of Illinois and therefore, subject to some skepticism. Colorado has 157 parcels. That's roughly, Illinois has roughly twenty times as many affected parcels as Colorado. Illinois has 2,868 affected stratified fee parcels; Arizona and Colorado have zero. Illinois has 2,750 ownerships; Colorado has 67.

4 The facts there indicate that there is an environmental impact that is very serious on one species, genus and species. That genus and species being homo sapiens. Illinois would have 219 relocations of homes and businesses. These include both family homes, businesses, and homes in new subdivisions and century-old farmhouses. Homes that have been witness to the joys and sorrows experienced by generations of the same family. I am one of those affected homeowners and I can witness to this fact that my family and my home and my family are not statistics to be bloodlessly tallied in an environmental
5 impact study. We are flesh and blood, we laugh and cry and we love our home and village. I built my home ten years ago with the help of my father. I drove every nail and shoveled every yard of gravel that it took to build it. I can't paint a picture and I can't write a symphony, but I can build a house, and I did. My home is my masterpiece, my creative expression, my gift to my family and my village.

The point to be made is this: we 2,750 landowners listed in the report are stubborn, angry people. We are angry at the way our elected officials have betrayed us. We have lost faith in the willingness of the State of Illinois to represent our interest. We will resist the siting of the SSC in Illinois with all of our strength, energy, resources and ability. Even if the DOE should be so foolish as to name Illinois as the preferred site for the SSC, we will continue to resist and to fight that decision.

6 If DOE should site SSC here in Illinois, you will find our ranks to swell with new members, new aroused members. Our membership will grow with other Illinoisans, when other Illinoisans come to find out how we have been betrayed. If the SSC is sited here in Illinois, you will find thousands of angry, resistant, resolute citizens here. You will find yourself in enemy territory.

Put the SSC somewhere else. Anyplace else. Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. EIGUREN: Next commenter is John Platt, followed by Arthur Blake. John Platt, followed by Arthur Blake. Quiet. John Platt, followed by Arthur Blake. John Platt? John Platt here? Arthur Blake? Arthur Blake?

1113 STATEMENT BY ARTHUR BLAKE

MR. BLAKE: Good evening, I am Arthur Blake. My wife and I live in Country Club Road, St. Charles Township, the Village of Wayne. The U.S. DOE and the Illinois DOE have provided me data that indicates
1 my property is to receive an access and ventilating shaft known as E9. According to the U.S. DOE map figure 5.1.4-3 and Illinois DOE map/U.S. Geological Survey, Northeast quarter, Geneva 15 minute quadrangle, E9 appears to be sited in my driveway at Country Club Road. Appears.

It is unbelievable that this area of established homes on parcels of four or more acres can be considered seriously for the siting of the Collider. The access shaft structures, paved parking, the fencing
2 will ruin the beauty and tranquility of my home. The beauty and tranquility of the countryside all along this device will be scarred in the ten areas of six acres each upon which the noisy and hideous factories for liquifying helium will be built.

The concept of such a plant is shown on page 9 of U.S. DOE pamphlet, "The Project and Environmental Process." The disfiguration of our countryside and the squandering of our tax dollars is more than we can condone. Speaking of money, the proposed site must be among the most expensive in the state. If
3 the collider were to be located in Arizona, or Texas, the savings in land costs and construction costs could most likely pay for the facilities required to substitute for the small portion of Fermilab required for the SSC.

According to DEIS, Volume I, Chapter 5, page 5.1-9, there are 2,969 parcels of land. In fact, maybe we don't agree with the previous speaker. Of that number it states 219 parcels require relocation. Since
4 the Illinois DOE has not been willing to provide complete data, I suspect those numbers. It appears that the 219 of us may be forced to underwrite further a portion of the collider's cost when the State's appraisers set property values.

Some of us remember twenty some years ago when the people of Weston were descended upon by the State-appointed appraisers and negotiators. These residents didn't have a chance and Fermilab was born.
5 Where is the list of Fermilab's practical accomplishments? I haven't seen one. With Fermilab, the people of Illinois have had the opportunity to witness the empire building of the administration and scientists hit areas that had nothing to do with particle acceleration. That is, wetlands, flora and fauna, the reflection pool, and pseudo-cultural activities.

6 Let us not permit this to expand. Let us not allow them to rob us again. Let us all insist the collider be located elsewhere. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comments of Arthur Blake of St. Charles will be included in the record as received. Next scheduled commenter is Melanie Hutter followed by Marion Orban. Melanie Hutter? Marion Orban? Marion Orban? Jim Bryski?

MR. BRYSKI: Bryski.

MR. EIGUREN: Bryski, I'm sorry. Name and address for the record, sir, before you start.

1104 STATEMENT BY JIM BRYSKI

MR. BRYSKI: Gentlemen, I'd like to comment about the lack of comment on tunnel groundwater leakage if the SSC is located here in Illinois. The EIS talks at great length about the quantities of water that they expect to leak into the tunnel during the construction of the SSC. However, there's absolutely no discussion whatsoever about the amount of water that will leak into the tunnel once it's completed. I don't understand. Does this mean that the DOE does not expect it to leak? If so, that's in direct contrast to what was indicated in the State of Illinois's own SSC site proposal.

That document is clear and along with that document the Illinois State Water Survey and the Illinois State Geological Survey have all indicated that they expect the tunnel to leak at a rate of fifty gallons per minute, per mile, throughout the entire operational life of the SSC. This amounts to over 3.8 million gallons of water that the Illinois ENR and other agencies anticipate will leak into the
1 tunnel day in and day out.

MR. EIGUREN: Quiet. Go ahead.

MR. BRYSKI: Why is none of this information mentioned in the EIS, is the question? Is the information left out because the DOE would prefer to ignore the fact that the tunnel will leak if it is placed here in Illinois? Is it because the DOE doesn't want to create any concerns over the flooding of the tunnel as occurred in Fermilabs?

Or is it because the DOE doesn't want people to become overly concerned about where the leaking groundwater will be pumped to? Will it be pumped to the 19 to 22 ponds located around the ring near the E & F access shafts? Will the water contain contamination of any type?

More importantly, will there be any radioactivity in the water? I'm not asking if the radiation is
2 limited or if it's minute? I'm asking if it's going to be there? Will the water be placed in those ponds, and if not, where will it end up?

One thing is clear. The leaking groundwater will have to be removed from the tunnel; otherwise normal operations of the complex machinery located within the tunnel and the experimental halls will not be able to continue.

3 In the book, Scientific Temperaments: Three Lives in Contemporary Science, by Philip J. Hilts, it's clearly indicated that when the tunnel at Fermilab was originally constructed, there was a major problem with magnets being burned out because of excessive moisture being present within the tunnel. Scientists at the time assumed that water would not cause failures, but did. Thousands of bolts of electricity shot through the magnets and to the floor of the tunnel causing hundreds of magnets to explode and burn up.

In fact, over three hundred and fifty magnets blew and over seven months of time was lost making those necessary repairs. If it happened in Illinois once before at Fermilabs, what makes the DOE think that the geology of Illinois site will not allow it to occur again? The Illinois is not above the water table as is true at the Arizona and Texas sites. This geology problem with the Illinois site is one of its major flaws.

The Illinois SSC proposers obviously expect the Illinois tunnel to be wet. Why doesn't the DOE or the EIS confront this problem? The EIS could be making some very costly mistakes both timewise and dollar-wise when it assumes that the Illinois tunnel will not leak or that water won't pose a problem. Ignoring these possibilities is blindness and is unacceptable. But more importantly, this method of thinking and operating is unacceptable. This omission indicates at least some lack of preparation in the EIS. If the DOE intends to continue this method of operation once the SSC is sited and funded, then I would expect that there could be some major problems surrounding the entire SSC project from beginning to end.

MR. EIGUREN: The next commenter is George Snow. George Snow? Cheryl Conro?

DR. NELSEN: Roy, did the last commenter's name get in the record?

MR. EIGUREN: Yes.

DR. NELSEN: Okay.

1105 STATEMENT BY CHERYL CONRO

MS. CONRO: Good evening, my name is Cheryl Conro. I reside on Stevens Road in St. Charles Township.

MR. EIGUREN: We can't quite hear you, thank you. Put the microphone in front of you right there down a little bit, thank you.

MS. CONRO: In Appendix 5b, page 25, the draft EIS discusses the problem of flooding along the length of Indian Creek. This is a small tributary to the Fox River which just happens to originate on Fermilab property. Nearly the entire drainage boundaries of Indian Creek are located within the collider ring. This amounts to approximately 14.7 square miles of property that becomes adversely affected whenever flooding occurs. In fact, flooding has been a significant problem in the Indian Creek watershed due to continual rapid commercial and residential development.

The EIS indicates that the most recent flooding occurred during July of 1983 when many businesses and homes were damaged. Local citizens have been very concerned about this flooding problem and have recommended a no-growth policy for the city of Aurora and for Kane County in the vicinity of Indian Creek.

My question is, does this mean that the DOE will not be able to locate any of the proposed SSC support structures near the Indian Creek floodplain? If this is true, doesn't the space available on Fermilab property start to get a little scarce, when you consider all the wetlands, prairie reconstruction projects and buffalo herds which can not be disturbed?

Also, how close is Indian Creek to this boneyard or radioactive waste dump that we hear about? Are the people living or working adjacent to Indian Creek subject to radioactive exposure that they are unaware of? This is all radiation which neither Fermilab or the DOE seem to want to talk about.

Another area of concern for me is the building of one of the six-acre helium factories and its noisy cooling towers and exhausted tunnel gases less than a mile from a new under-construction badly-needed grade school in the St. Charles area. You have to understand that I am not categorically against the SSC. What deeply concerns me is the fact that the SSC is an experiment; an experiment implies the unknown. In fact, its very definition is that of trying to find the answer to the unknown by controlled experiment.

However, history has shown that even in the event of the most carefully controlled experiments, things can and do go wrong. I feel that this are is just too highly populated to stand the possible catastrophes that could occur.

In a recent article about the serious Savannah River's Nuclear Plant mishaps near Akin, South Carolina, I was heartened to read a quote by Energy Department spokesman Will Kallicott. Referring to Energy Secretary John Herrington, Kallicott stated, that since taking office in 1985, Mr. Herrington "has given heightened attention to the area of environmental safety and health."

I commend Mr. Herrington for his efforts in this vital matter and I challenge him to continue his heightened attention to the area of environmental safety and health by siting the SSC in a less densely populated area and less environmentally special spot than the Fox River Valley area of northern Illinois. Thank you for your attention.

DR. NELSEN: I have a question, Cheryl, you reference the new elementary school that's going to be built in the St. Charles area.

MS. CONRO: Yes?

DR. NELSEN: Could you identify the location in terms of what?

MS. CONRO: Yes, it's at the corner of Burr and Bolcum Roads, it's on the northeast corner of Burr and Bolcum Roads.

DR. NELSEN: I'm sorry, how do you spell that?

MS. CONRO: Burr, B-U-R-R, Road and Bolcum, B-O-L-C-U-M.

MR. EIGUREN: Thank you, we will be in recess for five minutes.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

MR. EIGUREN: Ladies and gentlemen we would like to resume. If I could ask you to please take your seats. If I could please ask you to take your seats, we are ready to resume.

We will now formally go back on the record for Session I of the October 7, 1988, public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC project in Aurora, Illinois.

I'm going to go back to the top of the registered speaker's list and call names that I called earlier and we had no response. John Platt? Is John Platt here? Okay. Melanie Hutter? Melanie Hutter? Marion Orban? Marion Orban? George Snow? George Snow?

We'll then resume with our registered speaker's list where we left off. Ginny Gemmell followed by Carolann Laird. Ginny Gemmell. Ginny Gemmell? Carolann Laird? Carolann Laird? Gordon Hard? Gordon Hard? Jack Ryan? Jack Ryan? Alan Dutkiewicz?

UNKNOWN VOICE: Mr. Moderator, there is a lot of people still in the hallway.

MR. EIGUREN: Okay, well, we'll go through this list several times. Alan Dutkiewicz, is he here? Fine.

UNKNOWN VOICE: He's out in the hall.

MR. EIGUREN: Could someone from the Department of Energy go out in the lobby and indicate that we've resumed. Apparently there are a number of commenters out there that don't know we've taken up again.

In the meantime, we'll call one of our walk-ins. Richard Stouffer?

1001 STATEMENT BY RICHARD STOUFFER

MR. STOUFFER: My name is Richard Stouffer. I'm a research chemist and I live in the northwest section of where this tunnel may be constructed. As a homeowner my comments will address two principal concerns of most families living in rural subdivisions in close proximity to the proposed SSC.

A. The impact on groundwater, quality and quantity.

B. Movement of surface construction equipment and personnel.

First, water concerns. Almost all of the people living on the western half of the proposed tunnel site obtain their water supply from privately owned wells. Unlike Texas and Arizona, the Illinois site is not above the groundwater aquifers, but within the aquifer regions which are associated with our groundwater supplies.

In many places, the proposed tunnel will pass either through existing well casings or very close to our source of water. In my neighborhood, wells depths range from 200 to 500 feet deep. Other places they are 700 feet deep.

As for water quality, it is generally quite good, except for the expected hardness which requires a water softener to slow down the buildup of magnesium and calcium carbonate deposits in our bathrooms and kitchens. During peak periods of use, the water does develop a distinct taste which is due to the presence of hydrogen sulfide in the water.

Also, in periods of low usage, a glass of water will actually be seen to effervesce like a soda pop. This we attribute to the presence of gases such as methane in the water. Support for this conclusion stems from the observation that was made when our new well was being capped at ground level. When the casing was being cut with a torch, the temporary cap on top of the well was blown some 80 to 100 feet into the air, by the explosion in the well casing. The presence of hydrogen sulfide and methane in the aquifer area could pose a very costly surprise to those involved in constructing the tunnel.

According to the EIS statement, there are direct hydrological connections between the surface water and our groundwater supplies here in Illinois. This opens the potential for increased siltation, increased surface pollution, and construction pollutants entering our most precious source of water while the tunnel is being built.

As for water quantity, our region, with the present rapid growth rate right now, faces a potential shortage of safe drinking water. The drought this summer has brought this reality closer to home when a number of our wells had to be extended or completely redrilled.

With the construction of the proposed SSC tunnel at its present location, we all may have to either dig deeper into the ground or into our pockets, to find enough water for all of us to use.

Second topic: Briefly, I would like to touch on traffic problems during tunnel construction. Movement of surface vehicles within already congested areas will be a serious problem. Friction already exists between people living in these areas and the construction traffic supporting homes and road construction.

I've seen several cars damaged due to flying rocks, mud, and construction materials from fast-moving construction equipment. Our children use these roads to meet school buses in the morning and evenings, and to ride bicycles for recreation and sport. Will they have a chance on these extremely busy roads?

Besides the increase in potential for accidents, the noise level in what used to be a rather quiet area in which we live, is definitely going to increase substantially, especially for those who live on one of the tunnel access roads.

In summary, the unknown effect on water quality and quantity, its availability, combined with the excessive amount of construction traffic, suggests that the most responsible action to take would be to locate this project in an area that is not so heavily populated. Thank you.

DR. NELSEN: Mr. Stoffer, in relation to the quality of the water in the wells, you say that it does have H_2S in it sometimes. I'm wondering if in regard to the methane and maybe some other characteristics, do you have any information on the pH? Is it acidic or is it?

MR. STOUFFER: I don't have any information at all. It's pretty neutral.

DR. NELSEN: We need to have you speak into the microphones, please so we can pick it up.

MR. STOUFFER: I don't have any idea what the pH is, probably neutral, around seven.

DR. NELSEN: Okay, that's fine.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comment of Richard Stouffer will be included in the transcript of the hearing.

I'm going to return to the top of our registered commenters list. These individuals had scheduled times before 8:10. I'm just going to start at the top and call those names of individuals whose name I've called at least twice now who have not appeared.

John Platt? Melanie Hutter? Melanie Hutter? Marion Orban? Marion Orban? George Snow? George Snow? Ginny Gemmell?

1002 STATEMENT BY GINNY GEMMELL

MS. GEMMELL: My name is Ginny Gemmell, I live in Campton Township. I am deeply concerned of the DOE's continued consideration of the Fox River Valley as a potential site for the Superconducting Super Collider. Much has been made by proponents of the SSC of the jobs this project will generate during the construction and operation periods. But is this job issue an appropriate focus?

Should not the emphasis be on the value of the knowledge that we obtain from the SSC research? Emphasis on jobs indicates that they seem to support the project on the value of its output as a weak argument.

What would be wrong in spending all of our money on the SSC? The answer is that there would be little or no output that we could eat, or wear, or live in. The problem is that we are focusing on the labor involved and not on what is produced. Focusing on jobs and not on what is produced is avoiding the issue of whether or not the output of the SSC project is really useful.

The governments of Poland and the U.S.S.R. focus on jobs in their national economic policies. As a result, practically everybody has a job. But the economic output of these nations is catastrophically below their potential. Business people make investments not because they will generate jobs, because they anticipate revenue that exceeds anticipated costs. That is because they foresee profits.

The same standard should apply to society's investments. They too should meet the test of the marketplace. The SSC must be justified on the basis of value of output exceeding costs, not because it creates jobs. Actually, with the rate of growth the Fox River Valley is experiencing, the job issue is ludicrous.

Had the DOE conducted specific population density studies of the entire area of the projected site? If so, why did one of the DOE officials express such surprise during the site scoping in mid-May, at the number of new subdivisions they saw on acres their maps show to be agricultural fields? Apparently, the maps they had been shown were drawn prior to the recent boom development we've experienced.

It is just very difficult for me to understand why the Fox River Valley is still under consideration as a site for SSC when it will affect so many thousands of people who have chosen to live here, people who have made a personal investment in, and a commitment to the special qualities of our area. These special qualities have seen us included among "the fifty most desirable places to live in the United States", and that's a quote from the Chronicle on August 5.

The qualities we prize of beauty, tranquility, and the acquired taste of country life. The majority of us did not select this area to settle in and raise our families because it was a potential site for a massive above- and underground construction project. Or to have our homes located on top of a scientific project.

I firmly believe that a project of this magnitude will irreversibly lessen the very qualities that make our area such a wonderfully special place to live. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comment of Ginny Gemmell from St. Charles will be included in the hearing transcript of the proceeding.

Moving back to the top of the list that we left off at, Carolann Laird?

1008 STATEMENT BY CAROLANN LAIRD

MS. LAIRD: Hello, my name is Carolann Laird. I live in Batavia, Illinois. Can you hear me? I have lived there for 27 years.

First, I want to thank the Department of Energy for coming here and spending two days to listen to our testimony regarding the SSC. I am sure that by this late hour you have heard more than enough of the arguments both for and against the SSC in Illinois. I doubt if I can add any new ones.

But I want to tell you that I am a supporter for the SSC in Illinois.

MR. EIGUREN: Quiet, quiet, quiet.

MS. LAIRD: As a homemaker, a parent, past teacher, and concerned citizen, I have witnessed the many beneficial effects of Fermilab. I would not want to lose those benefits if the SSC site were to be chosen somewhere other than Illinois. I cannot help but think that the SSC would enrich and enhance the good that has already been established by Fermilab.

I would just like to comment on a few personal benefits that come to mind. One, bringing cultural events to the community. Two --

MR. EIGUREN: Quiet, go ahead, ma'am.

MS. LAIRD: Establishing OutReach programs to the public schools which turn kids on to science. Three, protecting the open space and wildlife specifically the reformation of a prairie site which is native to our state.

Four, building a series of bike paths on the grounds, so that anyone can enjoy firsthand the beauty of nature. Five, keeping an open door and friendly policy so that I can proudly take visitors there to learn in laymen's terms about the experiments to discover the nature of matter and to also view the buffalo herd and hundreds of wild geese and ducks.

Our area is growing up

MR. EIGUREN: Quiet, go ahead.

MS. LAIRD: Our area is filling up too rapidly with subdivision after subdivision. Besides destroying open land to build houses, this creates other problems. The increasing population is bringing increased traffic, more pollution, problems of waste disposal, and crowded schools, to name but a few.

We cannot stop the growth and change that is coming. But with the SSC here, it will help in a positive way to control the type of growth and change.

For these reasons, please consider choosing Illinois as the best site to locate the Superconducting Super Collider. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Would you like a couple of more minutes? Go ahead, that's fine.

Moving back to the top of the list, the next scheduled commenter is Gordon Hard. There, Gordon? There we go right there.

1108 STATEMENT BY GORDON HARD

MR. HARD: My name is Gordon Hard and I represent the Geneva Chamber of Commerce. First of all, I would like to thank the U.S. Department of Energy, the Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources, and the Fox Valley High School for working together to conduct these hearings to give the members of the community equal opportunity to express their thoughts and comments on such an important project. As a businessman and a resident of this area, I believe the Environmental Impact Statement confirms the belief that the Superconducting Super Collider will be beneficial for the Fox River Valley.

For more than twenty years we have observed the positive impact Fermilab has had. With its two thousand jobs and millions of dollars of economic activity, it is a crucial part of the local economy. It may some people to know that Kane County is growing faster than DuPage or Lake Counties. This area is rapidly growing, but we need to protect that growth from the swings in the economy that could be damaging.

The SSC is one way to help protect the Fox River Valley from economic downturns. This would be a stable project that offers stable jobs. Moreover, the draft Environmental and Tax Table says, and I quote, "Growth related to the SSC site in DuPage, Kane, and Kendall Counties would represent a substantial addition to the socio-economic environment. The regional economy would experience beneficial increases in employment, income, and sales, as a result of the construction and the operation of the SSC."

The opportunities are overwhelming. As the race to decide the most appropriate state to host the SSC comes to an end, and I hope you consider that Illinois is the only state that has something to lose, Fermilab. Although the Department of Energy has indicated that Fermilab will remain open during the SSC's operation, federal budget constraints and other factors may indeed close down the facility.

As a resident of Kane County and a neighbor of Fermilab, I would hate to see the loss of our good friends, educators, and community-minded individuals as they move to follow the SSC. Illinois offers the SSC some of the best schools and housing opportunities, utilities, and human resources in this country.

In turn, the SSC would offer Illinois the continuation of a twenty-year relationship with Fermilab and its employees. Fermilab has been a model citizen, neighbor, and a good friend. Therefore, as a member of the Geneva Chamber of Commerce, I'm concerned about the economic well-being of our community and the state of Illinois, and endorse the findings of the draft Environmental Impact Statement with regard to economic activity in this region. I encourage all businesses and citizens of this community to endorse EIS and I appreciate the opportunity to speak here this evening.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commenter is Alan Dutkiewicz. Alan Dutkiewicz?

1109 STATEMENT BY ALAN DUTKIEWICZ

MR. DUTKIEWICZ: My name is Alan Dutkiewicz. My address is 6 N 594 Old Homestead, St. Charles, Illinois. I'd just like to start out by saying that months ago when the whole ruckus started about the SSC, a lot of the comments that were brought up really weren't substantiated by anything in writing. I can't see that anyone who has read this all the way through can honestly believe that there is any benefit at all to having the SSC in Illinois.

There are no environmental pluses listed in this book for our particular area. In relation to Fermilab closing if Illinois doesn't get the SSC, I'd just like to quote one of your paragraphs under the heading "no-action alternative" where it states under Illinois, "continued light industrial and suburban development at current rapid rate, declining large tract agriculture, especially in the western portion of the site, and more pressure towards suburbanization there, continued use of Fermilab for high energy research and development." It doesn't say anything about Fermilab being closed here, if Illinois does not get the SSC.

Second of all, I'm really dismayed in these times because the environment always seems to come last in a business project, in government projects. What comes first in this country, unfortunately, is this, dollars. And it's about time the people stick up for the environment and I'd actually like to cover a few points in here that need a little expounding upon.

One of the main things that I'd like to talk about is about groundwater and the overdraft that exists. On your heading 3.7.3 on water supply, under Illinois it says, "A regional overdraft exists which would be incrementally increased by indirect water uses associated with the SSC." Well, that states that there are 320 wells potentially in the easement that could be affected.

Now if we turn to your Section 5.1.2 under water resources, there's a paragraph that states, "groundwater impacts would be associated most commonly with water level declines and/or basin or aquifer overdraft. These impacts would be caused by direct or indirect water supply withdrawals but these impacts can also be caused by dewatering and groundwater." It goes on to state some other things. In some of the paragraphs below it says, "this emigration might affect both communities in the immediate site vicinity as well as areas and communities some distance from the site."

2

In the next paragraph it states, "Existing water wells on land acquired for SSC project facilities and wells near the plant tunnel alignment might have to be abandoned. This impact would occur during the project-landed acquisition and during early construction." In the previous paragraph, it basically states that there's wells far away that may be affected by it.

Well, you stated 320 wells on the actual easement that may be affected. How many more may be affected, 1000? 2000? 500? 10? 20? That's a real problem. When people don't have water for their day-to-day use, it's a real problem. There's enough wells that go dry in this area if they aren't drilled deep enough.

3

I can't imagine that the Federal government would even consider a site that would cause so much problems as this. And if, indeed, your integrity is based on this Environmental Impact draft, then there is no way you can pick the state of Illinois for the SSC site.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commenter is Terry Desmond. The next scheduled commenter is Terry Desmond?

1003

STATEMENT BY TERRY DESMOND

MR. DESMOND: Thank you, gentlemen, thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your patience. It seems to me that we can stand up and show our colors when the President and Vice President of the United States are debating.

Certainly we can stand up and express our feelings on such an important decision such as this. I think we can be grateful that we live in a nation, irrespective of which side or the position that we take on this important issue, that we can sit in a forum like this and make our expressions known.

I come from an area of the state just to the west of this immediate area, DeKalb County, where thousands of people are watching eagerly at the decision that will be made in the future months on the site selection of the Super Collider.

I have made presentations in over twenty civic organizational meetings: Rotary clubs, Jaycee clubs, Kiwanis clubs, schools. Let me tell you that the overwhelming majority of the people that I have spoken to are enthusiastically supportive of the site selection.

Bringing the SSC to northern Illinois are going to create jobs and expand our tax base. You know, when we make our decision in government, or in business, or in our personal lives, we have to weigh all of the merits of a proposal against the demerits in determining the outcome.

Personally, I can honestly say, that if I lived in this immediate area and my home were going to be affected, I can't tell you that I wouldn't be sitting here showing my emotion. On the other hand, when we look at all the facts and put them in front of us, the overwhelming statistics point toward siting the Super Collider here in Illinois.

We have to accept that without the SSC, Fermilab would no longer be the premier accelerator in the nation. And it possibly could be closed. In contrast, if the SSC were built at Fermilab, it will generate to northern Illinois over eight million dollars in real disposable income.

Over 600 million dollars during the operation stage. Over 68 million dollars in state revenues during construction, 48 million dollars during its operations. You've heard these statistics. Enthusiastic support for locating the SSC in Illinois is rampant in northern Illinois.

Gentlemen, with past tradition in high energy physics, abundant and intellectual resources, its excellent geography, and the energy that this state has spent in building Fermilab, Illinois is the right site for the SSC.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comments of Terry Desmond will be included in the record as received.

UNKNOWN VOICE: That man does not represent --

MR. EIGUREN: Sorry, sir, you're out of order. Moving forward, the next commenter is Ed Leninger followed by Cheryl Herman. Ed Leninger? Very good.

1110 STATEMENT BY ED LENINGER

MR. LENINGER: My name is Ed Leninger.

MR. EIGUREN: Ed, could you try it over here with this microphone here?

MR. LENINGER: Oh sorry, my name is Ed Leninger, I'm a resident of 42 W 646 Steeplechase, St. Charles, in Campton Township. I'm an elected representative of the homeowners association of the Windings subdivision.

MR. EIGUREN: Just a sec, Ed. We have trick microphones. I apologize, why don't you start over Ed and I'll just retime it.

MR. LENINGER: Sure. My name is Ed Leninger, I live at 42 W 646 Steeplechase in Campton Township. I'm an elected representative of the homeowners association for the Windings of Ferson Creek subdivision in Campton Township and my comments generally relate to that subdivision.

I'd like to note that in the draft Environmental Impact study, there is a reference to my subdivision and it's in Section 5.1, page 10-12 [sic]. And it says essentially, it's discussing impacts relative to siting the SSC at that location.

1 I'd like to quote it, it says for site F7, it says, "this area is classified as VM Class 4, highly sensitive public use area, moderately sensitive travel route, potentially significant. Local scope, mitigable to a level of insignificance in a short term. This service area would be in a field directly across from a residential subdivision, in an area where there are several such subdivisions. The adjacent subdivision and the road accessing it, Empire Road, are of concern. The road is the only access route to these homes but serves other destinations as well. View from the road are considered to be moderately sensitive."

I'd like to fill in some of the gaps, it's the only reference to my subdivision. The Windings of Ferson Creek is a planned development of approximately 80 million dollars value of real estate. There's 360 homes in this area. It has been in existence for approximately ten years. It's growing at a rate of about 30 homes per year for the last two years.

2 I would like to basically say that my main concerns as a resident of the Windings and as a representative of the homeowners association, this subdivision of approximately 1,300 residents strongly opposes the siting of the SSC nearby. I would like to state that there are approximately three residences of the 360 that are directly affected, although, the site, the ring structure itself and its access site force of F7 is within two-thousand to three-thousand feet of the entire subdivision.

We circulated petitions and conducted phone surveys of our residents and they were approximately
3 85 percent signed petitions opposing siting of the SSC at this location. And some of the reasons I'd like to mention.

We see problems relative to the SSC to consist of the following relative to our subdivision. The water supply has been adequately covered by other speakers, it's particularly important to us since we've got a common water supply that was provided by a utility company.

We do not have individual wells, but in reference to the 320 wells that are affected, we have basically a community well that supplies 1,300 people, 320 residences.

This well is within fifteen hundred feet of the shaft right-of-way.

4 We've experienced problems this summer due to the drought in which we've had losses of water pressure, sprinkling and watering bans and restrictions in our subdivision, and we believe many people in our subdivision are very, very concerned about this dewatering problem water leakage situation.

Secondarily, and equally important, we're concerned about the water quality, if there's any potential leakage of contaminants into our water supply. Our well depth is very closely within the depth of the tunnel itself, as other people have mentioned.

Our second problem relates to noise. It's kind of interesting to note that the study mentions human
5 noise receptors. Well, we've got 1,300 human noise receptors that will be subjected to approximately, as stated in the study, 60-65 decibels of noise during the construction period. We find this to be extremely unacceptable.

There's two other subjects I'd like to discuss that would be considered mitigated activities that the State of Illinois has proposed, that we feel to be totally inadequate. There's two bills that were passed in Illinois governmental agencies, one related to real estate value protection, and another one related to damaged property.

We feel that probably both of those are inadequate in that they essentially cover only 80 percent of the difference in any apparent decrease of value in property as its sold within a two-year period of
6 the construction of the SSC. The State would only reimburse only 80 percent of the appraised value. This is, you know, academic whether there's going to be a loss or not.

But [copy missing] to my subdivision there are only three homes that would even avail themself of this protection. We've got 357 households, since we are not directly on the ring, but directly adjacent to it within five hundred to two thousand feet of the ring site, which would allow actually no protection of the real estate values.

MR. EIGUREN: Sir, your time has elapsed, you're out of time.

MR. LENINGER: Well, one more point relates to damaged property from the, there's a considerable amount
7 of information relative to blasting, the F7 site will have a considerable amount of blasting. Our subdivision will have no protection whatever based on the laws passed by the Illinois House of Representatives that would protect us at all.

8 We feel this is highly unfair to our subdivision. We feel the state of Illinois elected officials have done us a great disservice. Done the entire Fox Valley and done our subdivision, in particular, a great disservice and thank you for the time.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commenter is Cheryl Herman, followed by Suezanne Legatzke.

1007 STATEMENT BY CHERYL HERMAN

MS. HERMAN: Okay, thank you. My name is Cheryl Herman and I live in Campton Township. The following is a list of just some of the reasons while Illinois is not the logical choice for the SSC.

The presence of methane gas is a potential safety hazard and can be expected to slow down tunnel construction in Illinois. The entire Fox Valley site is covered by flood rate insurance maps and shows a high probability for damage due to flooding. This is not true at the other sites.

The air quality of the Illinois site is already the worst in all seven sites. Illinois is the only site to be designated as a nonattainment for levels of both ozone and carbon monoxide.

Total suspended particulate levels, at level E, F, and J sites in Illinois will exceed the national ambient air quality standards. The proposed service areas will not comply with the state of Illinois's rules and regulations, Title 35, Subtitle H, as regards noise levels for residential settings. Illinois shows the lowest level of public services available at all sites. Our student/teacher ratios are the worst, our health care levels are the worst, and fire and police protection in DuPage, Kane, and Kendall Counties are below the national average.

The roads at the Illinois site are the most congested of any site and are the only roads subject to stop-and-go traffic. As a result, more travel time will be required to move from point to point around Illinois than at any other site.

The winter weather problems in Illinois can be translated into increased time devoted to tunneling and to the disposition of tunnel's spoils. This, coupled with the extreme depth of the Illinois tunnel, means that tunneling completion will take longer in Illinois than the other sites where year-round construction activity is the norm.

The extremely large number of parcel owners means that Illinois will have the most difficult land acquisition process. The fact that many of us have already taken steps to cloud title on our properties, will only make the job for you more difficult.

Illinois is already the site with the greatest numbers of sources of hazardous and toxic waste materials; why add more? Illinois is the only site located in an area where there are already two sources that add an increase to the natural background radiation level, Fermilab and the Kerr-McGee chemical plant site.

Illinois already has the highest background noise levels adjacent to the proposed E and F access shafts. Perhaps most importantly of all, is that Illinois is the only site where land use patterns are expected to change if the SSC does not come. Only in Illinois, are land use patterns going from agricultural to residential, or commercial/industrial; it is the only site that has the potential for alternate uses. This opportunity cost is completely ignored by the EIS and all of its economic arguments.

In conclusion, I sincerely hope these past two days have made you realize that the SSC does not belong in Illinois. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commenter is Suzanne Legatzke, followed by Ken Robinson.

//// STATEMENT BY SUZANNE LEGATZKE

MS. LEGATZKE: My name--

MR. EIGUREN: I'm sorry, you may proceed.

MS. LEGATZKE: My name is Suzanne Legatzke and I live in the Fox Chase area and I would be living adjacent to the ring. After review of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, I am convinced that the SSC does not belong in Illinois.

Twenty thousand of my neighbors in DuPage, Kendall and Kane Counties feel the same way. I hope you will use good common sense in your final judgements. The Webster dictionary defines good common sense as practical judgement or intelligence or just ordinary good sense.

1 If listened to, common sense helps alleviate many problems and accomplishes many goals. Common sense indicates that people are most happy and able to perform well on a job when they feel appreciated and wanted. When they feel unwanted, job performance goes down drastically.

This will happen if the SSC is located in Illinois. The SSC is unwanted here, it is unwelcome by the very people it will most affect, who will have to live on or near the ring. As you are already aware, there has been more opposition to the project in Illinois in any other state in contention.

After review of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, twenty years ago when Fermilab was built, this area of DuPage and Kane Counties was largely not developed. Currently it is the fastest growing area in the state of Illinois. To quote the Environmental Impact Statement, "much of the site is suburban, intensely used for housing development and commercial light industry."

2 The biggest percentage gains were in Lake, McHenry, and Kane Counties. The SSC does not belong in Illinois; the SSC is unwelcome here. According to the report, 160 residents and 59 businesses, the largest number of all seven states should not be relocated. The town of Kaneville should not be destroyed.

The SSC does not belong in Illinois; the SSC is unwelcome here. The environmental impact on our water supply is too severe. We do not want contamination of our groundwater supply. 350 private wells,
3 according to the statement, the second highest of the seven states in contention, should not be destroyed. We feel this is closer to 1200 private wells being taken. Ironically, our state officials say only six wells would have to be removed.

4 The mayors of both St. Charles and West Chicago are concerned about the loss of land from the tax rolls. We do not need 18,648 acres in 3,305 parcels taken from us. They, as well as we, are also concerned
5 that the operating techniques of compressors throughout access sites will not meet OSHA or environmental protection agent regulations and laws. The SSC does not belong in Illinois; the SSC is unwelcome here.

Our precious wetlands are needed among other things, to purify the water that enters the Fox River.
6 The Fox River empties into the Illinois, the Illinois to the Mississippi, and the Mississippi down to the Gulf of Mexico. The loss of 850 acres of wetlands, the second greatest of the seven states in contention, cannot be tolerated. The very life of the bald-headed eagle, the falcon, the many migratory
7 birds, as well as the aquatic life are in great jeopardy. Therefore, the SSC does not belong in Illinois, it is unwelcome.

8 Put yourself in our shoes. Would you want spoils hauled twelve hours a day, construction of facilities near human noise receptors sixteen hours per day, cut and cover tunnel construction sixteen hours a day, if you lived here? All for the next eight to ten years. Of course not.

9 In your final decision, I urge you to use good common sense and build somewhere else. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Sir, it's been requested that you not stand over there. Would you please move over here with that, it's direct light in the commenters. Thank you, I appreciate it.

Moving forward, the next scheduled commenter is Ken Robinson, followed by Doris Carabillo.

1004 STATEMENT BY KEN ROBINSON

MR. ROBINSON: My name is Ken Robinson. I live in the Winding subdivision, on the north end of the ring. My address is 5 N 553 Jens Jensen Lane, Campton Township.

I'd like to address three questions tonight with respect to the siting of the SSC in Illinois. Number 1, where does the SSC fall within Illinois' priorities? Number 2, how do the states being considered for the SSC rank for environmental impact? Number 3, what does the future hold when the SSC project is retired?

Let's progress to the first question, Illinois' priorities. My son is, who is in the eighth grade, goes to Central High School. This last Saturday when we attended the homecoming game, there were no cheerleaders, there was no band, there was practically nothing. We had cheerleaders from the other school helping cheer our side. My son was very embarrassed and said what's going on?

Well, there's just not enough money, we have overcrowded schools, to keep things going. In addition to that, if we look on more global terms, Illinois is twenty-second in terms of dollars spent per student according to the USA Today, February 22, 1988. Illinois is sixteenth in ACT scores. College costs continue to soar to Illinois students and professors' pay is low. I believe we need to fulfill our educational priorities before we would plow Illinois money into the SSC.

Question two, state rankings for the Environmental Impact Statement. According to the Environmental Impact Statement that you have provided here, gentlemen from the Department of Energy, I tabulated six items in Table 1-1 concerning the following: wetlands lost, air emissions, well loss, farmland loss, miles of new roads, and job relocations.

According to these negative aspects, guess who gets the highest scores? Two states, Tennessee and Illinois. The states that get the lowest scores, on the other hand, are Arizona and Colorado. I have not touched this data in one bit and obviously the units, some are acres, some are miles, some are parts per million, but what I did was rank all these things together.

So, I would also say that I've not considered any costs in this, of course. Because if I were considering cost as a sole concern, I would probably be living in a small apartment in south Chicago. But instead, I chose a tranquil setting out here in the Fox River Valley.

The final question, what does the future hold when the SSC ring is retired? When this ring is shut down some twenty to thirty years from now, what is going to happen? Will we store toxic wastes down below the ground? Or military weapons where they can be safely stored? Frankly, I don't know, according to the way the State has dealt with things so far, I just don't trust them.

So, in summary, my comment is the SSC is big. The SSC is big in cost, it's big in size and the SSC is, I believe, a big mistake for the State of Illinois.

MR. EIGUREN: The next commenter is Doris Carabillo. Doris Carabillo? That is the end of our preregistered commenters. I'm going to go through the list one more time before I call the walk-ons.

John Platt? Melanie Hutter? Marion Orban? George Snow? Doris Carabillo?

The hour is now five of nine, we will take a brief recess.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

MR. EIGUREN: Take your seats please. We will now formally go back on the record for this Session I of the October 7, 1988, DEIS hearing being held here in Aurora, Illinois. I'd like to indicate for the record that during the break we received the written comments of Cheryl Herman, as well as the written comments of Carolann Laird. They'll be included in the transcript of this proceeding.

We will now move into the list of walk-in registrants for this night's program. The first is John Lederer, followed by Allan Peretz.

1006 STATEMENT BY ALLAN PERETZ

MR. PERETZ: My name is Allan Peretz of 665 Redwood Lane, Lisle, Illinois. The collider will provide us with a unique opportunity, a chance to explore the basic forces of nature. Discoveries in this field could radically change the way we see the universe.

As a member of the teen community, I'm here to support its instruction in Illinois. Having the collider here would instill a sense of pride in Illinois, would create many new jobs at a time when the state needs them. It could even help make Illinois a national capital for scientific research and development.

But many people are against the collider, some because they are afraid of change. These are the same people who tried to slow down the space program in its early years.

MR. EIGUREN: Quiet, go ahead.

MR. PERETZ: If they had succeeded, we would not now have the edge we have in space technology, the edge we are so close to losing. Others are opposed to it because it will force them to relocate. This is somewhat self-centered, in my opinion. I would gladly move if I knew that it would benefit future generations and help the prosperity of our country.

Then there are also some that feel that it could damage our environment. I suppose these fears stem mainly from recent ecological disasters such as Three Mile Island, Love Canal, and more recently Chernobyl. But anyone who has done any research on the SSC, would agree that it is safe.

According to the Environmental Impact Statement, there would be no soil, water, or biological contamination at the Illinois site. If Fermilab is used, the amount of low-level radioactive waste produced by Fermilab would increase by less than 20% of what it is already. Waste produced would be comparable to that of a medical center. But, I'm not going to bore you with these statistics because, as the other speakers have shown, anyone can use them to their advantage.

In conclusion, we as citizens of the United States cannot afford to slow down the building of the SSC with all of this opposition. And since Illinois is considered to be the ideal location, physically and in safety, we should be honored to have it built here. We would be stupid not to seize this opportunity. I want to see a future where the United States still has a place in this world. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comment of Alan Peretz will be included in the record as received by the moderator. Our next scheduled commenter is John Lederer.

1115 STATEMENT BY JOHN LEDERER

MR. LEDERER: My name is John Lederer. I live at 6 N 386 Riverside Drive in St. Charles. It's about a mile north of where the SSC crosses the Fox River, approximately E9 and F8. I live on the river and the main concern I have, my wife has, and our close friends that live near us have, is what impact is
1 SSC going to have on our groundwater and probably the quality of our life which we enjoy the most, the river.

We enjoy the birds. When they build the tunnel across the river, is there going to be a line of trees cut down? We're concerned and we wonder why it has to be built here? We're for progress and we understand
2 what the Super Collider is going to do and we're for it. But we have to look at it and say, why in the Fox Valley area? It just doesn't seem to make any sense.

I've read over the seven other sites and there are two or three of them which it would make much more
3 sense. There would be less impact on the people; you could have progress and the people could also be happy. Why do you have to have progress at the expense of the people? Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next scheduled commenter is Cyril D. Curtis.

1005 STATEMENT BY CYRIL D. CURTIS

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Moderator, I have a very brief and simple statement. As a former Illinois farmboy, and a physicist for most of my life, I should like to make an observation on the local citizens with regard to SSC.

There is one relatively small group of people who must leave their homes because of the SSC. It is difficult for them to reconcile their personal desires with the benefits to the larger community although they are compensated for their loss. One can understand their feelings.

On the other hand, some of the people raised questions on the dangers from radiation, water supply effects, other environmental impacts, depreciation of property values, economic dislocation, etc. These questions should be addressed and have been answered well, some of them many times. Yet some
1 people are opposed to the project. I've seen their supposedly substantive arguments turned into specious arguments as they persist in using them.

They like to cultivate the potential and imagined fears of the local citizenry. This, of course, is not an uncommon state of affairs on the road to progress. From my interaction with many people of the local communities and from other observations, in contrast with the picture just detailed, the vast majority of people in the region are favorably disposed toward the SSC and indeed are eager to see it come here.

I worked for Fermilab since its beginning until my recent retirement. I now work part-time on a technology spinoff from accelerator physics, namely a medical accelerator for the treatment of cancer. In the twenty years we have lived in Batavia by the side of Fermilab, our local property, in contradiction of some arguments, has quadrupled in dollar value and is not an uncommon example.

Because of my retirement, the SSC does not materially affect my personal future. I can appreciate, however, along with the great majority of local people, the great scientific and cultural benefit of the SSC to people everywhere and in combination with the economic benefit, especially to the people of northern Illinois. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comment of Cyril D. Curtis has been received and will be included in the transcript of the hearing.

I'd like the people with the green signs to stand first and yell, then the people with the blue signs. All right.

Now the blue signs. Thank you.

Moving down the list, Mark McInicoff, followed by Rod Wellandorf.

1116 STATEMENT BY MARK McINICOFF

MR. McINICOFF: Good evening, my name is Mark McInicoff. I'm a resident of Naperville. As a walk-on, I haven't had much time to prepare a talk, so please bear with me. I'll forward written comments at a later time.

1 Although I'm not a formal member of the SSC organization, or Fermilab, you can describe me as a member of PITCH, People Interested in The Collider Here. I have not had an opportunity to read the DEIS because I have only had it for a day, but I have been listening to the arguments of the opponents for

MR. EIGUREN: Hold on just a sec, let him go please. Continue.

2 MR. McINICOFF: But I've been listening to the arguments of the opponents for the past two evenings and frankly, I have yet to hear one good reason for the outright dejection of the SSC from Illinois. There were many concerns raised that may require additional study and development of technical or financial solutions, but in the final analysis, every one of these problems can be resolved.

3 It will boil down to a total construction and operating cost in Illinois versus a total construction and operating cost in any other candidate site after all the concerns have been raised and resolved.

4 Let me touch upon some of the most common objections I've been hearing. Loss of one's home, people have been complaining about being required to pack up and relocate against their will. Although, I understand that this is a major inconvenience for those affected, it is no basis for rejecting the SSC from Illinois.

MR. EIGUREN: Quiet, folks, let him finish, come on.

5 MR. McINICOFF: I am no lawyer, but I seem to remember from civics classes of years past that the principal of eminent domain exists to serve the greater good, when it is the sense of the people of a political region, that the governmental acquisition of privately-held property would serve a good purpose. And from what I have been hearing, it is the sense of the people of Illinois, or of at least northeastern Illinois, that we do want, the SSC here would serve the greater good.

I believe that it has been demonstrated to the DOE that the people want that. I would encourage the State to follow the letter and spirit of the law of eminent domain when it comes to the business of relocating families. Although the affected people do not have the right to block the lawful acquisition of their property, they do have the right to a just and fair compensation.

6 Some people have said that this area doesn't need the jobs, it doesn't need the development. How short are their memories. Do we not recall or how long do they think that this current economic expansion is going to go on? What happened less than three or four, maybe five, years ago when this area was becoming the rustbelt. Companies, jobs, and people were moving south. We're finally coming back. What we do not want to do, with the possibility of future economic reversals, is cut ourselves off from a potential boom or potential aid to our economic well-being and health in this part of the country.

To those who feel that the area is developing too fast. Have you considered what might become of the land not acquired by the state for the SSC project? Maybe we'll build more $400,000 homes? Maybe a couple more shopping malls? And a whole bunch of strip shopping centers? That's just wonderful.

MR. EIGUREN: Quiet, please.

MR. McINICOFF: Look at the current Fermilab site. How spoiled is the environment at Fermilab?

MR. EIGUREN: Hey, come on, knock it off.

MR. McINICOFF: Water, water will be piped into many areas of the DuPage and western suburbs, DuPage County and western suburbs in the next few years to alleviate the so-called overdraft problem. There are many technical solutions to the problem of handling the water.

7 Yes, there should be very close monitoring of the water supplies, the water tables and strict controls over construction activities during this period. And enforcement of any actions required to preserve the integrity of our water supplies. These can be done and these controls should be outlined in the final issuance of the EIS. But there is no reason why they cannot be imposed.

8 Esthetics and sightline issues: these are simply technical problems that can be resolved. There are many fine architects who can properly design the facilities so as not to create problems for nearby residents in the aspect of esthetics and sightline.

MR. EIGUREN: Sir, your time's elapsed.

9 MR. McINICOFF: Okay, one comment on traffic and noise. People talk as if they are going to be listening to this traffic and noise for seven or eight years straight. That's nonsense, there should be no reason for any imposition in that aspect for more than a year in any one location.

In conclusion, I would ask that we hearken back to the famous poem of Carl Sandburg, where is the city, or in this case, the metropolis, of big shoulders, are we no more, are we going to simply vanish and surrender this opportunity and the title of city or metropolis of big shoulders to someplace else that has the character, the vision, and the guts to take on this challenge. Think about it.

MR. EIGUREN: Next scheduled commenter is Rod Wellandorf.

1117 STATEMENT BY ROD WELLANDORF

MR. WELLANDORF: Good evening, my name is Rod Wellandorf. I represent Will County Well and Pump Company, I'm a branch manager of our branch here in Kane County. The purpose of my attendance here tonight is to provide factual information. I feel that you are entitled to know facts. You've got a decision to make in regard to where this is going to be located.

1 In regard to my speech here tonight, it's going to be limited to wells in this area of the tunnel. I'm going to try to be brief, maybe educate a little bit. The situation is this that the wells in the area of the tunnel are 200 to 600 feet deep. These wells are open rock wells which means that the casing, the well casing goes down to the top of the rock or shale, sealing off the drift or the overburden.

2 When we make contact with the top of that rock and that shale, we then drill into this rock and shale, open hole, no casing. That rock is fractured, water comes in at different levels in that rock formation. We sometimes have to go 300 feet sometimes 600 feet, 500 feet. And that's the situation out here in Kane County, that we have such a variance as far as where this water's coming in at.

3 The thing that concerns me and probably a lot of the people that are living in the area of this tunnel, is that when you disturb that rock, such as when we drill a five inch hole down in the ground, we can disturb areas a block, two blocks away. So I am concerned about the disturbance of these wells with that tunnel.

We had an experience just not too long ago where we drilled a well and we affected probably about two blocks. People were without water, I mean, it was cloudy water, dirty water, unusable water, and all we did was drill a five inch hole. So I am wondering what the consequences would be with putting this tunnel through there.

4 I think we should be concerned about the loss of water, lowering of water tables, the effect of possible radiation leaked down that strata there. To me I feel that it is something that you're going to have to address. These are facts. If you would like records, I will provide them to you. I've been in the process of drilling wells in this area for the last eighteen years. These are not I think so, these are actual facts, records, of wells in the area.

5 So, I would hope that you would seriously consider the situation when you make your decision to locate this tunnel. I don't know if you have any questions, but that's pretty much what I have to say here tonight.

MR. EIGUREN: Sir, we didn't get your address for the record. Could we have your address for the record, Mr. Wellandorf?

MR. WELLANDORF: No questions?

MR. EIGUREN: No questions. We just didn't get your address for the record.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Right here.

MR. LIGHTNER: Okay, thank you. The written comments of Rod Wallendorf will be included in the transcript of the hearing. The next scheduled commenter is William J. Noe.

1118

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM J. NOE

MR. NOE: My name is William J. Noe, Jr. I live at 100 Williams Drive in the village of South Elgin, Illinois, which is located just in the north perimeter of the ring, the proposed ring.

I'm not a physicist, I'm not an engineer. But I am a former employee of Fermilab and Brookhaven National Laboratory of New York. I worked there in New York from 1960 until 1971 as a bubble chamber operator. I was in the ring in the past of some fourteen or three. I have of an ill effects. I've had physical examinations, radiation exhaustion and, long years, I have an accumulated parts of my body.

I worked as operator on the fifteen foot bubble chamber as an operator. I was transferred to the accelerator ring and I was primarily concerned with the installation and operation of the helium compressors. I retired from Fermilab three years ago. I had every opportunity to sell my property, that I'm concerned about maybe losing its property values. I have no concerns. I continue to live in South Elgin and I will continue to live there through my retirement years.

I would like to let you know that many of the employees who have come here from Fermilab, in Fermilab from other places, have well served the community. For myself, I'm a former village trustee of South Elgin. I was defeated in the last election so therefore, I am no longer a trustee. But as a public service to my community, I was serve on the planning commission. I'm also past president of the Lion's Club. I speak for some of these people. I speak for myself.

The water concerns that the people have, I think your concerns would be more effective if they would be more concerned about the so-called bailfill [sic] that will affect the Mount aquifer that comes through and serves all of the Fox Valley. Few people seem to realize that there's a better possibility of contamination from that bailfill [sic] than there would be from any of these water supplies needed for Fermilab and the new ESG.

The water is recycled, cleaned. The water that cools the magnets never comes in contact with the cooling water. It's two separate systems. At Fermilab, the water is retrieved from the aquifers and there's very, very little loss. We had a pipeline down to the Fox River and to my knowledge, it has never been used. But they could do, when does the Fox River, if they wanted it, but so far, to my knowledge, they've never needed it.

As the reclamation of water, I think, and the preservation of the wildlife is another small concern. The water supply over at Fermilab is beyond questioning. I've been some quarry at Fermilab than I have seen at the Horicon Marsh, up in Wisconsin, in recent years. They've drained the Marsh, they tried to dig rid of the geese and I think most of them have moved over here to Fermilab.

Sunday, my wife and I go fishing with our grandkids every early Sunday of the year. And I have some problems in some that we've been there. The bullfrog that I suppose everybody has heard about that. Yes, that's something that's for education. In my opinion, that is just proof that there's no harm to the environment by having the ESG.

My question and my concern would be, is it really necessary? If it is, we are going to need it. We need to have it in Illinois.

MR. LIGHTNER: The next commenter is Joseph Lane.

1119

STATEMENT BY JOSEPH LANE

MR. LANE: My name is Joseph Lane. I reside at [illegible] Hawthorne Drive, Aurora, Illinois. Actually, I live just outside the town of Batavia. One of the environmental [illegible] Illinois should not be the Great Plains [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

The EIS indicates that no future land use changes are expected to occur at the other basically remote and undeveloped sites. Only Illinois stands off by itself as having alternate land uses available for the proposed SSC acreage. However, this opportunity cost associated with the Illinois acreage is never taken into consideration by the EIS or by any of the economic studies prepared by the Illinois ENR, SSC for Fermilab, or by the Department of Energy.

The Illinois site is unique in its economic potential, yet this fact is completely ignored by the proponents of the Illinois proposal. All economic discussions have centered around the economic benefits that will be derived from the SSC project, while ignoring many of the cost components which must be considered in a true cost benefit analysis. Either the economists involved in preparing the EIS have made a major mistake, or there were no economists involved at all.

Another factor that is obviously missing from the EIS is an analysis of the psychological impact which the SSC project is already having upon the affected residents at each alternative site. In Illinois, for example, there's no discussion about the degree of involvement necessary for people to fight this project. Nowhere does it describe the animosity which is developed between affected property owners and the government of the State of Illinois. Nowhere does the EIS describe the tremendous degree of mistrust which the local community has toward our governor, our local political leaders, the DOE, and especially toward Fermilab.

The EIS is deficient in describing local attitudes and feelings toward the SSC and its proposers. As a result, your scientists don't understand the complete hatred which we affected property owners have toward the SSC in general. Nor do you understand from the EIS the resolve that we people have toward insuring that the SSC will not be sited in Illinois. The EIS has failed miserably in its judgement of local attitudes toward the SSC. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The written comments of Gerry Long will be included in the record, or in the transcript of this proceeding. We'll move further down our list of walk-in registrants. Fred W. Ullrich. Following Mr. Ullrich will be Greg Chartrand.

1119 STATEMENT BY FRED W. ULLRICH

MR. ULLRICH: My name is Fred Ullrich. I live in Geneva and I work at Fermilab. I would like for you to look at really one thing that I have to say. There's been a lot of testimony. In fact, I was at the February testimony till 1:30 in the morning. A lot of the same arguments I heard this evening had been raised in February. One interesting thing that has come to my attention since that time is really to look at the opposition, the core group of the opposition, which is the CATCH group. They are all of the one group, okay, let me, I'm a little bit unprepared, but I'll stumble through it.

Okay, fine.

MR. EIGUREN: Quiet.

MR. ULLRICH: Thank you. Many people were able to develop a lot of speech skills and argument skills. But, what I'd like you to do is consider where a lot of this is coming from. In my estimation, it's a lot of one type of person. The type of person, you could almost put it in a geographic area, if you look at the banners behind you, they are probably two of the high schools represented that may even be represented by the opposition.

It represents, the opposition as I'm speaking of, really one type of a person, the SSC represents many type of people and many type of backgrounds, training and skills. I would hate to see something as important as the SSC be rejected from a very articulate, well-developed, well-trained group of people.

When you have the experts come up here, who give negative testimony, really who are the experts? You can take any kind of testimony or any kind of document and poke holes in it. I really feel that if Illinois, or for that matter the whole country, has an interest in going after a goal, they have to take chances, and of course, we need more information on a lot of areas. Lot of things would not have been built if that happened.

Four hours ago I had a conversation with Dr. Wilson who built Fermilab. He was talking about the accomplishments, in fact, we were doing a history on the accomplishments that he achieved. It would be a real shame to negate such accomplishments as bringing the Fermilab in two years ahead of schedule at twice the energy level of what it was intended and several million dollars under budget from a lot of people, in fact, a lot of people that are here, hard work.

I feel that the SSC would be a real shame to throw it away and that track record that Fermilab has on a monochromatic type of person who might call themselves Buffy and Biff. This opposition gives the word Yuppie a bad name. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: The next commenter is Greg Chartrand followed by Ronald A. Temko. Sir, just a second, he's next. Greg Chartrand, followed by Ronald Temko.

1011 STATEMENT BY GREG CHARTRAND

MR. CHARTRAND: Which of these are on? I'd like to make a brief statement. First of all, I personally have been concerned about environmental issues in this area, being the former vice president of the Fox Valley Concerned Citizens. And if I did not believe that the environmental concerns of the SSC would not be addressed

MR. EIGUREN: Mr. Chartrand? Mr. Chartrand, just a second, we're not picking you up on the system here. Folks, please be quiet, we're having difficulty with the recording system. Okay, Greg? Can you back up just a bit?

MR. CHARTRAND: Can you hear me now?

MR. EIGUREN: Yea, there you go.

MR. CHARTRAND: If I did not believe the environmental concerns of the SSC in Illinois would not be met, I would not stand up here today and testify in support of the SSC. And I'm saying that as an employee of Fermilab for almost nineteen years. And I've seen the sensitivity to environmental issues in this area, both on-site and off-site, shown by people that work at Fermilab. And that's gone through at least two generations of laboratory directors.

If the SSC is bad for Illinois, then so should be Fermilab. But the facts are that it's not. If Fermilab is bad for the environment, I would not have chosen to live within a mile of the Fermilab site and raise my family there. The environmental concerns of the SSC are best met by those who have experienced addressing the specific needs of a large accelerator.

Fermilab is the only site that has the experienced team to assure the environmental concerns are safely addressed. Yes, there's been opposition to a SSC in Illinois, but this opposition has been possible in part because Illinois has been open and aboveboard throughout this entire process.

Every SSC site will have very similar environmental impacts, only Fermilab has the team that can assure that the environment will be protected. Thus, Fermilab is the environmentally correct site for the SSC.

MR. EIGUREN: Ronald A. Temko.

1126 STATEMENT BY RONALD A. TEMKO

MR. TEMKO: Good evening, gentlemen, my name is Ronald A. Temko, I live in the town of Bartlett, 979 Oceanside Terrace. And the reason I'm here is I've lived in Illinois for forty-nine years, I'm going to talk about Illinois because that's what you want to hear about. You want to hear arguments, you want to hear input into why Illinois is the best state.

When I was a little child going to school, I remember how they would tell corporations, the government, build in Illinois, we have the best people, the best working class, the best money-making people, not for themselves but for the corporations or the people they work for. Every unit, every building, every project that the government comes in saves money and in turn the revenue goes back to the government. This has happened time and time again after forty-nine years in Illinois.

Why did you pick Illinois? I feel as an Illinoisan you picked Illinois because we have the trades people, we have the educators, we have the people that want to grow in a community. Fermilab was built here, it was nothing. I lived in this area for twenty-seven years. All of a sudden there was growth, why? It's a safe community, why? Because it's a safe area. Fermilab was never mentioned.

Once this ring is built in this area and these people live around this area, nothing will be mentioned about unsafety. There'll be mention about growth, progress; it's happening now. What you people have done for a state like Illinois, I feel you chose the state for one reason. To save the environment, to make more jobs, to put more revenue into the government because this job gives revenue by, not just Fermilab, you have to look at the future. The building growth, like is what's happening now. The homes being built in the surrounding area. Highways going through, more industrial areas, more aspect of more knowledgeable people. When you get knowledgeable people, what happens? You get better schools, better education, better play areas, more understanding.

These people tonight when they interrupt a speaker, they talk, they show you that that's not what Illinois's all about. I've never seen this, I've attended meeting after meeting. I'm the type of person that likes to learn by seeing other people. If you use these people in this area as an example of what Illinois's all about, please forgive them. Because they're not what Illinois is all about. Illinois is honest, fair and abiding. We have a governor, this governor represents both sides of political parties.

UNKNOWN VOICE: But where is he?

MR. TEMKO: He's been here, he's done his part. I'm here to represent what I feel as a taxpayer, as a voter, I register, as a man to serve my country, I know what it's all about, I've done all these things, and I haven't given up on my country and the people like you people up here that are in charge, you make the decision; I don't tell you what to do. You can't tell someone what to do, you just can explain to them, this state has everything you need.

It has -- during the recession, it didn't fall apart like the other states. Other states that you've picked have fallen apart and they feel they're going to give you this and that to build up. Illinois doesn't need you here, in an aspect of money, but you need us because we have knowledge, we have work force, we have productivity; and if you're not here, we'll have it and as you think and you look back, you'll say why didn't we choose it after it starts.

So to stop what I feel as a suggestion and my deep feelings as an Illinoisan, if you don't pick Illinois, you've made a mistake. And mistakes are made by everyone; Bush said he made mistakes, Reagan said he made mistakes, everyone makes mistakes. But the Illinois people, when you give them a job to do, they never make mistakes. Thank you.

MR. EIGUREN: Ladies and gentlemen that completes are list of registered commenters. Is there anyone who was registered to comment that has not had the chance?

At this point, we'll go ahead and bring on our two surprise commenters. Could Vice President Bush and Governor Dukakis please come in?

Alright, has everyone that's registered had a chance to comment? Very good, then. On behalf of the hearing panel and myself personally, we thank you for your attendance at this Session I of the October 7, 1988 hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, the SSC project.

With that, we are formally adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 9:50 p.m., the session was adjourned.)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Public Hearing on the Matter of

SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

Auditorium
Waubonsie Valley High School
Aurora, Illinois

Thursday, October 6, 1988
and
Friday, October 7, 1988

APPEARANCES

PRESIDING:

DEPUTY RICHARD NOLAN
Executive Director, SSC Site Task Force

MODERATOR:

BARRY LAWSON
Barry Lawson & Associates, Inc.

PANEL:

RICHARD NOLAN
JAY HUNZE
LINDA McCLAIN
DR. BILL WHITE
U.S. Department of Energy

PUBLIC SPEAKERS:

First Session:

SHEREE HOUGHTON
LINDA BENSON
JOHN DILEO
OLIVIA DIAZ
VIOLA WILLE
F. PAUL MOORING
JIM SCHLUCHTER
RANDALL PROS
HON. VIVIAN LUND
RICHARD SHOCKLEY
KATHY MATTES
HON. JIM DEZLER
JOHN BRINING
STANLEY PERRY
ED KELLY
KAL LESTER
HON. RICHARD LEWIS
RAY BOCHMAN
CHUCK ANDERSON
JOSEPH MANN
BILL RODMAN
ROBERT WURM

Second Session:

DR. MORRIS LEIGHTON
JOHN KEMPTON
ROBERT BAUER
KEROS CARTWRIGHT
DAVID L. GROSS
ANITA HOUGH
ROGER KILLBROOK
NEIL WALGENBACH
GILLIAN PANESENSKI
MARTHA LACZYNSKI

Second Session (Cont)

JANET McLEOD
DR. RAY BANDLOW
JOHN HAMILTON
JAMES REINERT
CRAIG RICE
DR. SUZANNE WILLIS
AUDREY HUGGINS
BRADLEY HUGGINS
JOHN PLATT
GERALD GIRARDOT
RICHARD COOPER
RITA DEPEDRO
DRESKO JOVANOVIC
BRUCE WINSTEIN
FRANK MERRITT
BONNIE DEKE
PAUL KURYLO

Third Session:

ORAN HARK
SUE EVANS
EDWARD MALEK
BONNIE WUENSCHE
HILDI SMITH
KRISTI FRACASSO
JENNY PANKOW
MICHAEL PANESENSKI
PATTI GILSON
KATHY BENNETT
CAROL BAYER
JANET KRAL
JOHN STAFFORD
BOB BENNETT
JANET MANNS
NANCY MALEK
DONNA BRYSKI
JOHN MARKOVIC
GERALD MATHERS
ROBERT McKINNEY
CHERYL MOORE
JOHN ROSS
MS. A. GLIENKE

Fourth Session:

BRIAN JOHN STAFFORD
LUCILLE DENKER
JUDITH HEMINGWAY
CAROL WILLIAMS
EILEEN HASLEM
PAULA HEMMER
AGNES HEISLEY
BARBARA HOGAN
DON PRICE
STEVEN JONES
CARL ADAMS
JEAN McMAHON
CHRISTY HEATH
LINDA VOELKER
GREG VANZANDT
ELIZABETH DAVIS
ROSE HAGGERTY
DR. DENNIS M. HAGGERTY
JEROME MROZAK
MARGARET HULKA
JIM CINTO
WALLACE DEPP
JAMES PETERS
MOLLY HOOLEY
ROBERT RAYMOND

FIRST SESSION

(October 6, 1988: 2:00 p.m.)

MR. NOLAN: Good afternoon. If those of you remaining would like to take seats we will be getting together right away, getting going.

I want to welcome each and every one of you to the Department of Energy's Public Hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Superconducting Super Collider. My name is Dick Nolan and I am the Deputy Executive Director of the SSC Site Task Force. I am the presiding official for your hearing this afternoon for this particular session. A concurrent session of this hearing is being held next door in the gymnasium.

The purpose of my brief remarks to you is to explain why we are all here. After my remarks, I will ask our session moderator Mr. Barry Lawson, who is seated here to my right, to outline how we will conduct our session this afternoon. The purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens an opportunity to comment in person on the Department's draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC. This hearing is not your only opportunity. We want to emphasize that. You may also send us your written comments which must be postmarked by October 17th this month.

We want you to know that we are sincerely interested in hearing your comments on this document and that each of your comments will be considered and will be responded to in the final Environmental Impact Statement. Let me just take a second and go back and refresh your memories on how we came to this point in the selection process.

In January of 1987, President Reagan's decision was to proceed with the SSC and he announced this decision and requested construction funds for the project from Congress. In April 1987, the Department issued an invitation for site proposals. We subsequently received 43 proposals and found that 36 of those were qualified. Those qualified proposals were sent to the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering for further evaluation.

Based on the criteria that we had laid out in the invitation, the Academies recommended to us a most excellent list of eight candidate sites for our further consideration. One of these proposals was later withdrawn by the proposer. Following a review and a verification of the Academies' work, Secretary Herrington announced the Best Qualified List, including the State of Illinois' proposal, on January 19, 1988.

On January 22, 1988, the DOE formally announced that it would develop an Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed SSC. In February 1988, we held scoping meetings in each of the seven states to obtain comment on the nature and scope of the environmental issues that the public felt were appropriate for us to consider in the draft EIS.

You may recall that we were here in February of this year, February 18th in Illinois, to receive testimony on what the public felt were those most important issues. Now, from your testimony at that time and from the testimony that we received in the other sessions in the other six states, we received some 2,100 comments about the nature of the issues that we should consider. We did, in fact, take those into account in determining the scope of the EIS that has been drafted and is the subject of our hearing this afternoon.

Following public hearings here and in the other six Best Qualified List states which have now been completed, we will develop a final Environmental Impact Statement and issue it in December of this year. Now, this current draft EIS evaluates and prepares four types of alternatives. First, site alternatives: the seven locations that are under consideration for siting the SSC. Technical alternatives, that is different technology or facility configurations. We have looked in the IS at programmatic alternatives -- using other accelerators, international collaboration or, in fact, delaying the project for some time. And four, the no-action alternative, which is the option not to construct the SSC at all.

This draft EIS identifies and analyzes the potential environmental consequences expected to occur from siting construction and operation of SSC at seven alternate site locations. And let me again repeat the states where the seven sites are located that are under consideration. They are located in Arizona, in Colorado, in Illinois, in Michigan, in North Carolina, in Tennessee and in Texas. The draft EIS that we will be talking about this afternoon, gives us as much information as we have at this stage of the development of the project regarding the potential environmental impacts that we could expect from siting the machine at any of the seven locations. However, the DOE recognizes that further review under the National Environmental Policy Act will be necessary prior to a decision to actually construct and operate the machine at the selected site.

So, following the selection of the site for the proposed SSC, we will prepare a supplement to this EIS to address in considerably more detail the impacts of construction and operation of the machine at the selected site. And we will, in fact, consider in detail at that point the alternatives for minimizing those impacts. Let me tell you a little bit more about the draft Environmental Impact Statement. It is obviously a very significant piece of work. In terms of length, it is over 4,000 pages and it does cover all seven sites. It's organized into four volumes. Volume I is entitled Environmental Impact Statement. Volume II is the Comment Resolution Document, and it's in fact not in existence yet because it is reserved for your comments and our responses to your comments and so it will only appear in the final published EIS this December. Volume III talks about our methodology for site selection and Volume IV is a compilation of detailed technical appendices that back up the conclusions in the Environmental Impact Statement itself.

Now, the comments that you give us at this hearing will be used by the Department to prepare a final EIS, as I said, that will be issued in December. This document will identify the Department's preferred site, which again will be designated in late November. No sooner than 30 days after the final EIS is distributed, the Department will publish its record of decision which will include the final site selection and that will formally complete the site selection process.

This afternoon we will in fact use the services of a professional moderator to assure a fair and orderly proceeding for us. Measures have been taken to permit maximum opportunity for interested citizens such as yourselves to utilize this session for expressing their comments. We urge your comments to focus to the maximum extent possible on the draft EIS and avoid statements aimed solely at expressing opposition or, on the other hand, support for the project. While all comments will be part of the formal record of this proceeding, those specifically addressing the draft EIS will be the most useful to us in preparing the final Environmental Impact Statement.

As I noted earlier, in addition to this opportunity for oral comments, we want to make sure you are aware that individuals can also give us written comments. Again, by October 17th, they would be appreciated. That is the end of our 45-day formal comment period on the draft EIS. That will allow us time to ensure that they will be considered in the final EIS. We will, to the extent that we possibly can, consider comments, however, received after October 17th. Just one final word on the role of the Environmental Impact Statement in the site selection process. Federal law requires that environmental impacts be considered by Federal decision makers in taking major Federal actions with potential environmental consequences. An EIS is one of the methods used to do this analysis, provide for public comment and participation and to make a final decision that meets the NEPA requirements. The EIS will be used by the Secretary and it will be considered by the Secretary in making the site selection.

We want to thank you in advance for your interest and your participation in being here. Today, you will be addressing a panel composed of myself and Linda McClain who is sitting to Barry Lawson's right. And periodically throughout our session today you will find that I will be spelled off by Mr. Jay Hunze and Linda will be spelled off by Mr. Bill White.

Let me now introduce to you Mr. Barry Lawson who will describe how we will conduct this afternoon's session. Barry.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you and good afternoon. Once again, my name is Barry Lawson. I am a community relations specialist and president of Lawson & Associates of Concord, Massachusetts. As an outside consultant I have been hired by the Department of Energy to serve as a neutral facilitator and moderator at this hearing. As Mr. Nolan has said, the purpose of this hearing is to give the interested citizens an opportunity to comment on the Department's draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Superconducting Super Collider. In February, the Department conducted a scoping meeting here in Illinois to listen to and to receive comments on what should be considered in the preparation of the draft EIS. DOE has now prepared the draft and seeks comment on this document which is more specific in detailing the potential environmental impact of siting the SSC here in Illinois and in six other states. The court reporter for this afternoon's hearing is Tim Devine and Tim is sitting to my left.

When we begin the comment period of this hearing, I will announce each speaker working from a list which will be provided to me by the people at the registration table. This is the registration table outside. I will take the speakers in the order in which they signed up in advance, with appropriate respect for public officials. As this is a hearing to receive comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, your comments should focus on issues addressed in the draft document. If I find that comments are wandering from the topic of this session, I will remind you to focus your comments more sharply. This is not intended to limit your remarks but rather to assure that they are as effective as possible in achieving the objective of this hearing as set forth by Mr. Nolan, the presiding official for this hearing.

To provide interested people with a fair opportunity to express their views, I have established the following rules for the conduct of today's session. This first session will last from roughly 2:00 p.m. until 5:00 p.m. and then again this evening from 7:00 p.m. until 10:00 p.m. Because of a large advance registration, there will be sessions extending into tomorrow with three-hour sessions beginning at 9:00 a.m. and at 2:00 p.m. in the afternoon and then at 7:00 p.m. in the evening if it is necessary. Periodically, I may call for a comfort break.

All comments will be limited to five minutes unless otherwise noted by me. I will try to remind you when you have 30 seconds remaining and your cooperation will be appreciated by the panel and other members of the public who will then also have a fair opportunity to share their view.

I will attempt to take people at their scheduled times. Although, if some of the presentations run less than five minutes, we may be able to run a little ahead of schedule. You are encouraged to submit written comments to me before or after your presentation. And if you would, perhaps, if you have written comments, you can leave them down on the side here and we can pick them up from there. At approximately 30 minutes before the scheduled end of this session, I will call speakers who have registered at the door today. Some of these speakers may also be called earlier if we are running ahead of schedule. Therefore, any of you who wish to speak and have not registered in advance are again advised to sign up at the registration table in the lobby.

Mr. Nolan has said, for those of you who may wish to submit written comments later, the deadline is October 17 and all comments raised here at the meeting or in written form and raised on the content of the draft EIS will be made part of the record to be considered by the Department of Energy as it prepares its final EIS. Now the panel's responsibilities today are to listen to your comments and to ask any clarifying questions necessary to create a complete record or your comment on the contents of the draft EIS.

You are reminded that this is a smoke-free building. There is no smoking allowed in any areas of the building. Also, there is a cafeteria but it is for student use only and is not available to the general public. A snack bar, however, directly opposite the entrance to the gymnasium is available for your use.

As this hearing is being held in a high school with students and faculty in attendance during many of our sessions, we request that you restrict your movement during this hearing to the meeting rooms and the registration areas. Please do not loiter in the corridors. The building will open for public access at 1:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, this day, and for Friday as well. For the three sessions tomorrow, we ask that people arrive no earlier than one half hour prior to opening of the session. That is at 8:30 a.m., 1:30 p.m. and, if necessary, 6:30 p.m. in the evening.

We would like to thank the Waubonsie Valley High School and the School District 204 for the use of their facilities for these hearings. We request that everyone attending and participating in these sessions respect the high school property and help us to keep it clean.

Finally, you are reminded that today's hearing is being held in two rooms -- the auditorium and the gymnasium. If you are registered to speak at the hearing, please make certain that you are in the room assigned to you at registration. This, of course, is the auditorium. If you are uncertain as to which room you have been assigned, please check with the registration table at this time. Also, I want to indicate to you that because this is a public hearing and because it is important that we have a complete transcript, it's important that the court reporter be able to get a complete transcript. One problem that can arise, not likely to arise in this room because of the acoustics but could arise, is noise. And I would just respectfully ask any of you who feel compelled to have a conversation with your neighbors, if you would please step outside of the room so that we would not interfere either with the speakers or interfere with the transcription that is being made of the session. I will announce any further procedural rules for the conduct of the hearing as necessary. And, again, your cooperation with these procedures and with accomplishing the objectives of today's hearing are greatly appreciated. Now it is time to introduce our first speaker. I will ask you, when called upon to speak, to move to the podium provided in front of the panel and for the record to introduce yourself, give an address if you will and to state your position and organization, if any. It is also important, actually critical for you, if you are submitting written comments or if you have questions that you would like to have addressed or asked -- would like to ask questions -- if you would please put your name, address and zip code on the comments that you submit and, if you would also, your telephone number. That will give us better assurance that we make sure that we understand the question that you are asking and make sure that the Department of Energy can give you a full answer to it.

I will remind those of you who wish to speak again, to sign up at the registration table. I will call on each speaker in turn, announcing at the same time the followup speaker so that you can be prepared. Now, the officials to the meeting have set aside at least one or two rows in front of me in the bottom here for those who are preregistered. If you are not already seated in one of those seats and I call you as the next speaker, I would greatly appreciate your moving down here so that we minimize the time necessary for movement back and forth to this podium and also ensure that you have a fuller five minutes within which to speak.

The first speaker for this afternoon's session would be Sheree Houghton. Is Sheree Houghton here? The second speaker would be Linda Benson. Is Linda Benson here? Thank you. Ms. Houghton.

849 STATEMENT OF SHEREE HOUGHTON

MS. HOUGHTON: Sheree Houghton. Then what do I do, do I come up there?

MR. LAWSON: No, no you are just fine right there.

MS. HOUGHTON: This light isn't real wonderful. That's all right. I want to address the changes to the original design of the SSC proposal. My comments will address two significant modifications Illinois has made to your original SSC proposal.

One, the use of the present Fermilab facility -- there should be relabeled the Fermilab disadvantage. And, two, extension modifications proposed to force fit the SSC into the Illinois site. First, the Illinois disadvantage. The State Department of Energy Natural Resources and its supporters have indicated that use of the Fermilab facility is the key advantage of the Illinois proposal. However, upon reading the Environmental Impact Statement, it becomes very clear just how important Fermilab is for maintaining our leadership role in particle research. In fact, the accelerators at Fermilab and Stanford are going to play major roles while the SSC is being built and on into the next century. We need Fermilab in full operation while the SSC is being constructed. Otherwise, you run the risk of losing precious time and prestige to European and Russian counterparts. Therefore, Fermilab becomes a disadvantage for Illinois.

Now, why? Quite simply you cannot hook the present Tevatron up as the SSC injector without jeopardizing the loss of Fermilab for one or more years for extensive modifications. Or the injector system has to be built from scratch. This major change in the Illinois proposal becomes a major disadvantage or no advantage at all.

Second, Illinois has made numerous changes to the site proposal to force fit the SSC into the Illinois site. In fact, Illinois has made more changes or adjustments to the so-called ring template than any other state. Illinois proposes moving five service access areas -- that's F sites -- from their original positioning. Only Michigan has as many as three such changes in their proposal. Also, four E shaft sites will be moved from their original position. Even more such changes have been recently proposed by the Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Only one other state changes one E site location. Perhaps more importantly, Illinois proposes moving the buried beam zone accesses at the J areas. Any and all changes as proposed mean altering the original design concept of the SSC and will necessitate changes which would equate to increased time and costs for the Illinois site. As E and F sites are moved further from the ring, additional tunneling and angled shafts become necessary. The Illinois tunnel is already the deepest of the seven proposed sites. In fact, at one stretch, it exceeds the maximum optimum level of 600 feet. By adding additional angle tunnels to accommodate the altered E, F and J sites, there will be far more tunneling required at the Illinois site. All this adds up to increased tunneling time and costs. This the Illinois taxpayer must pay for and not the Federal Government. Without any doubt, the Illinois site provides the most difficult and costly tunneling project of the seven sites. It bears pointing out that these 14 or more changes proposed by Illinois can be compared to the absolutely changes to the template as originally proposed in Arizona, Colorado, North Carolina and Texas.

The Department of Energy has designed the SSC but Illinois requires the most extensive modifications, loss of time and expending of more dollars to complete than any other proposed site. I would rather have the SSC at one of the other sites than under my home and in my source of water.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Do you want to leave your paper or no?

MS. HOUGHTON: It has hand-scratching on it.

MR. LAWSON: The next speaker this afternoon will be Linda Benson to be followed by Bruce Van Zetten. Is Mr. Van Zetten here? If he is not, is John Dilks here? Mr. Dilks, you will be the next speaker. Ms. Benson.

1155 SPEAKER OF [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

people who will be forced to live on the ring, but those of us who will be living near the ring and will have to tolerate the noise, the construction phase, the operational phases, the changes in our lifestyles.

More harvesters will be closed at the Illinois site than at all other sites combined. More acres of prime farmland are being removed from production in Illinois. Groundwater inflows into the shafts and tunnels are expected to be the third highest of all the sites. Due to the regional groundwater overdrafts situation in northern Campton township, groundwater supplies will be more adversely affected in Illinois than at any other site.

The resulting adverse effects upon wells and land values will also be the most pronounced in Illinois. We have spent the last several years in Fox Valley, Illinois, actually purchased an earthmover dragline. Being a City girl, all this dragline was doing is turn your land into water and try to make surface. Where is an overdraft already? The drought did not make it any better.

The presence of methane gas at the Illinois site is a potential safety hazard and can be expected to slow down tunnel construction. The entire Fox Valley, Illinois site is bounded by floodrate insurance maps and shows a high probability for damage due to flooding. This is not true at any other site. In Illinois too, just a few days ago, we had extreme flooding. Some areas where we were were not as bad, but I remember trying to drive into Oak Park and not being able to get there because of the flooding and then having a horrible time trying to get back home again because of the flooding.

The proposed Illinois site has the largest surface water channel in the presence of the Fox River. But the Illinois site also contains the greatest wetlands area. Any impacts due to siltation or pollutants being placed in the natural water drainage system will, therefore, have a greater negative impact in Illinois than at any other collider site.

The surface water quality at the Illinois site is already the worst of all sites. We already have the worst levels of: total dissolved solids, nitrate and fecal coliforms which is human body wastes. We have our fecals here in the country. We do not drink the water, we have bottled water.

Illinois has the largest number of people who will be adversely affected by noise. There is associated with occurrence of the Kaneous cancer and the T-cell from viruses. The only significantly negative and unique groundwater quality factors to exist at any site is the naturally elevated radium level which occurs at the Illinois site. Why should Fermilab be exposed to further levels of radiation from the SSC when the presence of radium in our water supply already exposes us to levels not experienced at any other site, at least some other site.

The negative effect of dynamiting which the SSC will be using at the E and F access shafts will impact more homes and more people at the Illinois site than at any other. Illinois is one of only three sites where there is a direct hydraulic connection between surface water bodies and the underlying aquifers. Once again, the negative impacts upon groundwater supplies become more pronounced if pollutants or contaminants enter the channel either drainage system of the chapel, creeks, lakes and streams. This is not true at any other location.

Note to the only site where a waiver that is designated as inconsistent for both ozone and carbon monoxide levels. Great percentage particulate levels will exceed the national ambient air quality standards. This is the worst conditions of the sites.

Because of the permeability of soil at the Fox River site, the Illinois site is bounded inland and contains the groundwater resources in this area. In addition, some tunnels at the Illinois and Texas sites would be particularly above the existing water tables. Thus, it may create problems associated with the SSC tunnels affecting wetlands. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

serves the Government as a major propaganda tool to give the appearance that the United States is preparing to leap into the forefront of worldwide technological superiority. As usual, however, the Government misses the point.

American industry is falling behind not from lack of research and development, but from lack of freedom in the marketplace. The ridiculous abundance of Federal restrictions, taxes and mandates on business have driven jobs in the high tech industry and all other industries overseas to nations with less abundant chains on their business sectors.

The SSC project will cost a minimum of four billion dollars. In the year of trillion dollar national debt, can anyone truly believe that this is a justifiable expenditure of taxpayer dollars? When
2 thousands are homeless, tens of thousands are starving, millions are suffering a sluggish economy in need of jobs and decent housing, can it possibly be rational to steal four billion dollars more from the public and bury it underground.

If Government's chief duty is to help the people of this nation lead peaceful, prosperous lives, it must lower their taxes and encourage business to thrive. It must not waste billions of tax dollars, force thousands out of their homes and close dozens of local businesses by competing with the R&D departments of private business and universities.

Government, allegedly the servant of the people, has no right to disrupt and destroy communities, to diminish property values of residents and to contaminate the water supply through radiation. By closing hundreds of wells, by clouding the titles of thousands of citizens and by destroying the potential productivity of this growing region, the Government will be harming not only the thousands of Illinojans here but the millions of other taxpayers nationwide whose hard earned dollars are put to use in the SSC, making the entire nation share the sins committed against these residents.

How should Government solve its problems? By lowering taxes, by cutting Government waste and by
3 eliminating the failed programs and restrictive regulations and leaving people alone to live their lives in peace, and by leaving research and development to the business community where it belongs.

Incidentally, if the Government is determined to waste these billions on an overgrown underground racetrack--which if done by the private sector would be profitable to the business climate and to the people involved but when done by Government is merely a waste, there are other states available for the project, states with more vacant land already in the Government's possession, states with less risk of environmental ill effects. And States who are blessed by having no such arrogant, egomaniac governor as we have, willing to sell his constituents down to an irradiated river for a few pages of favorable newsprint.

Illinois is the best state for residing in, for raising children in and for doing business in. It is the worst state for another dangerous, wasteful Government program, however well-intentioned or scientifically popular. Do it somewhere else, or don't do it at all.

President Reagan in 1980 proposed the elimination of the Department of Energy. If this is an example of DOE's activities, I have no doubt that the President then was right. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Just put it right there, I will pick it up in a second. Thank you.

The next speaker this afternoon will be Olivia Diaz. She will be followed by Mr. Von Zellen, if he has arrived. Is Patti Dritsas here? John Milroy? Is Viola Villa here? You will be the next speaker. Go'on, Ms. Diaz.

1157 STATEMENT OF OLIVIA DIAZ

MS. DIAZ: Yes, I am Olivia Diaz and I am the Executive Director of the Warrenville Chamber of Commerce. I would like to take this opportunity to address the economic benefits of the Superconducting Super Collider and Fermilab's contribution to the community.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

One of the great advantages of the Illinois proposal is Fermilab. Outside of the estimated $1.3 billion savings this facility represents is the positive impact Fermilab has had on its host communities. One of the most visible aspects of Fermilab is the restored prairies.

The grounds of Fermilab are open to all residents and with the walking and bike trails, the grounds are a testament to prairie conservation. Also, the bison herd on site enables young and old alike to view a fascinating creature that was once on the brink of extinction.

More importantly, Fermilab has contributed to the educational well-being of northern Illinois. The Friends of Fermilab, an independent, nonprofit organization, has developed a national model for incorporating Federally funded research programs into educational tools for area physics teachers and students. More than 2,000 gifted science students have participated in Fermilab's Saturday physics workshops. Teachers have benefitted from the availability of Fermilab physicists and specialized teachers clinics to better teach their students.

In fact, one of the year's McArthur Grant winners was Fermilab's physicist, Helen Edwards, PhD. Ms. Edwards, in a post-award interview, indicated that some of the money she received from the grant will be donated to area high school students who are interested in a career in high energy physics. Ms. Edwards is just one example of the type of dedicated, hard-working individuals that call this area home as a result of Fermilab.

As the race to decide the most appropriate state to host the SSC comes to an end, I hope you will consider that Illinois is the only state that has something to lose -- Fermilab. Although the DOE has
2 indicated that Fermilab will remain open during the SSC's operation, Federal budget constraints and other factors may indeed slow down or close down the facility.

As a resident of Warrenville and a neighbor of Fermilab, I would hate to see the loss of our good friends, educators and community-minded individuals, as they move to follow SSC.

Illinois offers the SSC some of the best schools, housing opportunities, utilities and human resources
3 in the country. In turn, the SSC would offer Illinois the continuation of a 20-year relationship with Fermilab and its employees. Fermilab has been a model citizen, a neighbor and a friend. I don't think that any other state could accept and integrate a Federally funded research center into its communities better than Illinois. It truly would be a shame to loose the relationship we as residents have developed with Fermilab. Thank you.

And I will submit these at a later time.

MR. LAWSON: Fine. Thank you very much. The next speaker will be Viola Wille. She will be followed by F. Paul Moering. Is Mr. Moering here? Ms. Wille.

842 STATEMENT BY VIOLA WILLE

MS. WILLE: My comments are from the SSC EIS. Appendix 16, which concerns scenic and visual resource assessment, fails to consider every E and F site which will actually affect individual site lines. For example, Section 16.3.3.2 identifies key viewing points along roads, railroads or bike paths where individuals may become annoyed if confronted with continually having the view the industrial yard nature of the compressor stations.

This section of the draft EIS fails to indicate that compressor station FATAF8 will be located immediately adjacent to Randall Road, a main north-south highway. Not only will this site be fully visible on all four sides, it will be located directly at the entrance to the newly developed Red Gate subdivision.

How can the EIS fail to realize this is a problem when at earlier states, residential land users are not visually compatible with the proposed project because of the obvious functional and structural contrast between project features and residences. F8 will be constructed right in the midst of an area of estate homes. Logically, site lines toward F8 would have a measurable long-term negative impact and would be nonmedicable. And yet the EIS very conveniently ignores this.

This proposed F8 site happens to be one of the sites where the State Department of Energy and Natural Resources has purchased options on land in order to move the facility further away. The ENR has purchased on option on ten acres of land at $20,000 per acre slightly further west on the north side of Balkon Road. This new location for F8 is still in full view from Randall and Balkon Roads and from the Red Gate subdivision. What the ENR apparently doesn't know is that this optioned land lies adjacent to a piece of property owned by the Christ Community Church of St. Charles. Also this optioned property is within 700 feet of another site owned by St. Patrick's Church of St. Charles. The Catholic Church intends to begin construction on their new church next spring, while the Christ Community Church has delayed their plans to build until it is clear that the SSC project will go to Texas.

Whatever the outcome, the EIS makes it perfectly clear that neither the EIS writers or the Department of Energy is aware of this potential unmedicable SSC facility siting. They are once again unaware because the State ENR has failed to notify them of this situation. How can an industrial complex be

allowed to be built at the entrance to a residential subdivision, adjacent to two churches and in full view of a major highway without the draft EIS even mentioning it? Does ENR or DOE feel this problem will simply go away by not drawing attention to it?

This is a totally unacceptable location for your tank farm facility. Not only will it be an eyesore for everyone passing it or living near it, but what about the noise? Are the church P.A. systems going to have to be abnormally loud in order to compete with the drone of the compressor station? Are the church windows going to have to remain closed forever? How can anyone be expected to attend church in the atmosphere that the DOE and the collider are going to create at this location.

Your failure to realize that this situation exists is just another example of the arrogance and unconcern for the quality of human life that surrounds us. It's quite clear that all that matters is the precious collider. Everything else is relegated to the level of insignificance. This cannot and will not be accepted. The Fox Valley site is not the logical choice for the SSC project. We ask that you put it where Dr. Lederman originally planned for it to go -- out in the desert where it belongs. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON. Thank you, ma'am. The next speaker will be F. Paul Mooring to be followed by Jack Romine. Is Mr. Romine here? Is Mr. Jim Schluchter here? You will be the next speaker, sir.

843 STATEMENT OF F. PAUL MOORING

MR. MOORING: My name is F. Paul Mooring. I reside at 295 Abbotsford Court in Glen Ellyn. I am president of the Illinois Prairie Path.

My comments are in the form of a letter addressed to Dr. Wilmot Hess, chairman of the SSC Site Task Force in Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Hess: On February 21, 1988, I wrote you on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Illinois Prairie Path, a not-for-profit corporation, which for 20 years developed and managed an extremely popular, multipurpose trail by the same name located in the study area of the proposed SSC.

In that letter, I called your attention to the fact that the Illinois Prairie Path is a national recreation trail which could be seriously impacted by the construction and/or operation of the SSC. This means that the National Trails Act applies and should be considered in the draft Environment Impact Statement.

Although my letter stated several concerns of our Board arising from the fact that the SSC ring will pass under three branches of our trail, and the United States Department of Energy will acquire fee title to three 1,000-foot sections of the trail, the draft EIS fails to respond to these concerns.

Indeed, the draft EIS Section 5.1.5-40 [sic] contains the following misleading statement indicating a total lack of awareness of the importance of the Illinois Prairie Path and other similar trails in the study area of the Fox River Valley. "C. Illinois. Hunting, fishing, environmental education and bird watching are the primary recreation uses of the area of the Illinois site." You should understand that the most popular form of recreation, by far, in this area is none of the above but is instead bicycling on the various trails including the Illinois Prairie Path, the Great Western Trail, the Fox River Trail and the Virgil L. Gillman Trail. The Illinois Prairie Path alone generates an estimated 300,000 user trips annually.

As I stated in my letter of February the 12th, our Board is concerned about the maintenance of the trail continuity. Both temporarily during construction and permanently during operation and also about possible radiation hazards to our users.

To this list we would like to add one more concern -- visional impact on a national recreation trail. Although the draft EIS considers the visual impact of the SSC on the Great Western Nature Trail, another national recreation trail in Section 5.1.10-14 F9 [sic], it makes no mention of the Illinois Prairie Path in this regard. In fact, as far as we have been able to determine, the draft EIS does not mention or consider the impact of the SSC on our trail at all.

We think that the National Trails Act should be added to the list requiring Federal permits, licenses and other entitlements in Chapter 6 and that the draft Environmental Impact Statement should address all of our above-mentioned concerns. Above all, we want a guarantee that the continuity of the Illinois Prairie Path will not be interrupted. Very truly yours, F. Paul Mooring.

And also, I am including a copy of the original letter to Dr. Hess written back in February 21, 1988.

MR. LAWSON: Mr. Mooring, thank you very much. Would you just put that on the table over to your right.

The next speaker will be Mr. Jim Schluchter. I hope I pronounced that correctly. And he will be followed by Randall Pros. Is Mr. Pros here? Are you here? There you are. You will be the next speaker. Mr. Schluchter, please.

1159 STATEMENT OF JIM SCHLUCHTER

MR. SCHLUCHTER: First of all I want to thank the Department of Energy, the Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources and the Waubonsie Valley High School for working together to conduct these hearings to give the members of the community the opportunity to continue to comment on this important project.

As both a businessman and a resident of this area, I believe the Environmental Impact Statement confirms the belief that the Superconducting Super Collider will be good for the Fox River Valley.

The SSC is more than a scientific project. It is much more. It is, in my opinion, the best scientific and economic development project we have ever had a chance to bring to Illinois.

For more than 20 years, we have observed the positive impact Fermilab has had. With its 2,000 jobs and millions of dollars of economic activity, it is a crucial part of our local economy. The SSC can play an even larger positive role. For example, the draft Environmental Impact Statement says, and I quote, "Growth related to the SSC siting in DuPage, Kane and Kendall Counties would represent a substantial addition to the existing socio and economic environment. The regional economy would experience beneficial increases in employment, income and sales as a result of construction and operation of the SSC."

I couldn't agree more. Yet the important thing to remember here is that this area should not grow just for the sake of growth. Our economic expansion should be controlled so as not to jeopardize the unique flavor of this community. Make no mistake, growth is coming. The SSC gives us the chance to shape that growth in a way that maximizes its benefits while minimizing its drawbacks.

As a resident of one of the fastest growing communities in one of the Midwest's fastest growing counties, I believe the opportunity the SSC offers us cannot be underestimated. It should not be missed. Finally, ladies and gentlemen, as concerned as we all are about jobs for our fellow citizens, the EIS documents state that the SSC would create a peak of nearly 10,500 construction and related jobs and another 3,200 permanent jobs when the SSC is in operation.

It is difficult for someone who is as concerned about the economic well-being of our community and state to do anything but endorse these findings of the draft Environmental Impact Statement with regard to economic activity in this region. The beneficial impact of the SSC is overwhelming as the EIS clearly shows. I appreciate the chance to remind you of these facts. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. The next speaker this afternoon will be Randall Pros and he will be followed by Mr. Bruce Von Zellen if he has arrived? Is Patti Dritsas here? Perhaps John Milroy is here? Vivian Lund? Ms. Lund, you will be the next speaker. Mr. Pros.

844 STATEMENT OF RANDALL PROS

MR. PROS: Thank you and thank you on behalf of all of us in Naperville. I represent the Naperville area Chamber of Commerce and I have a prepared text. I did want to mention also that I have been a lifelong resident of the area, having grown up in Glen Ellyn.

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Naperville area Chamber of Commerce which represents approximately 1,000 businesses and 1,800 individuals, I am here to speak in support of siting, construction and the operation of Superconducting Super Collider facility in connection with the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory in DuPage and Kane Counties.

Our relations with the current operations of Fermilab have been excellent over the many years that Fermi Laboratories have been operational in the area. The Naperville area is just one of several communities surrounding and supporting the personnel and the operations of this laboratory. We cannot presume to speak for the other communities also adjacent to the area, but we can in fact speak for our own community.

Naperville has enjoyed its relationship with Fermi and we believe that the personnel of Fermilab have enjoyed and found this area productive. Other speakers can address the technical aspects of the operation of Fermilab and the SSC project when it was sited here as to the geological, environmental and technical adaptability. We believe that there is nothing inherently dangerous or undesirable in the SSC project.

We, however, can address the other issues which also bear on the needs of such a facility. The surrounding communities, which include Naperville, that serve Fermi are expanding their personnel service and retail base by literally leaps and bounds. In Naperville alone, 150,000 square feet of retail space is being created each year. In terms of office space, approximately 750,000 square feet is built within the corporate limits of Naperville each year. Space is being created in each of the communities that will be used for both general and professional services that can serve the staff of the SSC as they have the staff of Fermilab.

In terms of living conditions, each of the communities offers a number of different residential housing community opportunities both in existing as well as in new construction. Again, speaking only for Naperville, approximately 1,200 to 1,500 new single-family residences are created in our community each year. This has been the trend for several years. Additionally, multifamily housing -- townhouses and condo units -- are also being built at a fast rate.

Due to the nature of the area, and particularly Naperville, there is such a turnover in existing housing, that there are many opportunities for individuals who have been transferred to places such as SSC to choose between either new residential areas or well-established areas with mature trees.

In terms of the education in Naperville, Naperville is building approximately one new elementary school classroom per month in both District 203 and 204. We have added junior highs, or middle schools, at a corresponding rate of growth and there are additions to three high schools serving the area.

Naperville has just completed a magnificent new public library building offering multimedia data services to the public. Concerts, plays, theatre groups, chamber music, children's activities, multimedia art programs and athletic programs are all available either immediately adjacent or in the Chicago metropolitan area. Museums and galleries are, of course, in abundance. They are available in the diversity of settings and subject areas to entertain, enjoy and educate the personnel that will be staffing this new facility.

Transportation and communications are state-of-the-art in the Chicago metropolitan area. This area enjoys this cutting edge advantages of fiber optic telecommunications as well as an on-demand bus service.

Finally, there is an aspect which has not been given proper recognition which we also believe is extremely important. This is the fact that there is a recognition of individual rights and responsibilities in this areas. During the years that Fermi Laboratory and Argonne National Laboratory have been located in DuPage County, the communities, including Naperville, have had the opportunity to be involved with the scientists, engineers, support personnel that work in these important installations. As you are fully aware, these individuals represent many nations, cultures and religions.

Over these many years, our community and others have offered an atmosphere where these individuals and their families have resided comfortably and unchallenged in their beliefs and philosophies. We continue this tradition with the next generation of scientific leaders from all over the world who will study and work in this new facility when it is built here in Illinois. I thank you very much on behalf of the Naperville Area Chamber of Commerce.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. I remind you, if you have a statement you would like to submit you can just put it over here. The next speaker this afternoon will be Vivian Lund to be followed by Richard Shockley, if he is here. Ms. Lund.

845 STATEMENT OF HON. VIVIAN LUND

MS. LUND: I am the Mayor of Warrenville and Warrenville is Fermilab's nearest neighbor and our western border butts the lab site. I am personally concerned that the opposition to the SSC at Fermi has been accelerated by unfounded fears.

I know as an official at the local level, it is sometimes difficult to make decisions based on the merits of the facts rather than one based on the emotional impact of vocal opposition. It is an unfortunate reality that those who favor an issue usually are not as forceful in their presentation of their views.

I am confident the Department of Energy will be fair in their consideration of both sides on this issue. I am also reassured by the good neighbor legislation enacted by our State that those whose properties will be most directly affected will be protected.

After the Environmental Impact Statement was issued and considered, the City Council of Warrenville felt it was important to consider a new resolution to support to siting of the SSC at Fermi and I will read that resolution now.

Resolution Number 8825 in support of Superconducting Super Collider. Whereas it is incumbent upon the Department of Energy to select the most logical, cost-effective site on which to build the proposed Superconducting Super Collider and whereas the environs of Fermilab contain the qualities necessary for the establishment of the SSC including geology, which would support tunnel construction, a strong established infrastructure of roads, airports, schools, hospitals and housing, which would have to be built from scratch at other sites, and an established single source of electrical power with sufficient capacity to serve the energy needs of the SSC at a relatively low cost, and whereas for 20 years, Fermilab has been a good neighbor to the city of Warrenville offering employment to city residents, and whereas the mayor and city council of the city of Warrenville believe it is vital to our community that the SSC be established at Fermilab thereby continuing Fermilab's preeminence in the field, and now, therefore, be it resolved by the mayor and city council of the city of Warrenville, DuPage County, Illinois as follows:

Section 1: That the city of Warrenville strongly supports the location of the SSC at Fermilab and the mayor is authorized and directed to forward a certified copy of this resolution to the Department of Energy and to offer testimony which supports the location of the SSC at Fermilab at any hearing of the Department of Energy.

Section 2: That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and approval in the manner provided by law passed this 19th day of September, 1988. And it was passed unanimously by the aldermen in attendance -- Asher, Wheeler, Alery, Taylor, Kruse, Goodman and Bloom (all phonetic), and signed by the Mayor, Vivian M. Lund and testified City Clerk, Lucy Bernard. And I will leave that with you.

I would like to thank you very much for allowing such generous public input to this important decision. I don't envy the job that you are doing.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, ma'am. The next speaker this afternoon would be Richard Shockley to be following by John Milroy if Mr. Milroy's here? And if he is not, is Kathy Mattes here? You will be the next speaker. Mr. Shockley, please.

846 STATEMENT OF RICHARD SHOCKLEY

MR. SHOCKLEY: My name is Richard Shockley. I am the Director of the Illinois Department of Mines and Minerals. On behalf of my agency, I welcome this opportunity to testify on behalf of the SSC project.

Having reviewed the data gathered by the proper personnel and after reviewing the U.S. Department of Energy's draft EIS, I can give my unqualified support to this extremely important project. The Department of Mines and Minerals' comments on the draft EIS focuses on three areas -- increased worker safety, mitigated noise and vibration caused by construction activities, and controlling the disposal of rock spoil generated by the construction of this project.

The statement of draft EIS regarding workers' safety procedures, safety training and complying with safety standards are too vague. The Department of Energy should indicate the safety standards followed with during each phase of the construction and operation of the SSC, specify the agency providing necessary safety training and specify the agency charged with enforcing safety standards.

The Department of Mines and Minerals' many years of experience and successfully regulating underground mine safety in Illinois is a resource that should be made available during the construction and operation of the SSC. The measures proposed in the draft EIS to mitigate the effect blasting has on the public should be made mandatory. Measures such as steaming the blast and reducing the charge weight per delay should be formalized and defined in the EIS.

A carefully designed blasting plan will help ensure worker safety, serve to eliminate any threat to the public and serve to allay public concern about air blast and vibration attendant to construction activities.

The removal of dolomite attendant to the SSC construction is not considered to be surface mining regulated by my agency. However, the disposal of the large volume of dolomite generated by this construction project at one of the quarries identified by the U.S. Department of Energy will require the Department of Mines and Minerals' input.

Since the Department regulates the mining and reclamation associated with the Fox River Stone Quarry, the Department will review potential reclamation plan changes caused by the disposal of large volumes of dolomite at this site to ensure that no environmental harm occurs.

In closing, I am pleased to announce that the Department of Mines and Minerals has identified no aspect of the SSC project within its jurisdiction that poses any adverse impact to the health and safety of the public or to the environment.

The Department is fully committed to support the SSC project in any way it can during construction as well as during the subsequent operation of the facility. the State of Illinois needs the SSC, especially given the large number of unemployed coal miners that could be retrained to help build this enormous project. We earnestly hope that the U.S. Department of Energy decides to site the SSC in Illinois. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: The next speaker will be Kathy Mattes, I am going to guess. And she will be followed by Jim Dezler. Is Mr. Dezler here?

1161 STATEMENT OF KATHY MATTES

MS. MATTES: One of my concerns is the water usage and and disposition of tunnel spoils. In Appendix 7, Table 7-4 shows the estimated off-site domestic water use expected over the years ahead for the SSC region of influence. Estimates for water use appear for DuPage and Kane Counties through the year of 1995. However, these statistics were compiled using 1983 estimates.

The tremendous surge in growth in Kane County was not anticipated, back in 1983. In fact, current growth statistics place Kane County as the fastest growing county in northeastern Illinois. Therefore, all water usage figures that are shown in Table 7-4 are outdated and underestimated. As a result, the SSC's direct and indirect water usage will have a much greater impact upon groundwater supplies than the statistics in the EIS tend to indicate.

This is an extremely important issue to the residents of Fox Valley and use of outdated statistics on the part of the Illinois ENR should not be allowed to influence the DOE decision-making process.

Section 10.2.3.3 of the draft EIS indicates that there are four quarries which are located around the SSC ring for disposition of excavated tunnel material or spoils. One of these is Quarry Number 1 located on Route 31 and McClain Boulevard in South Elgin. The EIS indicates that spoils from shafts E7, F7, E8, F8, E9 and F9 will all be transported to Quarry Number 1.

As many as 290 semitrucks are expected to be dumping material at this site on any given day. CATCH had previously indicated that 95 truckloads per day would be highballing down our country roads. Once again, we were proven wrong -- it's not 95, it's 290.

2 What is of greater importance, though, is the fact that management at this quarry indicates that it is currently handling about 300 trucks per day right now. How will it be possible for this quarry to double its service capabilities once construction begins? Will it be able to handle 600 trucks? Either it will have to eliminate some of its previous activities or you can anticipate huge traffic jams at the quarry as trucks wait in line to unload or load. This is not going to lead to smooth tunneling operations and could actually increase the length of time necessary to dig the Illinois tunnel.

3 As a result, it is very likely that additional quarries will be used for disposition of spoils besides the four mentioned in the EIS. If this is the case, concerns over the siltation of our streams and contamination of our vital groundwater supplies again becomes a reality.

The State of Illinois and the DOE thought that they had eliminated concerns over the disposition of tunnel spoils in Illinois by reducing the number of quarries being used. But congestion, time constraints and common sense all indicate that there is a high probability that other sites will be used as well. In fact, this is exactly what Mr. Joseph Louch from the State and Fermilab indicated would occur when questioned about this subject at a recent State mitigation planning committee meeting.

4 If this is allowed to occur, then all of the local resident concerns about where the tunnel spoils will be deposited will still go unanswered. The EIS appears to be designed to eliminate valid concerns without really considering what might actually occur. We cannot allow this travesty to be sited in Illinois. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker this afternoon will be Mr. Jim Dezler to be followed by Stanley Perry. Is Mr. Perry here? Is perhaps John Brining here? John Brining? You will be the next speaker, sir. Mr. Dezler.

1162 STATEMENT OF HON. JIM DEZLER

MR. DEZLER: Thank you. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Jim Dezler. I am the Mayor of Oswego. I would like to take this opportunity to discuss the tremendous economic development opportunities the Superconducting Super Collider will provide for northern Illinois.

According to official documents, the SSC will create more than $1 billion in real disposable income during the construction phase, more than 7,000 construction jobs, 3,200 permanent jobs and roughly
1 $274,000,000 that will be spent on the SSC's operating costs in Illinois.

Additionally, the spinoff opportunities created by the SSC expand beyond the figures I have just listed. The construction workers will need gasoline for their cars and trucks, lunches, dinners and other items that will be purchased locally. In fact, the potential economic impacts are so overwhelming that over 40 of our area chamber of commerces have publicly supported the Illinois bid for the SSC.

2 As the construction process nears completion and the SSC moves into the operational phase, I believe that the local communities will benefit from an increase in housing demands as a result of the permanent employees. The increase in housing also will provide an increase in our tax base which will further contribute to the betterment of our communities.

3 I will close my time by addressing the negative and the economic impacts which will be created if Illinois does not win the race for the SSC. Fermilab, which has been an asset to our communities and to Oswego for the last 20 years, may be discommissioned if the SSC is sited elsewhere and that would be a real shame. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: The next speaker will be John Brining. And he will be followed by Mr. Stanley Perry if he is here. He is here somewhere and we are running a little ahead of schedule so I suspect that some people may not be here. To be followed by Mayor Richard Lewis who is the Mayor here, or perhaps Ray Bochman. Let me go back to some of the people who were scheduled earlier but who have not shown so far -- Bruce Von Zellen, is he here? Patti Dritsas? John Milroy? And let me try one more -- Ed Kelly, is Mr. Kelly here?

Mr. Brining, why don't you proceed and we will see if anybody else is here after you finish. If not, we may take a brief recess.

850 STATEMENT OF JOHN BRINING

MR. BRINING: My name is John Brining. I am a business representative for the electrical workers of DuPage County. We built Fermilab 20 years ago. We went through a similar site selection process at that time and Illinois was selected.

We brought the Fermi site in under budget and ahead of schedule. We intend to do the same thing again. The Superconducting Super Collider has to be built in the United States if we are to maintain our competitive edge in the area of high energy physics. I believe that Illinois is the best possible location for the SSC. Building the SSC at the Fermi site offers too many advantages to be ignored. Using Fermi's Tevatron, the world's most powerful accelerator, as the injector for the SSC would result in an estimated savings of at least $450 million in construction costs and over $60 million in operating costs.

MR. LAWSON: Mr. Brining, I am sorry to interrupt you but, I must ask people who are out in the exit way to please keep their voices down. Once again, I must ask people to keep their voices down, even in the exit ways. They have, okay, thank you. Sorry, Mr. Brining, for the interruption.

MR. BRINING: Okay. I will continue. To build another location would add years to the construction schedule and project startup time. It would be fiscally wise for the Department of Energy to take advantage of the Tevatron and build upon Fermi's existing investment of more than $1.3 billion and 6,800 acres of its campus and facilities.

Even without the Fermi advantage, Illinois scores very high in this competition. The proposed site offers a solid layer of hard dolomite rock excellent for tunneling conditions, a highly skilled union labor force, proven tunneling technology and machinery are in place. The area has an impressive network of educational centers, the University of Chicago; Northwestern University; University of Illinois; Northern Illinois University; Illinois Institute of Technology; University of Wisconsin and dozens of other colleges and universities.

Within minutes of the site are major research facilities that have found the Chicago metropolitan area an attractive place to locate. They include: Abbott Laboratories, Argonne National Laboratories, Amoco Research Center, AT&T Bell Labs, AT&T Technologies, ITT Research Institute and Nelco Chemical, just to name a few.

Estimates show that Chicago metropolitan area supports 200,000 jobs in high technology. O'Hare Airport, the world's largest airport, is nearby, connecting the site to any destination in the world. Chicago's central U.S. location is well served by an extensive network of highways and railroads which will be further developed for the SSC's needs.

Chicago also has the nation's largest industrial bases with numerous machine tools and fabrication firms experienced in high technology applications. The area offers a wide range of housing choices and varied employment for spouses and children.

The State of Illinois is committed to major improvements that increase the overall suitability of the site including land acquisition, housing, road and tunneling construction, and the establishment of university fellowships related to the SSC. The estimated value of these improvement is more than $570 million.

After hours, Chicago offers a cultural scene that is second to none. The Chicago Symphony Orchestra, the Cubs, the Bears, the White Sox, Brookfield Zoo, Museum of Science and Industry, Newberry Library, the Art Institute and our famous festivals.

DOE, do not be misled by the shrill voice of opposition, for that does not represent the consensus opinion of the community. Forty-thousand-plus citizens have signed petitions in support of this project. Their voice cannot be ignored. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. I am going to read the list of people that I have scheduled to speak between the beginning of this hearing and 3:55 p.m. If any of these people are here, please speak up so I can take you now. If none of you is here, then perhaps we will take a short recess? Bruce -- I am sorry, you are?

MR. PERRY: Stan Perry.

MR. LAWSON: Mr. Perry, you would be the next speaker and as you approach the podium let me just check to see if there are some other folks here. Mr. Von Zellen? Patti Dritsas? John Milroy? Mayor Richard Lewis? Ray Bochman? Or, Ed Kelly?

We are running ahead so I would expect that these last folks would not be ahead. And Mr. Perry I appreciate your showing up early and the floor is yours.

851 STATEMENT OF STANLEY PERRY

MR. PERRY: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Stan Perry and I represent 40,000 members of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in northeastern Illinois. It is my pleasure to offer my comments on the Superconducting Super Collider and the amount of skilled labor in Illinois that is ready to build this important project as much as we helped to construct Fermilab more than 20 years ago.

It is my opinion that the draft Environmental Impact Statement proves, without a doubt, that the benefits of the SSC brings to Illinois far outweight the benefits it would bring to any other state. It also shows that Illinois more than any other state has a labor capacity to build and construct and operate the SSC.

To prove my point we need only to examine the excellent record of Fermilab and the operation of the Tevatron, the world's largest particle accelerator. By the joint efforts of some of the most brilliant minds in the world and the most skilled hands and minds in America, we were able to build the next step to the SSC when we built the Tevatron. Now, we want to help build the next generation of a machine that can help explain the unknown.

I believe we should remember something very important here today. We talk about how Fermilab has helped our community and has been a tool to answer questions. While we discuss the SSC and the Environmental Impact Statement, it is also important and logical to examine the growth of this part of Illinois and how the SSC can become part of it. To do that, I would like to quote directly from Environmental Impact Statement.

In describing Kane and DuPage Counties, the EIS said the following and I quote, "These two counties probably would not be adversely affected by the SSC, in part due to their recent experiences in growth management, and in part because Fermi's presence mean that their socio-economic environments are accustomed to demands."

In my opinion, this is perhaps one of the most important things the EIS says in more than its 4,000 pages, charts, statistics and text. What you are telling us is that we have the ability because of Fermilab and the growth of our communities to host the SSC. I believe no other state can make that claim and back it up with the resources that we have to offer. These resources will stay in Illinois in the form of jobs, tax revenues; it will help support our schools, build our roads and provide services to those in our community who need them.

More than 10,000 SSC-related construction jobs and more than 3,200 jobs that it would create as a result of building the SSC in Illinois, will add millions and millions of dollars to our economy and the SSC; in other words, will put people to work.

In this part of Illinois, the IBEW has been a big part of the unprecedented economic expansion that is going on everyday. We help build thousands of homes, office buildings, schools and countless other private and public buildings and facilities. We know how important the SSC is to Illinois. We want to be part of it. We want to help bring it to Illinois and help build it in Illinois. Its potential is tremendous and so is our support for the SSC.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for giving me the chance to speak up today and to tell you that I agree with the draft EIS that Illinois has the skilled labor force and the other resources to build the SSC right here. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Before I decide to take a short recess, what I would like to do is just survey if there are other people who are scheduled from 4:00 p.m. on who are here who might wish to speak at this time. Let me just go through the list of those that I have from now until the end of this afternoon's session. Mayor Richard Lewis, if you are here, please speak up? Ray Bochman? Ed Kelly?

MR. KELLY: Here.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. You would be the next speaker, sir. Kal Lester?

MR. LESTER: Right here.

MR. LAWSON: Oh, we are doing fine. Bill Better? Gary Benefield? Bill Jansa? Chuck Anderson? Joseph Mann? Or Jay Hedges? Well, despite the fact that we are running quite a bit ahead of time, if you gentlemen -- Mr. Kelly and Mr. Lester -- would like to proceed, Mr. Kelly you would now be the next speaker.

MR. KELLY: Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Mr. Lester, you would follow.

MR. KELLY: May I give this to you?

MR. LAWSON: Yes.

847 STATEMENT OF ED KELLY

MR. KELLY: I am Ed Kelly, Executive Vice President of the Elgin Area Chamber of Commerce. My organization represents 726 businesses employing over 24,800 people. Our members are located in Elgin, South Elgin, East and West Dundee, and Carpentersville which is all in Kane County.

We agree with the findings of the Environmental Impact Statement that the proposed site at Fermilab has the proper geology for tunnel construction, has a strong, existing infrastructure, and features, an established single source of electrical power. The city of Elgin is also in support of this project.

We recognize the impact of the SSC on growth in the entire Fox Valley area. Northern Kane County, which my organization represents, has the infrastructure to accommodate any growth generated by this SSC project. Our area supports the SSC and hope that you will recommend it to be built here in Illinois. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Mr. Lester.

848 STATEMENT OF KAL LESTER

MR. LESTER: My name is Kal Lester. I reside in Big Rock, Illinois, and I am a business representative of International Union of Operating Engineering, Local 150, representing over 12,000 members.

I certainly support the SSC and understand its importance to our community and the working men and women who live there. Ladies and gentlemen, the day before the draft Environmental Impact Statement was released, I participated in ceremonies when Governor Thompson signed legislation that offers, at their request, safeguards to the small members who oppose the SSC. I said at that time that my union and many others of northeastern Illinois have supported the idea of building the SSC in Illinois since it was first proposed.

We believe that the SSC represents an opportunity to improve our community and a chance to employ the working men and women who build for the future. As a union leader, it is my job to promote the ability of union members to work in their communities. The SSC, with its thousands of permanent and construction jobs, offers a great opportunity not just for me and the members of my union, but for all of us.

We realize, as I said that day, how important Fermilab has become to this community. We also realize that the EIS failed to mention that Illinois, unlike other states, has something to lose if the SSC is awarded to another state. We can lose Fermilab. Maybe not next year or five years from now. But, the plain fact is that if the SSC is built elsewhere, Fermilab's future is seriously in doubt. As they say, we don't miss something until it is gone. I would rather not find out what it's like to be without Fermilab. There's no doubt in my mind, and the minds of the men and women of my union who have helped build and operate this important facility, that Fermilab would close if the SSC is built somewhere else. If that were to happen, it would be a waste for our community and our nation.

Because we understand Fermilab has an important role in this community, we clearly understand the similar beneficial role the SSC can play. That is why, for example, not only has my union endorsed the SSC, but also the Illinois State AFL-CIO.

And I might add that the reasons which have compelled us to support the SSC also have brought out more than 200 resolutions of support for this project from organizations that represent hundreds of thousands of individuals. In addition to all this, nearly 40,000 members of this community have taken the time to add their names to petitions of support for the Superconducting Super Collider.

Those petitions, not a guess at membership, have been forwarded to your offices in Washington. Finally, every newspaper with the exception of one, has formally and consistently endorsed the SSC in Illinois.

In my opinion, these are important factors in the case for the SSC in Illinois. In fact, they make the case for the SSC in bringing its jobs and economic benefits to Illinois and to Fermilab. Ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity to say again what I said when the SSC bill was signed. That we are ready to build the SSC in the state that deserves and that is Illinois. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Given the fact that we are running considerably ahead of time, I think this would be an appropriate time in mid-session to take a recess. It is now 3:31 or 3:32 p.m. according to my clock. We will recess until 3:45 p.m. at which time we will reconvene promptly.

(Recess.)

MR. LAWSON: I would like to reconvene this session of the public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Superconducting Super Collider project. My name is Barry Lawson and I have been hired by the Department of Energy to serve as neutral moderator for today's hearing. I am pleased to have you here. I am not going to go through the full litany of the rules and regulations and procedures.

Basically the most important ones are that we very much appreciate your remaining quiet during the hearing, both to give the presenters a fair opportunity to give their presentations undistracted and also to ensure that we have a clear record being taken by the recorder to my left. Second, the major rule in terms of the presentation is that each person is limited to five minutes and that if I find that you are bordering on those five minutes, I will give you a 30-second warning notice.

I understand that three of the speakers scheduled in the next session are here already and so I will call on them. As I call on one person, I will also announce the followup speaker to find out first of all if you are here, and then, second, to ask you if you would to move to one of the reserved seats down in the front here so that you will be on the 'on deck' circle so to speak.

Before we start this session, I would also like to announce that on the panel for this part of the session, to my left and replacing Mr. Nolan who was here before, is Jay Hunze and to his right, replacing Linda McClain, is Bill White.

The first speaker in this reconvened session is Mayor Richard Lewis. Is Mr. Lewis here?

MR. LEWIS: I am.

MR. LAWSON: You will be the first speaker, sir, to be followed by Mr. Ray Bochman. Thank you.

1163 STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD LEWIS

MR. LEWIS: Good afternoon, gentlemen. I am going to keep my remarks very brief. Frankly I have got the flu so I am going to make this address and then head for home and to bed.

My name is Richard Lewis and I am the Mayor of Geneva. I am here as a very strong supporter of siting the SSC in Illinois. As a neighbor of Batavia and the Fermilab complex, the attitude of the people of Geneva over time has evolved from one of understandable apprehension to a feeling of shared pride in the accomplishments that have given Fermilab its well-deserved reputation as the oracle of physics research in this country and perhaps the world.

We are supportive of building the SSC for the questions that it will answer. Answers that aid industry, may allow us to correct genetic defects, cure the tragedy of cancer, to make life better for all of us in hundreds of unknown ways.

We are supportive of building the SSC in Illinois because it is the best place for it to be. As the most cost-effective location, due to existing Fermilab complex, we can offer the thousands of people who will construct and operate the SSC a fine quality of life with excellent recreational, cultural and educational opportunities. Transportation and other infrastructure needs are already in place and despite any illusion of the contrary, the overwhelming majority of residents in the proposed SSC area are very enthusiastic and supportive of this project.

As the primary elected representative of all the people of Geneva, I have been charged with delivering that message loud and clear. And to give specific emphasis of the importance of this project to my community. I urge all of you to recognize that unlike other states that would have to become familiar with an enormous scientific entity, the communities of Kane County welcomed Fermi and have come to depend upon the benefits of its association. In just the last year, Geneva has committed to a $1-million Build Illinois loan to extend sewer services to the far eastern portion of our city because of the bright future forecast for this high tech corridor. The new accelerator is critical to attracting research industries that will need that utility improvement and whose fees will aid in retiring that debt.

But that is the future negative impact of not getting the SSC. There is also the immediate negative impact of possibly losing existing industrial base that will follow the SSC, taking with it local tax benefits and good people who now call Geneva their home.

We need and depend upon those industries and people just as much as any other part of the country. This area is the only one of your considered sites that has a great deal to lose as well as a great deal to gain. And I respectfully ask that you include that consideration in your recommendation.

In conclusion, I appeal as the elected representative of 10,000 people. And, at their direction, I urge that the SSC be sited in Illinois. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. I hope you are feeling better. The next speaker will be Mr. Ray Bochman, to be followed by Mr. Bill Better. Is Mr. Better here? Is Mr. Joseph Mann here? Gary Benefield? Mr. Bochman, why don't you proceed and we will see where we stand after that.

1164 STATEMENT OF RAY BOCHMAN

MR. BOCHMAN: Thank you, Barry. My name is Ray Bochman. I am Chief Administrative Office of DeKalb County, Illinois. I am here at the request of J. Quentin Dailey, chairman of the DeKalb County Board and the members of that Board.

DeKalb County's interest in the Superconducting Super Collider -- in case you are not from here, we are the County just west of Kane. The original proposed ring configuration would have put the western portion of that ring in our County. This became generally known in our community during the 1983 year, I believe it was.

The Board's interest was obvious. On behalf of their constituents they felt compelled to investigate the ramifications of such a project and what those ramifications might be on our community. To that end, in 1984, the Board directed me in my capacity at that time as director of the DeKalb County community services department to sponsor a public hearing so that the citizens of our community might come forward and ask and have properly answered questions. 1

Several hundred people ultimately attended that hearing. It was held at the Egyptian Theatre in DeKalb, Illinois. The questions, if I could generalize, pertained largely to environmental questions. There were questions of groundwater contamination, possibilities the questions of whether or not the residue from the tunneling would be a problem, questions related to radiation and people's fears about that. Those questions, I think it was generally felt, were adequately answered at that time -this was in 1984. Subsequent designs for the ring do not find it coming into DeKalb County.

The bottom line is that as a result of the questions and answers and comments from their constituents, our Board on two different occasions has adopted resolutions in support of the collider. The citizens of the county that have contacted me, the elected members of the Board, have been overwhelmingly in support of this project. There was no problem then, in 1984, in our mind and there is no problem today. We welcome it, we are in favor of it. 2

I have resolutions adopted by the DeKalb County Board dated December 16, 1985 and again September 16, 1987. I have certified copies that I would like to submit for the record if that's possible.

MR. LAWSON: It certainly is.

MR. BOCHMAN: In conclusion, chairman Dailey didn't ask me to say this, but since I am here and we are all together, I have been as our resident bureaucrat very interested in how dollars get transferred. And for the last two years, according to the literature I have seen, Federal dollars have flown out of this State to the tune of no other. We once again ranked 50th in the return of our investment in the Federal system. I think it would be nice if the Department of Energy and the Congress and the leadership of this Nation could see fit to throw a little something our way. Thank you. 3

MR. LAWSON: Thank you and Mr. Bochman, you can leave your resolutions in that box right on the table to your right if you would, please.

MR. BOCHMAN: Right here?

MR. LAWSON: That's fine. Thank you very much.

MR. BOCHMAN: Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Let me ask and see if there's any folks who registered to speak who may be here at this time. Mr. Bill Better? Gary Benefield? Bill Jansa? Chuck Anderson? Joseph Mann? Jay Hedges? As none of those folks are here at this moment, we will stay at our places. I will call a brief recess, probably for five or ten minutes. But, I would ask the panelists to stay close by so that as these people arrive, we may take them. The meeting is now recessed for five or ten minutes. Thank you.

(Recess.)

MR. LAWSON: I would like to reconvene this session, as hesitant as I am to do so knowing that we only have one or possibly two speakers here that are scheduled. I will do so in the hopes of keeping them on schedule at least.

My name is Barry Lawson. I am the neutral moderator hired by the Department of Energy to moderate this hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Superconducting Super Collider project. I

have six gentlemen, I believe, that are scheduled to speak before the end of the afternoon. I understand at least one is here, perhaps two. I will take them in order. If you here, please so identify yourself. Mr. Bill Better? Is Mr. Better here? Gary Benefield? Bill Jansa? Chuck Anderson? Mr. Anderson, you would be the next speaker. Mr. Joseph Mann? You would follow him sir

Mr. Anderson please.

1165 STATEMENT OF CHUCK ANDERSON

MR. ANDERSON: My name is Chuck Anderson. I reside in North Aurora. I am a member of Painters District Council Number 30 serving as business agent. I have been asked by my 1,500 members to come and speak to you gentlemen, ask you, inform you that we do as citizens of the State of Illinois think that the Environmental Impact Study is proper. There are some things that we could probably pick apart, but as a general impact study, we certainly find no fault with what the Department of Energy has come up with.

We do want the SSC sited here in the State of Illinois. We are in 100 percent support of that and we just ask for the consideration that we think this is important to our economy, our environment will not be damaged -- we do not believe it will be damaged -- and I was asked just to let you people know that we are 100 percent behind this project here in the State and that we do not feel that a small segment of people that have personal greed, inept information, they do not want to listen or read the Environmental Impact Study with opened eyes. We do have a voice in the State of Illinois too. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker will be Mr. Joseph Mann to be followed by Jay Hedges, if he is here. Mr. Mann, please.

1166 STATEMENT OF JOSEPH MANN

MR. MANN: I would like to thank you for allowing us the opportunity to speak. I am Joseph Mann. I reside in Yorkville, Illinois. I am the business manager of Local 149 of the Laborers International Union of North America, the Aurora Local -- we serve Kane and Kendall Counties.

We believe that the Environmental Impact Study is pretty much correct. Again, we feel that in the Department of Energy's process of selection we feel that Illinois is best suited for this project. We feel economically it's of great benefit to all of us concerned in this area. We feel that it is basically a sacrifice of few for the benefit of many. We also agree with the geological survey's idea that this is the best geological area for this collider. The limestone formations in the ground which the tunnel will be put in, is just perfect for this project. We think that economically it is to serve all of Illinois. And to benefit all those through the entire area of the United States as far as high energy physics research.

We feel that we must stay on the leading edge of the competition for high energy physics research. We feel that to site it anywhere else in the world is detrimental to our scientific lead; it would be terrible for it to go somewhere else. And to put it into Texas, we feel there may not be as much opposition there, but we feel that Illinois is the best place for the SSC.

And we would like to thank the people that supported us, the many people that spent a lot of time to prepare themselves to work to push this project into this area. We would like to thank them and the Waubonsie Valley High School, the students themselves, and the many various construction trades, locals, throughout the Valley and throughout the Chicago area that have given all their support, and the people of Illinois themselves that have supported this. I know there are a few that are against, but again, it's a sacrifice of a few to benefit the many that are in the area. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. As of now, I have five additional speakers for this afternoon that I believe would be here. We are past the time for three of those. Let me just mention their names again. Bill Better? Gary Benefield and Bill Jansa? If you know these gentlemen are in the building, I would appreciate your bringing them in. The other speaker would be Jay Hedges. Is Mr. Hedges here?

Okay. Once again, we will take a brief recess until our other speakers have arrived.

(Recess.)

MR. LAWSON: I would like to reconvene this afternoon's session once again. We have another speaker who has arrived and we will take his testimony right now. His name is Bill Rodman. Mr. Rodman, would you please approach the podium? Thank you.

1167 STATEMENT OF BILL RODMAN

MR. RODMAN: Good afternoon. I am Bill Rodman. I am Deputy Director of the Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. On behalf of Governor James Thompson, I would like to welcome you, once again, to Illinois and thank you for this opportunity to address the hearing.

Jay Hedges, Department of Commerce, Community and Foreign Affairs Director, has asked that I speak with you today about the small business assistance bureau, which I direct, and how Illinois is prepared to work with small businesses that will benefit from the siting of the SSC at Fermilab. Or, in the alternative that might have to be relocated because of the construction.

In particular, I will describe our programs to assist the small business startups and our efforts at that job retention. Stated quite simply, the entire effort of the small businesses assistance bureau is geared to assisting new and existing businesses such as might evolve or spin off from the siting of the SSC at Fermilab. It is our goal to find ways to transform an inspired idea into successful commercial endeavor. Our program consists of five key elements -- all of which, I might add, are in existence today and are ready to go. We have in place a business development network consisting of 102 centers across the State. We have 55 Small Business Development Centers. These SBDC's as they are referred to are locally operated centers which provide a full range of business counseling and technical assistance to start-up and existing businesses. They can offer an entrepreneur or small businessman a full menu of planning and advisory services -- from business planning to market research to financial application help and site selection advice.

Of particular note, in relation to the SSC at Fermilab would be the SBDC operated by the College of DuPage Business and Professional Institute in nearby Glen Ellyn. That obviously would be the one that would be closest and most geographically convenient for the businesses that would locate near Fermi.

The SBDC many times serve as the entry point for other center programs which we administer. Since 1984, Illinois has supported the operation of 13 Technology Commercialization Centers, one of which is operated at Fermilab. The TCC's again, as they are called, serve as the window in/window out for transferring commercialization of new technologies between the universities and labs where the technologies are developed in Illinois businesses.

The TCC's can provide a wide range of technical assistance including grants of up to $25,000 per business to move a technology from the laboratory into the marketplace or the workplace. These centers can meet with a business, assess their technological needs, propose a technological solution and then, most importantly, help the business to implement that solution.

To date, our TCC's have worked with nearly 8,000 businesses and assisted with the creation or retention of over 3,500 jobs. We have also 17 small business incubators which are another important part of this business development network. We supported these 17 incubators and 3 of which are specifically geared to small technology driven businesses. These incubators not only provide below market rates for space, but there is ready office support services and professional entrepreneurship in business counseling.

Another component of the SBAB program is this network of 17 procurement assistance centers, PAC's. These centers offer advice and counseling to businesses interested in seeking and accessing government and contracts both State and Federal. The PAC's assist businesses who not only understand the intricacies of government contracts but also to secure for the businesses the level of quality or product specification which is often required.

It's not unusual, for example, for a business working with a TCC to be linked with a TCC -- Technology Commercialization Center -- so it can help the business apply a new technology, like numeric controls for production, which in turn allows the business to better compete for government contracts.

I would like to spend just one more moment on another program which obviously is of importance to these businesses. And that is the programs in our Finance Division. We offer development and business starting financing through a full range of finance programs -- investments in technologies, access to capital for plant and equipment, grants for job training, tax credits for energy conservation and [illegible] to mention just a few.

The small business bureau's mission is to assist Illinois businesses with services from A to Z. But the Small Business Assistance Bureau is somewhat like only the tip of the proverbial iceberg.

In anticipation of the siting of the Super Conducting Super Collider, the Department's assistance bureau has in place [illegible] ongoing [illegible] are there. [illegible] to encourage [illegible] provided [illegible] problems. [illegible] would be especially appropriate if there had to be a relocation because of the construction of the SSC at Fermilab -- we have a building and facility inventory that provides an up-to-date [illegible] of the community and other [illegible] and the [illegible] community and [illegible] information that the small business would have benefits access to in the event that they [illegible] a relocation.

[illegible] resources provided through such programs to assist employers in [illegible] the business to access a workforce [illegible] with [illegible] employer to [illegible] employees.

[illegible] programs which are designed to assist businesses in completing their retention and expansion [illegible]

[illegible] 1987 [illegible] Illinois Volume XIX

[illegible] (Page 11)

Now DECA, in cooperation with local initiatives, intends to make available the resources of our department to all businesses affected by the location of the SSC. All requests for assistance, whether for job training or business financing, will be closely monitored by our department to ensure a rapid response and prompt processing of applications where appropriate.

5 In closing, let me thank you again for this opportunity to testify. As you can see, Illinois has much to offer not only small businesses startups but existing as well. We are not waiting for SSC to arrive before we gear up to serve small businesses. We are doing it today and we are doing it successfully. We have every confidence that when SSC is sited, Fermilab, entrepreneurs and the like will find the resources and infrastructure waiting to turn those inspired ideas into successful businesses.

I thank you for your time. If there are questions, I would be more than happy to answer them.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Rodman. I understand we have another registrant. Mr. Robert Wurm. You are the next speaker, sir.

168 STATEMENT OF ROBERT WURM

MR. WURM: My home is not going to be affected by this. But my daughter goes to Kaneland High School and I don't know, I haven't seen it in the Illinois proposal, but they do not show in the Illinois proposal that this thing is going to run within 600 yards of my daughter's school and it is running underneath St. Charles High School.

1

Now, I am not talking just about the radiation that can affect these children. That this instrument is going to be placed there. Let me read something from Insight Magazine. Now this has been published in several magazines. This is Insight Magazine, July 4, 1988: "Medical researchers are raising the alarms about the impact of electromagnetic fields on people." Now they are not just talking line above from the electric lines -- electromagnetic fields -- which, that's what the SSC produces. "Last year, a study by the New York Department of Health found that children living near power lines which have electromagnetic fields which radiate a low intensity magnetic field, were inordinarily prone to leukemia and brain cancer. A study by the State of Maryland found that the utility workers and electrical engineers, people in similar jobs, had more than their share of brain tumors and cancers from the magnetic fields. Natural magnetic fields can muck up the still mysterious workings of the body's chemistry, especially the reaction that regular cell growth and behavior migrating birds that they point out find their way by sensing subliminal changes in earth's magnetic field and certain aquatic creatures detect the present of potential meals by monitoring the electromagnetic fields in the environment. 'Cells whisper together in a private and very faint language,' Dr. William Abbey, a cancer researcher, told a House subcommittee investigating the dangers of power lines. 'By blocking
2 these signals,' he added, 'electronic smog can promote tumors and undetermine the body's diseases fighting capabilities.'"

"Becker Research Director for a firm specializing in bio-magnetics chimed in with the belief that the pineal gland, the organ that controls the release of certain brain chemicals, can also be confused by abnormal magnetic fields leading to chronic stress."

And this is going to be located underneath a school. Now, anybody in their right mind cannot locate an instrument that not even the physicist can say we know exactly what it's going to do. Because nothing has gone as fast this -- this is going to go almost the speed of light. And no one can predict exactly what's going to happen, what kind of electromagnetic fields there are going to be, what type of radiation; they can only predict. But we are running this underneath of a high school and we are running within 600 yards of my daughter's school.

Now, I don't know if you gentlemen have ever seen somebody die from cancer. I have. I had a mother die from cancer. I have a grandfather die from cancer. And this thing should not be put underneath a school. This thing should be put out in the desert where it won't harm anybody. But, no we are going to put it under a school. Now, that makes a lot of sense. That's all I have to say.

MR. LAWSON: All right. Thank you for your time. At this point, I don't believe I have anyone else in the auditorium who is scheduled to speak. If I am wrong correct me. We are going to recess for the next five minutes to take any remaining walking registrants this afternoon. If none arrive, we will then recess officially until this evening at 7:00 p.m.

(Recess.)

MR. LAWSON: It is now 5:00 p.m. and since we have no other speakers, I am going to officially recess this session until 7:00 p.m. this evening, at which time, we will take up with a long list of advance registered speakers and we will also take walk-ons if necessary. This meeting is now recessed until 7:00 p.m. this evening.

(Whereupon, at 5:00 p.m., the Department of Energy representatives recessed, to reconvene at 7:00 p.m. the same day.)

SECOND SESSION (October 6, 1988; 7:00 p.m.)

MR. BOLAN: A very good evening to you. I want to welcome you to the Department of Energy's public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Superconducting Super Collider. My name is Dick Nolan and I am the Deputy Executive Director of the SSC Site Task Force. I am the presiding official for your hearing tonight. A concurrent session of this hearing is taking place in the gymnasium next door. The purpose of my brief remarks to begin speaking to you tonight, is to tell you why we are all here. After my remarks, I will ask our session moderator, Mr. Barry Lawson, who is here seated on my right, to outline how we will conduct the meeting this evening.

The purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens an opportunity to comment in person on the Department's draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SSC. We want to make sure that you are aware that this hearing is not your only opportunity. You may also send us written comments and we would respectfully ask that we receive those by not later than October 17, 1988. We are sincerely interested in hearing what you have to say about this document, and each of your comments will in fact be considered and responded to in the final document.

Let me go back for just a second and refresh your memories on how we came to this point in the site selection process. In January 1987, President Reagan's decision to proceed with the SSC was announced and construction funds were requested from Congress. In April 1987, the Department issued an invitation for site proposals. We subsequently received 43 proposals and 30 of those were found to be qualified. The proposals that were qualified were sent along to the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering for further evaluation. Based on the criteria that we had originally put forth in the invitation, the Academies recommended back to us a list that contained eight of, in their opinion, the most excellent sites warranting further consideration by the Department. One of those proposals was subsequently withdrawn by the proposer. Following a review and a verification of the Academies' work, the Secretary of Energy announced the best qualified list of sites, including the State of Illinois site, on January 19, 1988.

On January 22, the DOE formally announced that it would in fact develop an Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed SSC. The very next month in February we held a scoping meeting in each of the seven states to obtain public comment on the nature and scope of the environmental issues to be considered in the draft EIS that is the subject of our hearing tonight.

You may recall the scoping hearings were held here in Illinois on February 18, 1988. We received out of this process a total of about 2,100 comments, suggestions as to the issues and the scope of the concerns that ought to be considered in the Environmental Impact Statement. We considered those comments in the draft that is the subject of the hearing.

Following public hearings held here and in the six other best qualified states, which are now complete, we will develop a Final Environmental Impact Statement to be issued in December 1988.

Now, the draft EIS evaluates and compares four different alternatives. Site alternatives: that is the seven alternate locations for siting the SSC. Technical alternatives: these would include considerations of different technology, equipment or facilities. Programmatic alternatives: that includes areas of consideration such as using other accelerators, international collaboration on the project, or simply delaying the project. And finally, the fourth alternative is the no-action alternative. That is the possibility to not construct the SSC at all.

The draft EIS that is the subject of our meeting tonight identifies and analyzes the potential environmental consequences expected to occur from siting, construction and operation of the SSC at the seven site alternatives. And let me repeat the states that have the seven site proposals under final consideration. These sites are located in Arizona, in Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas.

This draft EIS gives as much information as we have at this stage of the development of the project regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed construction operation of the SSC at the seven alternate sites that I mention. However, the DOE recognizes that further review under the National Environmental Policy Act will be necessary prior to a decision to construct and operate the machine at [illegible]

[illegible] the draft EIS. It is a very thick document, [illegible] and comprehensive document. It covers more than 4,000 pages. It is organized into four volumes. Volume I is entitled [illegible] Volume II is entitled [illegible] Volume III [illegible] site selection methodology that we used [illegible] the site for the SSC. And Volume IV [illegible] the technical appendices. The specific details of information on which we based our conclusions in the [illegible] Volume I.

Comments that we get tonight will be used by the DOE to prepare the final EIS issued in December. The final EIS will identify the Department's preferred site which I mentioned will be picked late November. No sooner than 30 days after the final EIS is distributed, the Department will publish its Record of Decision, which will include the final site selection and complete the site selection process.

Now tonight we will be using a professional moderator to assure a fair and orderly proceeding for our session. Measures have been taken to permit the maximum opportunity for interested citizens such as yourselves to utilize this session for expressing your comments. We urge the participants in tonight's meeting to focus their comments on the draft EIS and we would respectfully request that you avoid statements aimed solely at support or opposition for the State of Illinois' proposal. While all comments will become part of the formal record that you make to us tonight, those specifically addressing the draft EIS are the most useful to us in preparing the final document.

Now as I noted earlier, in addition to this opportunity for oral comments, you may give us written comments. We would like to receive them by October 17. That is the end of the 45-day formal comment period to insure that they are considered in our final publication. We will do the best we can to consider comments that are received, however, after October 17.

One final word on the role of the EIS and the site selection process, the National Environmental Policy Act requires that environmental impacts be considered by Federal decision makers in taking major Federal actions with potential environmental consequences. An EIS is one of the methods to do this analysis, provide for the public participation in the process, such as we are having this evening, and make a final decision that meets the NEPA requirements. The EIS will be considered by the Secretary in making his decision on the site selection.

We want to thank you in advance for your interest and participation in the session tonight. Tonight you will be addressing a panel that will be composed of myself and Linda McClain, sitting to the right of Mr. Lawson, and periodically through the evening, you will see that I will be spelled off by Mr. Jay Hunze and Linda will be spelled off by Mr. Bill White.

Let me now introduce to you Barry Lawson who will in fact describe how we will conduct tonight's session. Barry?

MR. LAWSON: Thank you and good evening. My name is Barry Lawson and I am a Community Relations Specialist and President of Lawson Associates in Concord, Massachusetts. As an outside consultant, I have been hired by the Department of Energy to serve as neutral moderator for this hearing. As Mr. Nolan has said, the purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens, such as yourselves, an opportunity to comment on the Department's draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Superconducting Super Collider.

In February the Department sponsored a scoping meeting here in Illinois to listen to and to receive comments on what should be considered in the preparation of that draft EIS. DOE has now prepared the draft and seeks comment on this document, which is more specific in dealing with a potential environmental impact of siting the SSC here in Illinois and in six other states.

To my left is the Court Reporter for this evening, Tim Devine. When we begin the comment period for this hearing, I will announce each speaker working from a list which is provided to me by the people at the registration table out in the lobby. I will take the speakers up in the order, in the order in which they have signed up in advance with appropriate respect for public officials.

As this is a hearing to receive comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, your comments should focus on issues addressed in the draft document. If I find that comments are wandering from the topic of this session, I may remind you to focus your comments more sharply. Now this is not intended to limit your remarks, but rather to assure that they are as effective as possible in achieving the objective of this hearing as outlined by Mr. Nolan, the Presiding Official for the hearing.
To provide interested people with a fair opportunity to express their views, I have established the following rules for the conduct of tonight's session. This session will last roughly from 7:00 p.m., to 9:30 p.m. You are also reminded that there are sessions tomorrow, three hours each, beginning at 9:00 a.m. and at 2:00 p.m., and if necessary at 7:00 in the evening. Periodically tonight, I may call for comfort breaks.

All comments will be limited to five minutes unless otherwise noted by me. I will try to remind you when you have 30 seconds remaining and your cooperation in following these rules will be appreciated by the panel and by other members of the public who will then have a fair opportunity to share their views. I will attempt to take people at their scheduled times, although if some of the presentations run less than five minutes, we may be able to run a little ahead of schedule.

You are encouraged to submit written comments to us before or after your presentation, and there is a little black in-box down on the table to my left where they may be placed.

At approximately 30 minutes before the scheduled end of the session, I will call speakers who have registered at the door today. Some of these speakers may also be called earlier if we are running ahead of schedule. Therefore, any of you who do wish to speak and have not registered in advance, should sign up at the registration table in the lobby.

Again, as Mr. Nolan pointed out, for those of you who may wish to submit written comments later, the deadline is October 17. All comments, whether oral or written, raised on the content of the draft EIS will be made part of the record to be considered by the Department of Energy as it prepares its final EIS.

You are reminded that this is a smoke-free building. There is no smoking allowed in any areas of the building and the cafeteria, which is for student use only, is not available to the general public. I understand that there is a snack bar directly opposite the entrance to the gymnasium which is available for your use.

As this hearing is being held in a high school with students and faculty in attendance during many of our sessions, we request that you restrict your movement for this hearing to the meeting rooms and the registration areas. Please do not loiter in the corridors.

The building will open for public access at 1:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. today and for the three sessions tomorrow, October 7. We ask that people arrive no earlier than one-half hour prior to opening of the session. That is at 8:30 and at 1:30 and at 6:30.

We would like to thank Waubonsie Valley High School and School District 204 for the use of their facilities for these hearings. We request that everyone attending and participating in these sessions respect high school property and help us to keep it clean. You are also reminded that today's hearing is being held in two rooms, the auditorium and gymnasium. If you are registered to speak at the hearing, please make certain that you are in the room assigned to you at registration. If there is any doubt, this is the auditorium. If you are uncertain as to which room you have been assigned, please check with the registration table at your earliest convenience.

I would like to make a note about noise. This is generally not a problem, and especially in a room where acoustics are good, as this is. However, it is an awkward entrance and I just would like to remind you that because it is an official public hearing, it is important that we have an accurate transcript as taken by our recorder here. In order to insure that, I must ask you to please keep unnecessary noise down and that if you do feel compelled to hold a conversation with one of your neighbors or friends to please do so outside in the far lobby area. This is also a nice thing to do for the people who are speaking so that they will not be abstracted, nor will the panel in understanding and listening to their comments.

I will announce any further procedural rules for the conduct of the hearing as is necessary. Again, your cooperation with these procedures in accomplishing the objectives of tonight's session is greatly appreciated.

Now it is time to introduce our first speaker. I will ask you, when called upon to speak, to move to the podium provided in the front of the panel and for the record, to introduce yourself, give your address if you will, and to state your position and organization if any. It is critical that if you do ask questions in your presentation or in your written comments that you submit to the Department, that you please put your name, address, including zip code, and preferably with your telephone number, so that if there is any question of clarification in responding to your question, there is a way for the Department to get in touch with you.

I remind you that the panel, Mr. Nolan, Ms. McClain, their prime responsibility is to listen to your comments and of course ask any clarifying questions that are necessary to create a complete record of your comment on the contents of the draft EIS.

Finally, I will remind those of you who wish to speak, again, to sign up at the registration table. I will call on each speaker in turn, announcing at the same time the follow-up speaker so that you can be prepared. I understand one or two rows in the front left here have been reserved for the people who are registered to speak, and if your name is called there as the on-deck speaker, we would appreciate it if you would move to this area so that we minimize the time in coming and going from the podium. The first speaker on my list this evening is Mr. Donald Halter. Is Mr. Halter here? Mr. Halter is not here yet. Is Dr. Morris Leighton here? Dr. Leighton, you will be the first speaker and you would be followed by Mr. John Kempton. Is Mr. Kempton here? Dr. Leighton, the podium is yours.

948 STATEMENT BY DR. MORRIS LEIGHTON

DR. LEIGHTON: Thank you. My name is Morris Leighton and I am here to offer comments on the draft EIS that will hopefully help DOE in developing its final EIS. I am Chief of the Illinois State Geological Survey, a division of the Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources. We are located at 615 East Peabody Drive in Champaign, Illinois. Our Survey was established in 1905 to study and report on the geology and mineral resources of the state and it is both a scientific and an information agency.

One of our goals is to insure that through geological research, we understand the nature of our surroundings. Another goal is to report objectively our scientific findings as a credible research institution. If you check the record, you will find that our survey has done just that and enjoys both a national and an international reputation as a leading geological research institution. For those of you who may not know, our Survey coined the term Environmental Geology in 1963, later to be incorporated in the curriculum of many universities and colleges.

A significant part of our research effort commencing in 1983 has been devoted to the siting of the SSC, that is, in the selection of a geologically suitable spot in Illinois that would also meet all environmental requirements. Our site selection process involved an initial geological screening and feasibility study in 1983. Early work by survey geologists identified a highly favorable area in the vicinity of Fermilab for many of the same geological reasons that led to the selection of Fermilab as a site of the existing Tevatron ring. The feasibility of a tunnel in bedrock underlying the thin veneer of glacial drift was also identified in the early phase of the survey's efforts.

Following the feasibility study and early in 1984, a formal SSC Geological Task Force and an SSC Environmental Task Force were established to conduct more detailed geological, geotechnical, and environmental studies. Both task forces addressed issues on a regional basis over a 36-township area, then in a 16-township area as a ring dimension became firm, and finally, along the proposed ring location following the 1987 DOE Request for Proposals.

My purpose in telling you this is not to provide a chronological account of our efforts, but to provide you with a perspective view on the approach that was deliberately developed to provide the control needed to assure a suitable, safe, secure, stable location, one that avoids any environmental characteristic that might be considered a fatal flaw or that poses a serious problem not readily remedied by acceptable mitigation procedures.

Our resulting control is in the form of wells drilled, cores and samples taken, holes logged, field tests conducted, laboratory analyses performed, seismic refraction and reflection lines shot, and hard data compiled. It is control that allows reliable conclusions to be made about the three-dimensional space and the nature of the materials in which the SSC tunnel and its experimental chambers will be housed.

Increased control means increased knowledge. Increased knowledge reduces the risk of future surprises that may occur during construction and/or operation of the SSC.

So what is Illinois' knowledge based on? It is based on over 7,700 well records in the 36-township area. It is based on samples and cores from 1,500 of those wells and borings. It is based on more than 850 holes, 150 with sample sets that penetrated the top of the Galena, the unit that will hold the SSC. It is based on 270 holes that penetrated bedrock below 320 feet elevation, the approximate depth of the tunnel. It is based on 33 core holes whose locations were specifically selected and drilled to provide necessary infill information in the area and along the corridor in which the ring is to be located. It is based on 16,734 feet of exposed rock in drilling those bore holes. It is based on 10,574 feet of core or more than 1,075 tests of hydrogeological properties, over 7,000 rock strength tests and 20 in situ stress measurements. It is based on 86 miles of refraction data and 17 miles of high resolution, 24- to 48-fold high-effort reflection surveys. It is based on experience gained from actual tunneling in similar Paleozoid rocks only 16 miles to the east.

This control has enabled us to construct a three-dimensional picture of the rocks in which the SSC will be located, a picture that we have found to be both lithologically and structurally simple and predictable. Because of the control, we do not expect geological surprises that in turn may have unforeseen environmental or economic consequences during the construction or operation of an SSC in Illinois. So in closing, let me leave you with three thoughts. Illinois knows its geology and there should be no surprises. Illinois has done its homework, and Illinois cares.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much, Dr. Leighton. The next speaker will be John Kempton. He will be followed by Robert Bauer. Is Mr. Bauer here? Mr. Kempton please?

949 STATEMENT BY JOHN KEMPTON

MR. KEMPTON: My name is John Kempton. I am a senior geologist with the Illinois State Geological Survey, 615 East Peabody Drive in Champaign, Illinois. I have been involved with geological studies for the Illinois SSC site since 1983 and leader of the geological surveys, SSC Geological Task Force, since 1984.

My comments address the structurally simple, uniform, predictable, and favorable geology of the Illinois site not directly stated in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. The database and control available on the geology of the Illinois site for the SSC show that the geology is simple, both lithologically and structurally, and verifiably uniform as detailed in Volume III of the state site proposal. The geologic units into which the tunnel and experimental chambers can be implaced, the Galena and Plattville groups combined, are a very homogeneous and high strength unit consisting of dolomite and dolomitic limestones. The unit is a minimum of 320 feet thick regionally, allowing for adjustments in the final position of the tunnel and chambers, should any be necessary, without geotechnical compromise.

In addition to the advantages of the thickness and lithologic uniformity of the Galena and Plattville groups, the association of the overlying Maquoketa group, with its continuous basal shale, enhance the selection of the Galena-Plattville as a host for the SSC tunnel and chambers. The Maquoketa and particularly the basal shale forms an effective aquatard, limiting significantly the rate of downward movement of groundwater into the Galena-Plattville.

In addition, the overlying Silurian dolomites and glacial deposits are well defined. Their characteristics documented and provide no major problems in the construction of access shafts and surface facilities.

The well-documented overall structure of the Illinois SSC site is uncomplicated, consisting of generally southeastern dipping bedrock units. The regional dip, usually about 10 feet per mile, is superimposed by very local and very gentle east-west trending broad undulations of less than 80 feet with a maximum structure relief of less than 200 feet, less than the other sites. The nature of the undulations is known as the results of 850 control points and 33 especially placed bore holes. High resolution seismic reflection surveys along the ring alignment have identified a few major offsets with maximum vertical displacement of 35 feet.

No other faulting has been documented. The closest major fault zone is the Sandwich Fault Zone, long inactive, about six miles to the southwest. The area is techtonically stable and seismically quiescent, mapped as being in Zone 1 of the Uniform Building Code.

In comparison with the cross sections presented for the other sites, the description of the Illinois site structure should describe the bedrock dips as increasing locally along some minor undulations. Detail on the Illinois structure is clearly greater than that for any other site as indicated by information provided on the frequency and amplitude changes noted on the boundary services in the cross section for each site.

The frequency and amplitude changes shown for the Illinois site should not be confused with structural complexity. They simply reflect control minimizing the risk of future surprises and ensuring adequate knowledge of the details of the subsurface geology.

In the case for Illinois, the data insures uniform, simple geometries and lithologies, with structural relief less than for any other site. This well-established geologic framework of the Illinois site provides a solid basis for the geotechnical and hydrogeologic evaluations utilizing the exhaustive data provided in the State of Illinois' Site Proposal and for the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Kempton. The next speaker will be Mr. Robert Bauer to be followed by Mr. Donald Halter. Is Mr. Halter here? No? Is Keros Cartwright here? You will be the next speaker, sir. Mr. Bauer please.

950 STATEMENT BY ROBERT BAUER

MR. BAUER: Thank you. I am Robert Bauer, an engineering geologist with the Illinois State Geological Survey, 615 East Peabody, Champaign, Illinois. My expertise is underground stability and construction. Our responsibilities in connection with the siting of the Illinois SSC is the characterization of the strength and rock mass properties which are important in evaluating excavation condition, excavation rates, and support requirements of the tunnel and chambers in the bedrock. Geotechnical and geological data have been specifically collected for the Illinois site since June of 1983. These data and the already existing collection of nearly 8,000 borings in the area along with the large number of strength tests performed for the SSC siting are the most extensive of any SSC finalist. In fact the over 7,000 individual laboratory tests performed on cores from the Illinois site far exceed the combined number of tests from the six other finalists.

All this information shows that the conditions and materials for the construction of 53 miles of tunnel and the large chambers are uniform and predictable. The rock mass conditions are considered good to very good for underground excavation requiring only minimal support. Above all no other state can boast that they have already constructed a facility of similar proportions. Over 72 miles of machine-bored tunnels, from 6 to 35 feet in diameter, have been excavated ahead of schedule and under cost in Chicago area dolomites. Also four large chambers, the size required for the SSC, have been excavated in dolomite bedrocks at depths of 360 feet. These house operating electrical and mechanical equipment. Over 256 shafts have been excavated through glacial materials and down into the bedrock. The Illinois SSC proposal clearly states how conventional shaft construction practices will be used to safeguard disturbing near surface groundwater supplies and will not require regional dewatering. Overall, the DEIS document was a monumental effort to assemble all this information from seven states.

In reviewing the geotechnically related information in Appendix 10 of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, I have a question related to the calculated amount of excavated materials from each of the SSC's tunnels. Why do the two SSC sites, Illinois and Tennessee, which do not require a lining or systematic support in the tunnels, have the highest volume of material excavated in relationship to the other four sites with tunnels in rock that require a lining or systematic supports?

As shown in the March 1986 SSC Conceptual Design, Attachment C, Conventional Facilities Document Drawing RA-2, Sheet 44, Appendix A, systematic supports of rock bolts and reinforced concrete can take up to eight inches of diameter of tunnel and a tunnel with a concrete lining can take up to two feet of the diameter of the tunnel.

Therefore, the more support and thicker the lining will require a larger diameter of tunnel to provide this minimal ten-foot inside diameter. Assumptions such as the initial tunnel diameter, support type and amount required and muck swell factors for each excavation method placed in the final EIS, may help clarify these differences. Thank you for your consideration.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Next speaker will be Keros Cartwright to be followed by David Gross. Is Mr. Gross here? Mr. Cartwright?

951 STATEMENT BY KEROS CARTWRIGHT

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I am Dr. Keros Cartwright from the Illinois State Geological Survey, 615 East Peabody Drive, Champaign. I am the principal scientist in charge of environmental geology research and services.

I am here to comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement regarding the hydrogeologic setting and spoil disposal.

Hydrogeologic conditions in the area of the proposed SSC have been assessed for potential impacts. Two major concerns of the assessment were impact on or interference with water wells and groundwater infiltration or seepage into the underground SSC facilities.

These are concerns for both the construction and postconstruction phases of the SSC site in Illinois. Studies by the state geological and water surveys have shown that the SSC tunnel will not have any impact on the yield of water from wells in the area during construction or operation of the SSC. Few wells use the Galena-Plattville formations since the yield is low and those that do are principally above the tunnel elevation.

We have estimated that from 6 to 31 wells are in the tunnel corridor and may be irreversibly impacted. This is based on the inventory of 1,505 wells in the area, well records of 773 of them, and the position of the wells in relationship to the site facilities as outlined in the SSC technical documents furnished by DOE. The state water survey will comment further on the inaccuracies regarding this matter which appeared in the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Closely related to water well interferences is overdraft of the local aquifers. Groundwater is available from two groups of aquifers. The shallow aquifers at depths ranging from 30 to 400 feet consisting of sands and gravels of the glacial drift and the fractured bedrock immediately underlying the drift and deep sandstone aquifers. Water levels in the deep aquifers used mainly by industry and municipalities have been declining. However, the installation of the SSC will not exacerbate this condition. Although the purchase of water from public sources could add to withdrawal of water from the deep aquifer, there are ongoing programs to replace groundwater with surface water imported from Lake Michigan.

Additionally, it has been proposed that the SSC/Fermilab Complex develop wells in the glacial drift, a resource that it is not fully developed. In fact the geological and water surveys are two years into a three-year study to identify and map the shallow aquifers of Kane County. This project has already resulted in several new wells being brought into production.

The watering during shaft construction is highly unlikely and lowering the water table, or stressing groundwater resources and/or existing wetlands should not be an issue. Techniques exist which will allow construction to proceed without significant hindrance from groundwater infiltration.

Similarly, seepage into the SSC underground facilities during operation will not be a problem. Several pumping stations will be able to handle the flow of water and the water collected will be able to be used for cooling purposes. In this way, the discharge of groundwater from the tunnel to area streams will be limited to less than three-tenths of a cubic foot per second and have little or no impact on the draining system. The State water survey will also have some comments on this topic.
With respect to disposal of spoil generated by the project, we foresee no impact. The draft Environmental Impact Statement states that three quarries and one gravel pit are available which will handle the more than three million cubic yards of material generated. In fact at least 17 quarry and pit operators have agreed to accept and store spoil produced by the excavation and tunneling during SSC construction.

The distribution of these facilities are such that many of the associated problems of traffic and noxious emissions and dust generation are minimized by relatively short hauling distances. The spoils do not contain significant quantities of readily leachable deleterious minerals. In fact the rock is substantially the same as those extracted from the quarries. The effects of a minor amount of

secondary minerals are greatly reduced since the acidity of the water passing through them is buffered by the dominantly calcereous materials. Thus the spoil will have no detrimental affect on regional water resources. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. The next speaker will be David Gross and he will be followed by Donald Halter if Mr. Halter is here. Is Mr. Halter here? Is Anita Hough here? You will be the next speaker, ma'am. Mr. Gross please.

952 STATEMENT BY DAVID L. GROSS

MR. GROSS: Good evening. I am David L. Gross, Geologist and Head Environmental Studies and Assessment Section, Illinois State Geological Survey, Champaign, Illinois. The State of Illinois, including the Illinois Geological Survey, began as early as 1983 to assess the potential for siting the proposed SSC in Illinois. A task force was formed by the Governor to investigate the geological feasibility, environmental, legal, and social/economic issues of building the SSC. This task force, consisting of representatives of many State agencies, began a study which was used as the basis for the Illinois SSC proposal. I coordinated the environmental portion of that work. The State has based its proposal on sound geological and geotechnical data, data which we know to be the most complete of any submitter on the best qualified list. Our data had been published on a regular basis during the entire investigation and represent the best efforts of some of the finest geologists and technicians in the State of Illinois and the world. These individuals are committed to the preparation for the safe installation and operation of the SSC in Illinois. Our extensive database is made even more effective by inclusion of much of it in the geographic information system which allows relatively quick access to assess any situation with respect to the SSC site. Environmental screening early in the investigation disclosed no fatal flaws to siting the SSC in Illinois. The construction of the SSC and its operation could be and would be in accordance with all environmental laws and regulations. Further, the task force, with a wealth of data and the powerful tool found in the GIS, was able to optimize the placement of the facility within the site area. This optimization has resulted in a proposal which provides the lowest cost potential for construction, operation, and decommissioning of any potential site and one with the least number and best known environmental impacts.

As the well-developed geologic subsurface data allowed for flexibility in tunnel and chamber implacement, so the base established for the site template of the SSC also allows for complete flexibility in the placement of surface facilities. This is an important aspect as the final design of the SSC evolves in terms of experimental efficiency and final site specific considerations. An important facet of the Illinois commitment will be the establishment at the construction site of a fully operational remote work station of the Illinois Geographic Information System. This will allow for full use of the geological and environmental files generated for the SSC project and all other files available on the Nation's largest scientific geographic information system.

Because the State of Illinois has been concerned with environmental planning, we submitted our own version of an Environmental Impact Statement as Volume III of the supplement to the site proposal for the SSC in Illinois. We were disappointed to discover that this volume, entitled Environmental Assessment, was not referenced in the draft Environmental Impact Statement although it was submitted as part of the environmental data in April of this year. An EIS format was used in the preparation of this document and the review of environmental parameters associated with the Illinois site is based on resource materials developed by the state, as well as a series of direct public responses to the Illinois Site Proposal.

We are resubmitting that environmental assessment volume as an attachment to the written copy of this statement and request that the information therein be included in the Department's final Environmental Impact Statement. We also draw your attention to Table 2-1 in Section 2.1.3, Volume III of the draft Environmental Impact Statement and note that the following comments were associated with other sites, but not Illinois. I quote: "Favorable geology, minimal dewatering/groundwater impacts, minimal dewatering groundwater impacts, strong technical labor base at or near site, minimal environmental degradation, simple predictable geology, and an excellent industrial base."

All of these items are also qualities of the Illinois site and should so be noted in the table. The State of Illinois has been and will continue to be committed to the SSC project. The technical and scientific expertise which generated the extensive and quality assured data will be available on a continuing basis for SSC development in Illinois. If built in Illinois, the SSC project offers an excellent opportunity for maintaining and preserving the character of the environment while providing a sound geologic, economic and academic base for the installation and operation of the world's foremost and finest high energy physics laboratory. I thank you and I will submit these comments.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. This hearing is being held to give everyone a fair opportunity to present their information. Excuse me, I expect courtesy to all of the speakers this evening. I am going to tell you that I expect courtesy from all of the participants. I do not want any more disruption of the hearing. I expect no more interruptions. I expect courtesy. That is all I am asking. The next speaker this evening will be Anita Hough and she would be followed by Mr. Donald Halter if he has arrived. Is Mr. Halter here? Martha Laczynski? Chester Stelmasek? Roger Kilbrook? Mr. Kilbrook, you will be the next speaker. Ms. Hough.

1169 STATEMENT BY ANITA HOUGH

MS. HOUGH: My name is Anita Hough and I live on Elm Court in Kaneville. My husband and I have lived in Kaneville for over eight years. Our house will be one of the homes purchased by the State of Illinois in order for the Superconducting Super Collider to be built. My original thoughts when I found this out were of anger and a feeling of helplessness. However, when discussing with others in the same situation, I realized more importantly that it was not just myself and my home at stake, but rather the community of Kaneville and all the other communities involved along the 53-mile tunnel site. In my area alone, the relocation of many families has been discussed. Prime farmland is being taken away from people who have farmed that same land for over four generations and would like to continue to do so. Unfortunately they can never successfully relocate their heritage nor their rich land if the State takes it from them. Earlier this year, I joined a group called CATCH, Citizens Against the Collider Here, opposing the SSC project in Illinois, because I feel strongly that the quality of life is of main concern here. Kane County is unique in itself because we still have large parcels of farmland and industry has not been an overdeveloped situation as it has been, for instance, in DuPage County. I lived in DuPage County for over 25 years. I saw its rapid growth and expansion until it was ready to burst at the seams. And just now people who live there are starting to reject all the progressive growth and its repercussions. I am not against progress of a normal nature. However, if the SSC is built in Illinois, I feel that the Kane County area, particularly Kaneville and the surrounding area, will be subjected to an unnatural growth at an accelerated rate, not 15 years projected down the road, but realistically in five to ten years. I believe that that type of growth will have a negative impact economically, sociologically and environmentally. My home and my community are very important to me. I have come to love and fully enjoy where I live. My husband and I have saved for many years to be able to have what we have now. Our home and our property is our investment for the future and now we may face the State of Illinois telling us that we may have to give it all up and relocate somewhere else. Where do we know where to go where this will not happen again? Is this really a democracy? I would like to be able to move when I choose, not when the Government tells me I have to. Until a decision is made about the SSC siting, our lives are virtually on hold. We don't make any long range plans, because we don't know what the future will hold for us here. I do know one thing though, if the State of Illinois is selected for the SSC project and I am forced to leave my home and my community, I will also plan on leaving the State of Illinois. I will not live or pay revenue in a state that has no recourse in recognizing human rights. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker will be Roger Killbrock, to be followed by Neil Walgenbach. Is Neil Walgenbach here?

1170 STATEMENT BY ROGER KILLBROOK

MR. KILLBROOK: My name is Roger Killbrook. I live in Downers Grove and I am here tonight as Chairman of the Chicago Section of the American Nuclear Society. American Nuclear Society is a not-for-profit international, scientific, and engineering and educational organization dedicated to the peaceful application of nuclear science. The Chicago Section has about 420 members working in research labs, the power industry, consulting activities, and environmental protection across northern Illinois and northwestern Illinois. The support of the section for the SSC in Illinois was demonstrated by the gathering of several hundred signatures in the course of about two weeks in the spring of this year, solely by members of the Board. The members of the Chicago Section support the SSC on scientific and technical grounds, but with regard to the environmental and sociological impacts of siting the SSC here in Illinois, I will confine myself to three aspects. There is a vital scientific population already in the area capable of supporting the SSC, thus minimizing personnel transfers into the region and associated costs. There is plenty of electricity in the region to support the operation of the facility. Much of this is nuclear in origin and therefore not subject to the freeze-ups that occur in some parts of the country as witnessed in Pittsburgh a few years ago while I lived there. If the SSC is built elsewhere, anywhere else in the country, it will result in the decay and demise of Fermilab. This does not seem to have been mentioned in the EIS or at least I haven't been able to find it in Section 5. This would remove the western anchor from the high tech corridor along Interstate 88 and adversely affect the technical growth and cultural activities in this area of Illinois. I think this site is unique in as much as it is the only one that will have a negative impact if this project goes forward elsewhere in the country. I thank you for the opportunity to present this evidence and I am submitting a written form.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Killbrook. The next speaker will be Neil Walgenbach to be followed by Gillian Panesenski. Is Gillian Panesenski here? Mr. Walgenbach.

955 STATEMENT BY NEIL WALGENBACH

MR. WALGENBACH: As an employee of AT&T Bell Laboratories, I owe my livelihood to science and technology. When I met the woman who later became my wife she was doing medical research in Chicago. We are both lovers of science and have followed the discoveries in the physical world with great interest. We are familiar with linear accelerators and the experiments that are carried out there. One of my co-workers used to work at Fermilab and at lunchtime sessions we have talked a little bit about it, and I know a thing or two about the operation of Fermi's accelerator with the attendant risks. Because of this knowledge and not in spite of it, my wife and I had no qualms about building a house and starting a family three years ago just 300 yards south of the existing accelerator ring at Fermilab. Quite

frankly, because of my wife's research into the effects of heavy metals on the human body, I am orders of magnitude more concerned about the barium and the radium in Aurora's municipal drinking water than I am about any possible effects from Fermi's superconducting ring across the road from me. Another co-worker a couple of offices down the hall from me will have to sell her house if the SSC is sited is here.

So you better believe I have been hearing the other side of the SSC issue. She is worried about many other things, getting a fair market value for her house, finding suitable housing in her area. She says she would have to downgrade. Moving expenses. She has a 15 year old mortgage that she is not even looking forward to replacing with a new one at double the interest rate. I empathize with her concerns. I want her concerns to be addressed, especially since my subdevelopment appears on Fermilab's map inside of a little box marked Future Expansionary SC. Although this little box has existed for many years and has not been thus far impacted by the SCC, that is not to say that next month or next year I won't be facing the same dilemma as my co-worker is. I don't want to see anybody get burned by the SSC.

I would even be willing to pay little more in state income tax rather than see my co-worker, and conceivably me, run roughshod by eminent domain. I like my neighborhood and I like my neighbors. I can see myself living there 20 years from now easily. But I would be willing to go if asked, especially for science, but I would want to be treated equitably. Some people, notably Texans, say the SSC should go to Texas because of their poor economy. Texans have been whining about their oil boom gone bust for many years and I'm tired of listening to it. I read an interesting statistic in the newspaper a year or two ago. I don't know if it is still valid, but it certainly was news to me. In terms of money leaving Illinois in Federal taxes versus money coming back to Illinois in Federal spending, Illinois ranked 50th. More money went to Washington than came back from Washington than any other state in the Union.

Maybe the SSC alone will raise Illinois' ranking to 49th. I don't know. But I do think this is just one more reason why the SSC should be built in Illinois. The other reasons are public knowledge. Fermilab is centrally located with even better airport access forthcoming. The scientists and engineers necessary to build and operate the SSC are already here. If they went to Texas, it would cause a brain drain on the schools and the other R&D entities in this area. The I-88 corridor is steadily building momentum as a world class, hightech corridor and I don't want to see it in 15 years or so degrade into a mid-tech or a low-tech area simply because one of the engines of high-tech moved for points south. The drilling equipment is already here, custom-made for the geology of this region. The manufacturing technology is already here developed for the existing superconducting ring Fermi already has in operation. A ring that cost hundreds of millions of dollars to build, took many years, has only recently begun operating at full power, will be closed in two or three years if the SSC is not sited in Illinois, because of the mass exodus of researchers and engineers. They will follow the SSC where ever it is sited.

In closing, I would like to remind the Board that despite this well orchestrated opposition, who has some legitimate concerns, I think I can speak for the vast majority of Illinoians, including those in this county, who want the SSC here. When I say that Illinois is proud to be host to the world's premier high energy physics research facility, that is Fermilab, and would like very much to remain in the vanguard, to literally unlock the mysteries of the universe, is one of the most interesting and profound of human endeavors in the modern era. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker will be Gillian Panesenski and she will be followed by Martha Laczynski. Please.

1172 STATEMENT BY GILLIAN PANESENSKI

MS. PANESENSKI: Gillian Panesenski. I live in Campton Township. One of the major flaws of the EIS is
1 that it is very subjective in its approach to some very basic problems. Many times it is evident that the writers involved have used their personal subjective reasoning to obtain a very illogical solution to a problem. In many instances a set of double standards resulted. For example, on page 5.1.10-7, the EIS writers indicate that "The industrial-yard character and large scale of the sector service areas, buildings, and tank farms," this is their term not mine, "are incongruous with the character of residential neighborhood and country residences."

Just two sentences later, though, these same writers say, "Rural residential areas, however, are often
2 associated with outbuildings, or are near farmlands and pastures where utility sheds are not uncommon. Here, the access areas would usually go unnoticed." In one instance, these tank farms are considered out of character and then suddenly the EIS writers reversed themselves and say they will go unnoticed.

Which is it? Are they obnoxious looking or not? Why should it be left up to the writers or observers to determine which local areas are truly affected when it is obvious they don't have set standards upon which to judge or evaluate a decision? As a result, subjectivity becomes important and personal viewpoints play far too large a role in determining the fate of people who will be forced to live next to
3 these tank farms. Writers or field observers cannot determine objectively the impact that local residents will experience living next to loud, obnoxious looking tank farms. When field observers went to

each shaft site, did they view each area under similar circumstances? Were sites in one state viewed during early spring when little or no plant growth appeared? Were others conducted when plant growth already limited site lines?

4

Were some viewed on cloudy days while others were viewed in full sunlight? In any case, without conditions being equal, subjective reasoning had to come into play and that has led to unfair and unequal evaluations. For example, it should be clear to everyone that Illinois is the most highly populated region now under consideration for the SSC. Numerous E, F and J sites happen to be located right in the midst of residential areas. This is especially true of the F7, E8, F8, E9, F2, and F4. The EIS writers indicated there are definite problems associated with each of these shaft sites and their surrounding residential settings. But in each case, they indicate that the situation is judged insignificant because it can supposedly be mitigated. And I stress the word judged. When a project of this magnitude and scope can have the dramatic effect that it will on thousands of people, there can be absolutely no room for value judgments by those who are helping to determine the final site location.

5

6

The selection should be based upon fact and not viewpoints. The EIS writers' and your DOE scientists' very unscientific approach in choosing the SSC site is something which we residents of the Fox Valley are not going to tolerate. You can anticipate lawsuits being filed if you choose to place your laboratories in our front yards, under our homes, next to our wells, and under our schools. Take your machine where it belongs out in the desert where Dr. Lederman originally planned for it to go and keep it out of Illinois.

7

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker will be Martha Laczynski and she would be followed by Chester Stelmasek. Is he here? If not, is Carol Hadamik here? You would be the next speaker please.

1173 STATEMENT BY MARTHA LACZYNSKI

MS. LACZYNSKI: My name is Martha Laczynski and I am from St. Charles, Illinois. I am here to let you know that I feel that Illinois is not the logical source for the SSC. These are just some of the reasons why Illinois is not the logical place for the SSC. They are all discussed in the EIS. More wells will be adversely impacted or closed in Illinois than in all other states combined. More property owners are involved than in all other states combined. The Illinois site has the largest number of people living adjacent to proposed SSC facilities. As a result, more people will be adversely impacted by noise pollution, air pollution, exposure to airborne radionuclides, adverse visual impacts, in Illinois than in any other state. More businesses will be closed or relocated in Illinois than in all other states combined. More acres of prime farmland are being removed from production in Illinois than in any other state. Illinois has the second largest number of wetlands that may be adversely impacted. The Illinois site and its proposed tunnel depth make this the most difficult tunneling project of all the sites. Water leakage into the access shafts and tunnel will be the highest in all sites The Illinois site has the worst water leakage problem encountered at any of the proposed sites. The five mile stretch of tunnel between E3 and E4 is expected to leak during construction at the rate of 5,200 gallons per minute per 100 feet or nearly a waste of 20 million gallons per day. Of major importance is the fact that Illinois has a regional groundwater overdraft. Of equal importance is the fact that Illinois has a local groundwater overdraft in the populated area of the northern arc. Numerous wells as deep as 300 to 400 feet went dry this summer. This cannot be blamed on the drought. The glacial geology of the Illinois site has created a situation where there is a direct hydrological connection between surface water supplies and groundwater supplies. Therefore any pollutants generated by the SSC in its construction may easily find their way into our well water supplies through our surface waters. The surface water quality of the Illinois site is already the worst of the seven sites. Illinois is the only site with an existing groundwater quality problem. We are already exposed to higher levels of radiation due to the elevated levels of radium in our groundwater drinking supplies and perhaps, and most important of all, is that Illinois has the largest number of people who oppose the placement of the SSC under or through our homes.

1

2

3

4

This project is doomed in Illinois because we will not give up. We will fight the Illinois ENR, Governor Thompson, and the DOE until the Illinois proposal is voluntarily withdrawn. We will not go away and we will fight all the way to the Supreme Court if necessary. In fact we promise to make so much noise over this project that you scientists are likely to see that funding may never be approved in Washington. The only way we will back down is to have Illinois withdrawn from consideration.

5

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker will be Carol Hadamik, and I understand you will be presenting a tape Will you explain that to us for us?

954 STATEMENT BY JANET McLEOD

MS. HADAMIK: I am presenting a tape made by Janet McLeod from Campton Township. Is that all you need to know?

MR. LAWSON: I understand there has been a tragedy.

MS. HADAMIK: There has been a death in her family and she is out of town and has been working on this for eight months, and it is so important to her that she put her voice on the tape and we asked if we could present it like this, and we do thank you for letting us do that.

MR. LAWSON: Okay, and just before you do I want to check to see who will be the next speaker, so hang on just one second if you would. Is Chester Stejmasek here? Dr. Ray Bandlow? You will be the next speaker, sir. Ms. Hadamik please.

MS. HADAMIK: (Voice of Janet McLeod on cassette tape.) Gentlemen: The draft EIS is full of subjective reasoning and illogical conclusions on the part of the EIS writers. For example, Table 4-18 shows that the Illinois site has 94 State-protected species in the proposed region of the collider. This is more than all of the other sites combined. Section 11.3.3, page 15 clearly indicates that approximately 200 acres of habitat will be permanently disturbed or destroyed by the SSC construction. An additional 235 acres will be temporarily disturbed. This is over 435 acres of land which will be directly impacted by the SSC in Illinois.

The EIS also states that some wetland habitat would be adversely impacted or lost and that construction noise will adversely affect wildlife during construction. It is clear that the EIS writers admit there is a great deal of potential for these 94 State species to be adversely affected and especially since they are admitted to be in the region of the collider ring. However, the EIS writers relegate this potential problem to a level of insignificance simply by stating that, "Although the Illinois State listed protected species are numerous in the general region in the site, they are not expected to be found in the areas proposed to be disturbed." Why is this so? Are we simply to take the EIS writers' word for it? Have there been actual teams sent to each proposed construction site to sit and observe what animal life is present over an extended period of time? Or isn't it more likely that through the use of computer models and predictive models, the writers assume that no species would be disturbed.

This assumption or conclusion is totally illogical based on all the information that is given. How can 94 State-protected species exist directly in the area of the collider and yet none be adversely impacted. It is impossible, except for the subjective reasoning and illogical arguments used by the EIS preparers. They want to delegate this problem to a level of insignificance, so they simply did so without any proof or substantiation. This same type of absurd thinking appears time after time throughout the lengthy draft EIS. For example, page 5.1-10-12 describes service area or tank farm area, F2, as being located in a field surrounded by an existing subdivision. This naturally creates a problem for noise levels and especially for site lines from the existing homes toward the tank farm.

However, the wonderful EIS writers, in their wisdom, indicate that those now living there need not worry about anything, because their views will eventually be blocked by the new homes that will be built around the tank farm. How illogical can you get? What makes the EIS writers think that anyone would want to build next to a tank farm after it is already in place? I could understand someone unknowingly building a new home if F2 site were not in place. But how could anyone with a brain in his head think that people will be flocking to the F2 site once its obnoxious looking and air shattering presence is already in place. This type of illogical argument is used repeatedly throughout the EIS in order to mitigate nearly every problem to a level of insignificance. If this same level of intelligence is shared by other scientists within the DOE, it is easy to understand why the United States is losing its leadership role. Ask yourself this: Do you want these same people conducting experiments beneath your home or business or your children's school? I sure don't.

MR. LAWSON: The next speaker will be Dr. Ray Bandlow, to be followed by Chester Stejmasek if he has arrived. If not, is [illegible] here? You are the next speaker, sir. Dr. Bandlow.

1175 STATEMENT BY DR. RAY BANDLOW

1 DR. BANDLOW: My name is Ray Bandlow. I am Superintendent of Kaneland School District 302 and a resident of Sugar Grove in Kane County. Many of the people who are here tonight and today are residents of the Kaneland School District. The Board of Education of our school district has adopted a position of neutrality on the siting of the Superconducting Super Collider in the Fox Valley area. However, our Board would be remiss if it did not object to and voice concerns about certain elements of the SSC proposal that will directly affect our students' educational opportunities and their environment. The Kaneland Campus is located just west of the Town of Elburn, Illinois, near the proposed siting of the SSC ring.

After reviewing various materials and the Department of Energy's Environmental Impact Statement and [illegible]

2 [illegible]

[illegible]

the Kaneland School site and it is also the primary link for the town of Sugar Grove to our site. Even though our students can go on Route 47, our buses can use Route 47 as a state highway, 47 is a good deal more busy and it is not considered to be as safe a transportation route as Dauberman.

We have experience when we speak about the concerns of highways and transportation. The East-West Tollway, I-88, was built through the middle of our district some years ago and at that time we experienced considerable difficulty with our student transportation. The intentions of the Department are not clear with regard to the use of Dauberman Road and we would like to have information about construction or removal of sections of this road. We believe that is vital knowledge to our school board and we would appreciate receiving such information as soon as possible. We are concerned about the safety of bused students in relationship to truck traffic should the SSC be built in this area. In the section of Volume I, Chapter 5, Letter E, entitled Spoils Hauling, it is explained that spoils hauling activities are expected to take place during normal working hours 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. This could cause considerable problems to our school district, especially when we consider that Table 5.1.6-4 of the draft projects an increase of 9.5 accidents due to SSC truck traffic per year. The safety of Kaneland students when bused to the campus and home is the Board of Education's highest priority. Provisions need to be made for no SSC truck traffic during the hours of 7:00 to 8:00 a.m., 2:45 to 3:45 p.m. and 5:30 to 6:00 p.m., which is generally the time for our activity bus routes. Kaneland students will be subjected to a greater risk if large hauling rigs are on the highway during our prime busing hours and we ask that that be taken into consideration.

The District's Board of Education feels that lower truck speed limits would be necessary in the vicinity of Meridith and Kesslinger Roads, Dauberman Road, Frances Road, Main Street Road, and Route 47 near quarry four and I refer you please to DEIS Volume IV, Appendix 10 as all of these are main arteries for Kaneland buses. We are also concerned about the disruption of classes due to construction noise. We would like to point out that our campus was left off Figure 5.1.4-3, Volume I, Chapter 5, entitled Human Receptors, Illinois Site. We cannot emphasize enough how important it is for uninterrupted classroom time on task for our students. We are very concerned about the emotional well-being of our students. Those students who currently live within the proposed ring siting, the emotional well being of these young people is of grave concern. Our district students represent generations of students from the same families or from families who usually remain in our school district until their children graduate. We are not a transient area. They have not experienced being uprooted from their home, their community, from their school.

MR. LAWSON: Mr. Bandlow, I am sorry to interrupt, but you have exceeded your time. Is it possible that you could wrap up your comments in the next 30 seconds or so?

DR. BANDLOW: I will indeed.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

DR. BANDLOW: We are also concerned about the depletion of the district's water supply. We have two wells. We are concerned about the enormous use of water projected for the project. We would like some guarantee that our water sources will be protected. We are also concerned about future funding with the loss of tax base and we are also concerned about changes in the state aid formula that might be made to address this if our State Government is serious about mitigating the harm that the project might do to some entities. To conclude, our Board of Education will oppose SSC plans that do not adequately address our educational objections and concern. These are elements that we believe need viable solutions.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. The next speaker will be Mr. John Hamilton to be followed by Lawrence Howe. Is Mr. Howe here? Is Chester Stelmasek here? Is Craig Rice here? You will be the next speaker, sir. Mr. Hamilton.

1176 STATEMENT BY JOHN HAMILTON

MR. HAMILTON: Thank you. My name is John Hamilton. I am an economist with the Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. My perspective is that of an economist concerned with the economy of the whole State. Illinois has come a long way since the two recessions of the early 1980's when monthly unemployment rates on a seasonally adjusted basis got as high as 13.2 percent. The most current Illinois unemployment rate is the August 1988 seasonally adjusted rate of 7.0 percent. At that rate of unemployment, 415,000 in Illinois were unemployed. That's 415,000 people without jobs who are looking for jobs.

The SSC would clearly provide jobs in Illinois. Our econometric modeling comes to conclusions very similar to those that are expressed in the DEIS. During the construction and preoperation phase, as many as 3,400 direct jobs would be created with 7,000 indirect jobs. During the operation phase 3,200 direct jobs and as many as 3,800 indirect jobs. Furthermore, our analysis of the impact of a shutdown of the Fermilab, a situation we fear if the SSC goes elsewhere, is a loss of 2,000 direct jobs and 2,200 indirect jobs. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker will be Craig Rice to be followed by -- let's try it again. Is Lawrence Howe here? Elizabeth Berkos? James Reinert? You will be the next speaker, sir. Is Craig Rice here? Mr. Reinert, are you prepared to speak now? Thank you, and you would be followed by Mr. Rice.

1177 STATEMENT BY JAMES REINERT

MR. REINERT: Good evening. Brevity seems to be the byword this evening, so I think we will stick to that. My name is James Reinert and I am a resident of Kendall County, Illinois. According to the local papers, the SSC should run under my home and a six acre service center would be located a mere 200 yards away. I present myself this evening both as a private citizen as well as the most immediate past president of the Aurora Board of Realtors. As a private citizen I empathize with those opposing the SSC on the basis that if located exactly where proposed, they would need to relocate. I say empathize because as a youth I saw my grandparent's small farmette, along with others in their area, sold to make room for what is now Interstate 88. The orchard where we picked apples and I climbed trees as a small child is now the site of a gas station. The gardens that were so lovingly tended by my grandfather are now the site of a parking lot for a huge discount store. I believe I understand the inconvience of progress. And I believe those of us to be affected by the SSC will also accept the inconvenience of progress.

I also speak to you as a realtor from this area, being a broker for the last 18 years; and as immediate past president of the greater Auroraland Board of Realtors. Over 50 percent of the SSC ring falls within the service area of that Aurora board. So the realtor community learned early on of the concerns of our fellow neighbors and customers. Some of those concerns seemed legitimate. Some were spawned with fear; but all were real to those expressing them. Giving as much weight and consideration as possible to the situation, the Aurora Board of Realtors Board of Directors voted in support of the SSC in Illinois, and whatever efforts needed to publicly express such support were extended. Likewise, the Illinois Association of Realtors, 30,000 members strong, issued a position paper in February of 1988 endorsing the SSC for Illinois. Both the local and the state associations recognize there is no escaping the inconvenience and emotional difficulty for owners whose property is acquired for the project. This is probably the most salient negative factor to be considered in any major governmental program which requires property acquisition.

It is unfortunate but a fact; any major installation in a populated area will cause some relocation. Displaced owners will receive financial compensation and will be treated fairly and in full accord with the laws of eminent domain and federal statutes, as well as the recently enacted Illinois law referred to as the Good Neighbor Bill, providing for relocation assistance. There is absolutely no evidence of any decline or negative adjustment in local real estate values, and the housing opportunities in the area will provide housing for new home owners and home seekers in all areas and all pricing. The fact that the federal government will save $400 million by taking advantage of the existence of Fermilab should be reason enough to go forward with the SSC of Illinois, let alone the myriad of other factual reasons provided by the research team. Ladies and gentlemen, Illinois is the right place for the SSC and we want you to take that thought back to Washington with you, and thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker will be Craig Rice, to be followed by Suzanne Willis. Suzanne Willis here, next speaker.

1178 STATEMENT BY CRAIG RICE

MR. RICE: Hi, my name is Craig Rice and I live in Naperville. First of all, I just want to take exception with Mr. Gross who said that there is a strong technical base here. In last week's Naperville Sun, they stated there was a survey of local employers; they state that within a matter of years there will be more jobs than there are people. The company I work for has jobs that are going begging and I do work for a very technical company. So I don't know where he gets his information about the strong technical base here. These people must be coming in from out of state. In today's Chicago Tribune, there was an article regarding a couple of our local mayors. Mayor Reynolds of West Chicago, Mayor Norris of St. Charles both have some legitimate questions regarding the SSC placement in Illinois. Both are afraid if they raise questions regarding the SSC that they may somehow be responsible if it were to go somewhere else. The last time one of them raised the question on the SSC, they raised -- they received letters denouncing them from every labor union in the state. That is how political this issue has become.

According to Jim Prescott from a local support group, this draft statement shows that there are no significant adverse environmental effects in Illinois. I would suggest for Mr. Prescott's benefit that you put this out in Braille. I don't think he can read. William Kempner is from the SSC project office, said these hearings -- this I think was in today's paper -- these hearings will have no effect on the review board. Maybe they feel we are all wasting our time here. Maybe Mr. Prescott feels that 20,000 local residents who oppose this are an insignificant number. My main opposition to the SSC here in Illinois is the large number of people that will be affected. When you compare Illinois to Arizona, for example, Arizona will have a total of four residences and no businesses effected. According to Table 3-5, there are 3,305 parcels affected in Illinois. This compares to 898 in Tennessee, the state with the second largest number. In Illinois there are approximately four times as many affected parcels as the second highest state.

I have here a copy of the Illinois SSC East Sector map which includes this area that we are in right now. And what I found interesting about this map was that Eola Road which is right out in front of this high school, is not even on this map. I checked with the Aurora street department today. Eola Road has been here for approximately seven years. You would think, with the billions of dollars that Illinois has spent on this proposal, that they could have come up with a more recent map. I contend that the state of Illinois has low-balled all the figures in their report and in Table 3-5 they will admit that the number of affected parcels may vary by as much as 20 percent and the number of relocations by as much as 50 percent.

We often hear of the benefits of the SSC coming here, the jobs, etc. And yet, in Section 3.3, under the no-action alternative, the Environmental Impact Statement shows that if the SSC doesn't come here this area in Illinois here will continue with light and industrial and suburban development at the currently rapid rate. And the continued use of Fermilab for high energy research and development.

6

Again I do not know where the man got the information when he said Fermilab will shut down in two to three years. I have never read anything of that nature. In short, we live in a booming area that really does not need the SSC. We have plenty of jobs for our people; in fact we have more jobs than people right now. As far as some other aspects of the Environmental Impact Statement, we have already touched on the water shortage. The SSC is expected to use approximately 180 million gallons of water during the construction phase.

7

I live in Naperville. I have not been able to water my lawn for most of the summer. There is definitely a water shortage here. As far as the farmland, according the Environmental Impact Statement here, it shows that Illinois has the most natural fertile soil of the seven states. We have 6,500 acres of prime farmland. And I would like to see it stay that way. As far as the air quality, again, Illinois comes out as the worst state for air quality. They show 228 total suspended particles, which is the highest. We are already high in carbon monoxide and the ozone problems.

8

9

MR. LAWSON: Mr. Rice, you have exceeded your time. Could I ask you to finish your comments in about 30 seconds please?

MR. RICE: Sure, right. Let's see, and as far as the air quality goes, it sounds like that they are willing to throw out the EPA standards for this area to get the SSC here. Comparing other parts of the country to Illinois you will find areas such as Arizona have a very simple land use plan compared to Illinois, which has a very complex land use plan. In short, I have talked to alot of people about this. They seem to feel that given the alternatives, Illinois is just a terrible location because of the number of people that will be affected. Everybody seems to think that it should go in an area where it will not affect anybody.

10

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. The next speaker will be Suzanne Willis. And she would be followed by Lawrence Howe, if he is here. Mr. Howe? Or perhaps Elizabeth Berkos. Is Audrey Huggins here? You will be the next speaker. Ms. Willis, please.

956 STATEMENT BY DR. SUZANNE WILLIS

DR. WILLIS: Thank you. I am Dr. Suzanne Willis, Associate Professor of Physics at Northern Illinois University. I speak to you both as a physicist and as an educator. On behalf of Dr. John E. La Tourette, president of Northern Illinois University, I am pleased to appear before you to testify to the educational benefits of locating the Superconducting Super Collider in northern Illinois. Let me mention just three of the educational advantages of locating the SSC here. Benefits to Northern Illinois University and other nearby colleges and universities, benefits to elementary and secondary schools, and benefits to the local population in general. First, Northern Illinois University will be the closest university to the SSC. Our campus is just 35 minutes from Fermilab and only 15 to 20 minutes from the west side of the SSC ring.

In fact, I myself left a tenure position at the University of Oklahoma to come to Northern Illinois University because it is so close. We, the experimental high energy physics group at Northern, already have undergraduate and graduate students working at Fermilab with us. Many of our students are from the western Chicago suburbs that grew up with a knowledge of and interest in Fermilab. They express excitement at the opportunity to work at the premiere high energy physics laboratory in the world. The nearness of the university to the laboratory means that students who are still taking courses can also be actively involved in forefront research. This is a wonderful opportunity, one which is not usually available to students of high energy physics. Indeed I had to leave my university when I was a graduate student and do my research somewhere else, and lost the benefits of being at a university. Many more students will have similar opportunities at the SSC. Other universities which have active high energy research programs and are within a reasonable drive of the SSC site include Northwestern, The University of Chicago, the Illinois Institute of Technology, the University of Illinois at Chicago; and further out, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the University of Indiana, Notre Dame and Purdue.

In addition, the other universities and two- and four-years colleges in the area, such as Roosevelt University, Northeastern Illinois University, Lake Forest College, Elmhurst College, DePaul University, the College of DuPage and so on and on, will benefit from the nearness of such a prestigious research

laboratory. The large selection of colleges and universities provides employees of the SSC and their families with unparalleled educational choices as well. Second, Fermilab already has in place a large number of programs for elementary, junior high and high school students and elementary and secondary school science teachers. These programs reach students and teachers from all over the country, but especially from the northern Illinois area. Putting the SSC here will enrich these programs.

Furthermore, since the SSC site is easily reached from the entire Chicago metropolitan area, locating it here makes these educational programs available to millions of school children, including many who are economically disadvantaged.

Third, the local population as a whole stands to gain. The SSC, as Fermilab is now, will be the world's premier high energy physics laboratory. Its work is completely unclassified and the site will be open for tours and visitors. Anyone can visit the Fermilab site during daytime hours. If you do, you will find a fascinating series of educational exhibits explaining the research done there, including slide and video presentations. You will also find families picnicking, fishing, training their hunting dogs, watching the buffalo, and generally enjoying what is obviously a safe and pleasant area. The SSC as well will be an educational resource for the entire Illinois community, and we welcome that and we will take advantage of it. The point to see clearly is that no other site under active consideration offers so many people, college and university students, school children, teachers and the general public, the educational opportunities of the SSC. No other site offers so many students the opportunity to do research and study at the same time. Here on the outskirts of one of the world's great urban centers we can introduce visitors from many different backgrounds and from all over the globe to the wonders of modern high energy physics. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker will be Audrey Huggins. And she would be followed by Bradley Huggins. Is Bradley Huggins here?

MS. HUGGINS: He is here.

MR. LAWSON: I was hoping you would say that.

1179 STATEMENT BY AUDREY HUGGINS

MS. HUGGINS: My name is Audrey Huggins. I am from Big Rock, Illinois. Many people here today are in opposition to the SSC in Illinois. These are the people who have taken a public stand against the so called crown jewel of high energy physics. These people are the only the few who have chosen to ignore the harassment and insults. Others are yet to be open about their stand on this topic. Local political machines and most local news journals have made it very difficult and sometimes dangerous to openly state opposition to the SSC.

During the first several months of the 1988, only limited coverage of the SSC acquisition made newsprint and then it was edited in a very biased form. Often this poor representation was followed by insulting editorial comments and insinuations. At one point, soon after the state revealed the Illinois' proposal, the Aurora Beacon called the opposition Luddites and stated that the opposition was only a handful of uninformed and disgruntled persons. We have also been called chicken littles by this same newspaper. We have been harassed by supporters and not answered when asking questions to Dr. Lederman, Don Etchinson and other officials for the SSC for Illinois, or is it SSC for Fermilab?

1 During the early months of this controversial subject, almost no governmental official had the courage to announce their opposition to the SSC siting in the Fox River Valley. Only now in this late stage of the scoping are some of our Governmental representatives and officials starting to crawl from the woodwork. Suddenly we find out that several members of the Kane County board have been in opposition to the Illinois SSC site proposal since its announcement this past January. The tide is starting to change. What points have we, the people of opposition, been stating throughout the entire ordeal? Many things. But a few are so simple, yet so very important to so many people in this area that it is inconceivable that the supporters of the SSC, the local press, and you, the Department of Energy could ignore us. This area will grow with or without the SSC. This is very clearly pointed out to me over and over again in reading the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Properties taken for the use of the SSC will be removed from the tax bases of local governmental bodies, thereby lowering the revenues of some already financially troubled areas.

This also is clearly noted in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. In fact, one local study has indicated that some areas may be adversely impacted monetarily in order of magnitude equal to what the SSC is predicted to benefit the entire region. Siting the SSC here in Illinois would disrupt the lives of hundreds of families. Some of these families will be directly displaced by the siting of the ring; others will be directly affected by the required construction of the project that will support the SSC, such as the railroad, airports, highways and utilities. Many will be indirectly and very adversely 2 affected due to a tremendous magnitude of this construction project. Still others will be permanent neighbors to this construction and experimental project, and will be forced to live in fear of the many possible dangers that could affect their loved ones. This too, is mentioned in the Environmental Impact 3 Statement but it is not dealt with sincerely. I can state other things to you from the Environmental

Impact Statement, but you have heard them over and over and over again. You, the Department of Energy, are the experts. Why are you not stating the concerns and the health hazards to us? Ironically, my husband and I spent this morning in a hearing fighting our Kane County taxes. I will be damned if I stand here and watch my Federal taxes, my State taxes, my county taxes and my property taxes go up to support the $6 billion experiment, and then watch out a window of my home as a ten-year construction phase begins and my property values drop. I hope you can clearly see that there is enough opposition in
4 the State of Illinois that we cannot and will not welcome the SSC to Illinois. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: The next speaker will be Bradley Huggins. And he would be followed by Lawrence Howe. Has Mr. Howe arrived? I assume he will not. Elizabeth Berkos. Is Elizabeth Berkos here? Is Paul Kurylo here? I know I mispronounced that, K-U-R-Y-L-O? John Platt? Dresko Jovanovic? Oh, John Platt? You would be the next speaker, sir. Mr. Huggins, please.

1180 STATEMENT BY BRADLEY HUGGINS

MR. HUGGINS: Thank you, I suppose it is clear where our position is on this topic. I also am from Big Rock. I have been involved in scientific research all of my working days since school. I am in the field of electron microscopy right now, which Governor Thompson and others have often compared this SSC to. I see no likeliness. I respect the energy levels that I work with, which are a small fraction of the energy levels of the SSC and we deal with our microscopes in our labs with concern and cautiousness and I don't see that same concern and cautiousness with this experiment being placed amongst the resi-
1 dents here of the Fox River Valley. A lot of concerns are held by many of us. You have been hearing them over and over again. As far as the draft EIS, there is a lot of inconsistencies that we see. I have a short little speech here on some problems with water and tunnel leakage during the construction phase.

On page 16 of Appendix 10 of the EIS it is stated that Illinois proposes to construct 19 retention ponds, one-third acre in size, one each at the shaft access areas E and F. The exception is at site F3, where because of the extreme amount of water expected to infiltrate the tunnel, three separate ponds, each two acres in size, will be necessary to handle the water pumped from the tunnel. This same section of the EIS indicates that 37-1/2 miles of the tunnel are expected to leak at an average of five gallons per minute per 100 feet while under construction. This sounds small, but it is over 14 million
2 gallons per day. The EIS indicates that the five-mile stretch between E3 and E4 is expected to leak at the rate of 5,200 gallons per minute per hundred feet. It is as if an underground river were hit in this area because this amounts to over two billion gallons per day of our precious water supply emptying into the tunnel and subsequently being pumped up to the surface. The average daily usage of water from the entire city of St. Charles with its nearly 20,000 inhabitants, its number of retail outlets and its diverse industry is just a little over 3.7 million gallons per day.

Therefore, the rate of this leakage and pumping from just this one, small, five-mile stretch of tunnel will be over 540 times greater than the average daily water usage of St. Charles alone. Something is either grossly wrong with the EIS figures or this tunnel will not be able to be built. The tunnel boring machines and personnel could be completely under water at those water rates of infiltration. Nowhere in the EIS does it mention how long this rate of flow is expected to continue. Nor does it mention how leakage is expected to occur during the normal operation phase of the SSC project. This again is a glaring error in the EIS. The EIS is clearly incomplete in that many key facts are completely missing or ignored. This problem of tunnel leakage is but one example of facts that are missing. One thing is quite clear, however; this drainage of water is a direct threat to our local water supplies. Hundreds of walls within the boundaries of the ring will be adversely affected by this
3 draw down to our vital water supply which the EIS describes as already being a regional overdraft situation.

Several other states also experience drainage problems associated with tunnel construction; however, the depth of our tunnel in Illinois would again just compound the problem that would be encountered during construction. This leakage problem therefore again increases the likelihood that the tunnel will not be completed on schedule. Although leakage will occur also in other sites, no other state will experience the negative effects which this means to our local well water supplies. Everyone in the unincorporated areas west of the Fox River is on an individual private well. This represents over 30,000 people in the area of influence. And because homes continue to be built in these unincorporated areas at such a rapid rate, the numbers of potentially adversely affected wells and people grows day by
4 day. This is not true of any other state. The well water problem associated with the draw down in local area water supplies is the number one reason Illinois stands out as being the wrong place for the SSC project. It is the density of population at the Illinois site versus all the other sites that makes
5 this negative effect even more pronounced. Illinois is not the proper site for the SSC. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Huggins. The next speaker this evening will be John Platt and he would be followed by Jack Knuepfer, I believe. Mr. Knuepfer here? Do I see a hand up there? Incidentally, as I announce your names, if you would please come down to the front seats it would make it easier and move the hearing along a little quicker. Mr. Platt, please.

1181 STATEMENT BY JOHN PLATT

MR. PLATT: My name is John Platt. I am a resident of Maple Park, Illinois. I am a registered professional engineer in the State of Illinois and I am employed as a research associate in the corporate research headquarters of one of the Fortune 10 Companies in this country. As such, I have been associated with and derived my livelihood from the pursuit of science. I spend a lot of my time in the pursuit of science. I am not opposed to the SSC project, but I have concerns about its placement in the State of Illinois. My concerns are those that have been voiced by other individuals here and that has to do with the impact on our groundwater supply.

1

In documents released by the Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources during the pre-hearing proceedings, the statement is made that the after grouting leakage into the tunnel of the SSC will amount to only 50 gallons per minute per mile. However, a bit of arithmetic leads us to see that this is almost four million gallons per day. There is a widely published figure for domestic water usage that the people use that say that a four family home will use approximately 350 gallons per day. If we use this figure, then the tunnel leakage rate from the deep aquifers from which our municipalities derive most of their water, comes to an impact of 11,000 new homes or 44,000 new residents. This water will be discharged from the tunnel into local streams, rivers and sewers and as such will not be available for use for public consumption. There is an additional published requirement for cooling water which is to be taken supposedly from the shallow aquifers. This amounts to 2,200 gallons per minute according to published figures. This works out to be 3,200,000 gallons per day, or the impact of 9,000 new homes or 36,000 new residents. This water comes, as I said, from the shallow aquifers, and this is where the majority of the residential and agricultural water supplies are derived in western Kane County.

2

In addition to that, most of our municipalities are now faced with radium levels in their deep aquifer water supply, which exceed levels mandated by the Illinois State. Therefore, some of these municipalities, in an effort to reduce their radium levels, are drilling wells into the shallow aquifers and using that radium-free water, blending it with the radium-rich water from the deep aquifer in order to reduce the total radium level in their municipal water supply. So we are going to suffer severe impact here in this shallow aquifer water supply that supplies the residential and agricultural wells. Several years ago I heard an address at the Fox Valley Chapter of the Illinois State Professional Engineers Association presented by an Illinois State hydrologist; and his predictions concerned the depletion of the shallow and medium aquifers in western DuPage and Kane County.

3

This appears to be the case now because in your Environmental Impact Statement it is recognized that there is an overdraft, a severe overdraft in this aquifers at this point. This past summer we suffered in this area a drought, which hopefully is not going to be repeated in the near future, but as a result of this as well as the overdraft in our aquifers, there were many residential wells that went dry, and if you go about the counties that are affected by the SSC now you will find that many yards now have well-drilling apparatus in them, where they are having to redrill or improve the wells that went dry.

4

In summation, we have a projection here of a total of 7,000,000 gallons per day from our aquifers. This is the same as 20,000 new homes or 80,000 residents, which is essentially the same as siting another city the size of Aurora into this area immediately. I would recommend that something be done to mitigate this such as making it imperative that the cooling system be close-looped, that secondary loop be cooled by leakage water, and that the leakage water then be made available through treatment facilities to municipal supplies so that at least the municipalities will not be without water. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. The next speaker will be Jack Knuepfer. Is Mr. Knuepfer here or not? I thought I saw a hand up indicating that he was here. Is Gerald Girardot here? Sir, you would be the next speaker to be followed by Richard Cooper, is Mr. Girardot.

1182 STATEMENT BY GERALD GIRARDOT

MR. GIRARDOT: My name is Gerald Girardot and I am the Winfield Township supervisor. I would like to address the existing utilities that Illinois can offer the Superconducting Super Collider.

Electrical power lines, switching stations and equipment for the SSC which will be locally supplied by Commonwealth Edison are already in place at Fermilab. The increased power requirements for the project only will require an additional 1.5 miles of low-level power lines. In comparison, Arizona will require 41 miles of new high-powered electrical lines, an additional 11 miles of lines to power the SSC's water systems. Texas, for example, will require two new switching stations and 4.5 miles of new power lines. Outside of the obvious electrical capacity advantage Illinois enjoys is the cost savings associated with the infrastructure that is already in place on site. To replicate Fermilab's power capacity at any other proposed site would cost time and money, a luxury we simply cannot afford.

1

Fermilab's existing natural gas capabilities also can be utilized through the SSC. Unlike most other competing sites, Illinois will not have to construct new natural gas facilities, which will further save money and time.

Lastly, because of the Fermilab advantage, the Illinois site will be provided with a state-of-the-art telecommunication system. In 1987 Fermilab installed a digital communication system that will not

require any additional improvements. In other states the same is not true. Outside of the fact that an entire communications network must be constructed and equipment installed in those states, new communication lines also would have to be constructed, adding to the time and cost for bringing the SSC on line.

From a standpoint of utilities capabilities, siting the SSC at Fermilab will enable the Department of Energy to concentrate on the construction of the SSC tunnel and accelerator, and not on infrastructure improvements. Illinois is the only state in the running for the SSC that has all of the required utility systems currently in place. The time and money needed to replicate the utilities already on site at Fermilab is a cost with which neither the Department of Energy nor the American public should be burdened. As citizens of Illinois and as federal taxpayers, we want to see the SSC built. And we want it built in the most effective location.

2 After reading the Environmental Impact Statement and weighing the environmental issues, it becomes plainly clear that total construction and operational costs should be the deciding factor for selecting the host state for the SSC. It also becomes apparent that Illinois is the only economical decision.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. GIRARDOT: Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: The next speaker is Richard Cooper. Mr. Cooper will be followed by Rita Depedro. You will be the next speaker. Mr. Cooper?

1183 STATEMENT BY RICHARD COOPER

MR. COOPER: Thank you. I am here tonight to speak on behalf of those who are opposed to the location of this machine in central Kane County. My wife is the editor and I am the nominal publisher of the
1 Elbourne Herald, the only paper that I know of in Kane County that opposes this operation. My reasons are stated well by the gentleman who spoke before the last gentleman, with respect to water yields and water use.

The area that we serve in our little weekly newspaper is the site of the principal activities to be carried on if this machine is built in Kane County. The quiet, pleasant little village of Kaneville
2 will be destroyed. The areas to the south and the areas to the northeast will be adversely affected, both currently and by the uses to be made of the water available to the present population, and that water use will be vitally affected by the people who will come later to this community that I speak of.

I can understand why the current scientists who work at Fermilab would like this machine built in this
3 vicinity. They live in pleasant homes, they are bright, able young men. But the homes that they will destroy unwittingly and willy nilly are just as vital to the people who reside in those homes, and by a major part support their families and their existence in that community. I speak of Kaneville, Big Rock, Maple Park, Elbourne to say nothing of the confusion and the utter spoiliation of pleasant country
4 life supporting the relatively large rural population that will result from seven years of construction, excavation in a tunnel that is quite long, and I was pleasantly surprised that the study that these young people have made with respect to the leakage in that massive tunnel. The leakage exceeds the water use in those areas by ten times the leakage or the use of the water that was made of a similar quantity in 1970.

The Illinois Water Survey statistics support my statement. I assume the young man who said the leakage
5 would be in the matter of millions of -- more than one or two million gallons a day. The production of water from the shallow aquifers is being utilized now by the city of St. Charles, Geneva, Aurora to a limited extent, and Elgin now is forced to use what is available from the shallow aquifers supported by the Fox River. A recent word came to us at the Elbourne Herald that the water supply this machine would utilize would come from the Fox River. And I find that laughable because a friend of ours in Geneva lives in a comfortable home on the Fox River and two weeks ago he saw two bicyclists riding down the center of the Fox River. The water is not even in the Fox River. We urge that this machine be located in the area that Dr. Lederman suggested it be located in, according to an article in a Dallas newspaper, someplace in a desert, a thinly populated area; and if it is to be built, it should be built
6 in such a place.

Illinois stands in this problem position because of the political desires of the present governor. He was not selected as vice president, but I assume his enthusiasm maintains. The people of this state will be required to pay twice -- the promised amount when they pay the bonds, and the interest on those bonds over the 20 year period. That is a gratuitous insult to the population of Illinois on the part
7 of the politicians. And we hope if it is to be built, it is to be built where Dr. Lederman initially thought it should be built -- in some thinly populated area, preferably a desert. I thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. The next speaker will be Rita Depedro. I hope I pronounced that correctly.

MS. DEPEDRO: Yes sir, you did.

MR. LAWSON: You would be followed by Jack Knuepfer, if he is here. Is he here? If not, is Bruce Winstein here? Is Paul Kurylo here? Dresko Jovanovic? You will be the next speaker, sir. Ms. Depedro.

1184 STATEMENT BY RITA DEPEDRO

MS. DEPEDRO: Thank you very much. My name is Rita Depedro. I live in the Windings which is a community of single-family dwellings, some townhomes, off of Empire Road, very close to the site of the proposed tunnel. In fact my home will be approximately eight-tenths of a mile away from the tunnel. I have various concerns and I have some questions. By the way, I would like to congratulate you on the completeness of your report. It was quite weighty.

1 In the report, Volume I, Chapter 5 and in other areas of the report, it states that in the state of Illinois 320 wells will be lost. Nowhere in that lengthy and weighty report did I see or could I find which 320 wells would be lost. I would like to know if anyone could answer that because the community in which I live, there are 365 individual family dwellings and townhomes. We get our water from two wells. Are you going to destroy our two wells? And if you do destroy our two wells, where are we going to get our water? And if you say well, we will pipe in water to you, who is going to pay for the piping? Are we going to pay for the piping? Or is the Government? Do not tell me the Government is because the Government is so far in debt that it can not afford to pay its bills now. Dynamiting -- how much dynamiting is there going to be? And how large are the charges going to be? What are you going to do if my house is damaged by dynamiting, even though it is not right on top of the tunnel?

2 There were reports in one of the local papers. There was a letter written from the teachers in Willie Lakes School. There were people from the DOE and they were taking core samples. On the day that they took core samples, supposedly these were very small charges in comparison to what is going to be done. The teachers could not teach school because there was so much noise. Are you going to tell me that for seven years I am going to have to put up with that dynamiting? Sirs, where you are building this tunnel,
3 there are a lot of individual homes, much more so than I think you realized three years ago when you first came and looked. Another question I have. It has to do with radioactive wastes. In Chapter 5,
4 Volume I you talk about disposal of solid, radioactive and hazardous wastes. Where are they going to be disposed of? Are they going to be disposed of in landfills in this area? We would like to know that.

Not too long ago I read in one of the I believe it was chemical magazines about how the DOE or some Government agency is finally finding a place where it is going to put hazardous radioactive wastes, and they have decided that they are going to be put above an area where water can seep through. Are they
5 going to be built around here? Are they going to be disposed around here? Another part of the report talks about housing peak, that in one year there will be a need for 2,700 homes. Where are we, we the taxpayers who are here now, where are we going to get the money to pay the increased taxes for the schools that will have to support those children of those people who will move here? Where are we, the
6 taxpayers that live here going to get the money to pay for this Super Collider? I would also like to point out, in ending, the number of dislocated residents and businesses in the area will exceed 200 in the State of Illinois.

I suggest to you, sirs, that the support for the Super Collider as the gentleman before me so very well put it, is not really from us who live here but rather from the politicians who have very large egos and wish to have another feather in their caps. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: The next speaker will be Mr. Dresko Jovanovic to be followed by Bruce Winstein. Is he here?

1185 STATEMENT BY DRESKO JOVANOVIC

MR. JOVANOVIC: My name is Dresko Jovanovic. I am a physicist from Fermilab. And I do not know whether I am speaking for or against in this community of greens and boos, but I want to mention some statistics which they may know or not know. Fermilab has been a good neighbor to neighborhood schools. Some 70 high schools send between two to ten of their seniors every Saturday to listen to the lectures on modern physics. In fact, this Saturday, two days from today, some 130 high school seniors will appear at our doors and they will be lectured on the principal of their school and I believe there will be two from Sugar Grove, from [copy missing] school district, who will listen to their principal, I
1 suppose also.

This program has been running for the last nine years. So 2,200 high school kids have graduated from our program. We have conducted a survey as to the impact of such a program which Fermilab conducts and we find that four years ago those who have gone to our program, all have graduated. There was not a single dropout. We do not take credit for their not dropping out, but we take small credit for motivating them to be on the good road to become responsible citizens of this country. And I believe if people want me -- me and some other people from Fermilab to relocate and teach cactuses in Arizona or some other roughlands in Texas, we will probably do so. But let them ask their children. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker this evening is Bruce Winstein, and he will be followed by Professor Frank Merritt. Is Professor Merritt here?

1186 STATEMENT BY BRUCE WINSTEIN

MR. WINSTEIN: I speak to you tonight as a resident of the western suburbs of Chicago, as a member of the National Community of Physicists that make use of high energy facilities throughout the world, and as a concerned U.S. citizen. The SSC recognized around the world as a truly exciting and leading edge research facility belongs in Illinois attached to the existing Fermilab. The truth of this assertion seems so clear and obvious to both scientists and nonscientists all over the country that it is somehow overlooked and still being debated. Fermilab is a world class laboratory that has had a great impact on science and a very beneficial impact on the broader community represented here tonight.

The expertise to design, build and operate the SSC resides at FNAL, Fermilab. And should the SSC be sited elsewhere, that expertise must move. That move will be painful for the individuals involved but it will be severely damaging to the science in this country. I do not want to speculate on the damage that might result to this area of Illinois should this research center dry up. What might be done with the land? What would be the effect on the science at FNAL from SSC construction? That has been questioned. To quote from a report commissioned by DOE to analyze the suitability of Fermilab as the injector for the SSC, on page 31 it says, "There should be minimal impact on time available for high energy physics." Can we afford to begin anew elsewhere? Essentially the facilities at Fermilab would have to be duplicated at enormous expense. Even if other states offer their own money to partially make up the difference, do we think that then no more federal money will go to such a state? There is only so much money available.

For the continuity of science, Fermilab must be the site of the SSC. Should a young physicist be expected to travel from his home institution to Fermilab to test new equipment for the SSC because there will be no test facilities early on in the construction of SSC? And then maybe the very next day go to the site to participate in the installation of other equipment? Will such a lifestyle be attractive to young people? Is it not clear how damaging to the future and to all of our futures since broadly we depend on science, basic research, how damaging it would be siting it elsewhere? As sound as these arguments may seem, we should still look to see how such major upgrades have been accomplished elsewhere. If only for guidance. In Japan, their major new facility which is just coming on this year, was added on to the existing ring structure. In the Soviet Union the same concept operates. They have not started a new laboratory for their very ambitious plants. In Germany the facility has been significantly upgraded and will be a first class site in just a few years. At CERN, the highly successful European organization for nuclear research, their new facility will be ready in about one year. They have added on.

In our own country, whenever we have wanted to improve our physics potential, we have upgraded the rings at Cornell, the rings at Brookhaven and the ring at Stanford. We have done the same thing at Fermilab. But there is one difference -- Fermilab is a younger lab than all of these other labs. Have we heard other states saying that the facilities are outdated? Go there for yourself and see, what do you think? Why do you think that around the world the major new facilities are built on existing ones? Is it not obvious as I said previously? Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker will be Mr. Frank Merritt to be followed by Dennis Lemon. Is Dennis Lemon here? Is Paul Kurylo here? Professor Merritt, why don't you proceed, please.

1187 STATEMENT BY FRANK MERRITT

MR. MERRITT: The experimental study of high energy particle reactions over the last 20 years has led to some very important breakthroughs in our understanding of nature. These include the discovery of quartz, of the new massive vector [copy missing], and the discovery of strong, underlying symmetries between the basic forces of nature.

But current theories do not tell us just how these fundamental forces are related to each other. The clues to this lie in the higher energy region which the SSC will explore. The mission of the SSC is to explore this region and to uncover clues and to uncover what the fundamental laws are, perhaps the most fundamental laws of nature. This is a very ambitious undertaking. It is important to the high energy research effort of this country to build on our strengths. Fermilab is without any doubt the leading high energy lab in this country today. If we are to best use our research resources we should build the new SSC here and use not only the existing Fermilab accelerator, but also the staff, and the experience and organization and resources of this lab.

MR. LAWSON: Excuse me, Professor Merritt. I must ask for those of you who must talk with your neighbor to please do so outside. Thank you.

MR. MERRITT: The Europeans learned this lesson long ago when they centered their research, as the last speaker said, at the Multi-National Lab of CERN near Geneva. This is a lab where the new massive W and Z bozons were discovered, and it has probably been the leading laboratory in the world over the last five years. New accelerators at CERN such as [copy missing] are built to take full advantage of existing facilities. This is a strategy that works and is one that we should adopt here. Research of the SSC will be centered on the new accelerator but even more on the building of new detectors, developing new

techniques of handling high rates, and so on. It will be absolutely essential to have external beam lines, staging areas and laboratories to test and develop new equipment for the new detectors. We will need the resources of a lab like Fermilab.

Why duplicate this lab instead of building on an existing excellent facility. To attempt this would be to diminish the effectiveness of our overall research effort. It would hurt Fermilab and it would hurt the research of the new SSC to spread our resources so thinly. The SSC will be the leading world laboratory probably for decades in high energy research.

It is a great benefit to the U.S. to have this in this country, and it is a great benefit to Illinois to have it in this state. The benefit to midwest universities such as The University of Chicago is enormous. Having the SSC here makes it possible for physicists to simultaneously be active in their own universities and also in the research of a lab. Experimental groups have collaboration meetings here. The lab is a general center of research; not only in high energy physics but also in related areas such as theoretical physics or [copy missing] physics. At the University of Chicago we have been able to attract the very best [copy missing] central candidates and graduate students and faculty in part because of our proximity to Fermilab. The same is true for other labs in the Midwest and in Illinois. But how will the SSC affect the local community? In terms of its effect on the community Fermilab is the best example.

Student groups visit Fermilab from the universities and from the high schools and see the detectors and the beam lines and the overall research effort that is going on there. There are always interesting scientific exhibits in the lobby of the Atrium about radiation, cosmic rays, particle detectors or scientific research in general. Students from Illinois and from outside the state come to live and to work over the summer with research groups. The Fermilab auditorium is somewhat of a cultural center, with scientific lectures as well as other events. The genre of the lab has been an offset to the community and a good neighbor. In terms of the effect on the environment, the SSC will clearly have a strong positive effect on the intellectual and research environment of the area.

But how will it effect the natural environment? Again Fermilab is the example. It has had a strong positive effect on the natural environment, and it is very clear that this tradition will continue if the SSC is built here. Fermilab was built under budget to blend with the surrounding area and to be a place of beauty and a place for families and for people to visit. Fermilab is a wildlife refuge, it is a place where children and families come to feed geese and ducks and see the buffalo and to spend weekends. To spend Sunday afternoon. You can frequently see raccoons and sometimes deer around the lab. Bicycle trails run all over the lab. The Fermilab Prairie Restoration project has been a wonderful ecological project of the lab. So Fermilab in general has been an asset to the community. And the SSC would continue that.

But what will happen to Fermilab if the SSC is built elsewhere? The lab might continue to thrive for years, but it will lose some of its best people to the new lab. As the SSC nears completion, the excitement of research at Fermilab will diminish because the mission of this lab is to make discoveries, and that means to be the leading edge of scientific research and its ability to maintain this position is one thing that attracts the best physicists to it. When the SSC goes into full operation, I doubt it will make sense to continue research at Fermilab because it will be overwhelmed by the superior facilities and capabilities of the SSC.

What will happen to Fermilab? The sole purpose of a lab is fundamental scientific research, and I think it will have to either radically change or die. Of course I do not know what will happen, but if the SSC is built elsewhere, in another 20 years I would not be surprised to see the Fermilab site turned to other uses. What would you prefer to see at that site? A landfill, a new Bears' stadium, a new airport? Fermilab has been an asset and whatever the case of what happens to that site the loss of Fermilab would be a serious loss to Chicago, to Illinois and to the community.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Is Bonnie Deke in the auditorium? You would be the next speaker, please. And once again I would ask is Dennis Lemon here? Paul Kurylo? You are here, okay. You would be the following speaker. Ms. Deke.

1188 STATEMENT BY BONNIE DEKE

MS. DEKE: My name is Bonnie Deke. I am a nurse at the neutron therapy facility at Fermilab, and I just have two short points of view from other people that I wanted to share with you this evening. We are currently treating a senior citizen from Chicago with a very serious tumor. Her sister who is 82 years old who brings her back and forth for treatment states that a best friend of hers had a farm on the Fermilab site area. At the time when they had to give up their land they were quite upset about it, but now when they look back on it and see what is happening on behalf of their friend and also what Fermilab has generated on high technology and giving to our students, and introducing and encouraging our state, our high school children, into physics which is needed not only in our state but in many states, they are very thankful that they made the choice or had that choice to make at the time.

And also I was in a seminar a couple weeks ago with a couple of people when I found out that I worked out here, had great things to say about the fact that they are not even that close but come out to the cultural events that are offered once a month out at the lab. And find it quite interesting that they

brought this to the community out this far from Chicago because in terms of parking and what is offered for the community, they figure that Fermilab has given back a lot to the community, far more than what they ever anticipated when this first came about. That is it.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Unless there is somebody, is there anyone else besides Mr. Kurylo who has registered to speak who has not been called this evening? As of now, Mr. Kurylo, you are the last speaker. And I hope, I trust, I have pronounced it correctly, but perhaps you will correct it for the record.

1189 STATEMENT BY PAUL KURYLO

MR. KURYLO: Close enough, thank you. Well the many speakers before me have pretty well covered everything I had hoped to touch on and a lot more besides. One point that they had not made up until this point, and maybe the previous speaker touched on it a little bit was that -- well, I will put it this way. I was in the area when the National Accelerator Project went down and was sited at Weston. And I am afraid many of the same arguments that I heard at that time against the National Accelerator we are hearing today again.

This time instead of a number of farmers being dislocated, we have got a lot of people with better and broader educations to argue their points. So the level of the opposition has certainly increased. My opinion, however, is that this thing should still go down here in this area. I think the preponderance of the evidence is for it being sited in Illinois. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. If there are no other registrants to speak this evening, I think that what I will do is call a recess to this session and we will reconvene again at no later than 9:45. This session is now recessed until 9:45.

(Recess.)

MR. LAWSON: I wish to reconvene this evening's session on the public hearing for the draft Environmental Impact Statement. As far as I can tell there are no other speakers to give testimony tonight. Is there anybody here who sees it differently? If not then I must say that this is the end of this evening's session. I and the panelists wish to thank you all for your thoughtful comments and for observing the procedures of the session.

You are reminded that there are sessions tomorrow beginning at 9:00 and at 2:00 and also at 7:00 in the evening. And the procedures to be followed then will be similar to the ones that we followed today. Also reminded that the doors will be open no sooner than one half hour before each of those three sessions. That is 8:30, 1:30 and 6:30 tomorrow.

Finally I would like to remind you that the comment period on the draft EIS lasts until October 17 and you are cordially invited to submit written comments on the draft EIS until that date. And they should be sent to the site task force, whose address is given on cards available on the registration table outside.

Thank you again for observing the procedures for tonight's hearing and the session for tonight is now closed.

(Whereupon at 9:46 the hearing was closed.)

THIRD SESSION

(October 7, 1988: 9:00 a.m.)

MR. NOLAN: I'd like to get started if we could, please. Good morning to all of you. I want to welcome you to the Department of Energy's public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Superconducting Super Collider.

My name is Dick Nolan, and I am the Deputy Executive Director of the SSC Site Task Force. And I am the presiding office for this session of this public hearing. A concurrent session you may be aware of is this hearing that is running next door in the gymnasium.

The purpose of my brief remarks today is to tell you why we're all here. After my remarks, I will ask Mr. Barry Lawson, who is seated here to my right, to outline for you how we will be conducting our meeting this morning.

The purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens such as yourselves the opportunity to comment in person on the Department's draft Environmental Impact Statement on the SSC. We want to make sure that you are aware that this is not your only opportunity to comment for us. You may also send us written comments, which we would like to have received by not later than October 17th.

We want you to know that we are sincerely interested in hearing what you have to say. We do want to hear your comments, and that each of your comments will be considered in the preparation of the final Environmental Impact Statement.

Let me go back just a second now, and refresh your memories as to how we have come to this point in the site selection process.

In January 1987, President Reagan's decision to proceed with the SSC was announced and construction funds for the SSC were requested from Congress.

In April 1987, the Department issued an invitation for site proposals. We subsequently received 43 proposals, and we found that out of those 43 that 36 of those would be -- were qualified.

We forwarded those qualified proposals to the National Academies of Science and Engineering for further evaluation. Based on the criterion in the invitation that we had issued, the Academies recommended a list of eight most excellent sites for our further consideration. One of these proposals was later withdrawn by the proposer.

Following our review and verification of the Academies' recommendation to us, the Secretary of Energy, John Herrington, announced the best qualified list, including your State's proposed site, on January 19, 1988.

On January 22, 1988, the DOE formally announced that it would develop an Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed SSC. In February 1988, we held scoping meetings to obtain public comment on the nature and scope of the issues that we should consider in the Environmental Impact Statement.

You may recall that scoping meetings were held here, in Illinois, on February 18, 1988 and out of that whole process across all seven states, we got about 2,000 comments on the scope of the issues that should be considered in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Following public hearings here and in other Best Qualified List states, which are now, in fact, completed, we will develop a final EIS to be issued in December 1988.

Now, the draft EIS is the subject of our meeting this morning. It evaluates and compares four different alternatives. One, site alternatives; that is the seven alternate locations that are under consideration for siting the SSC.

Two, technical alternatives. That includes different technology, equipment or facility configuration.

Three, programmatic alternatives. That includes the possibility of using other accelerators, international collaboration, or in fact, delaying the project.

And four, the no-action alternative, which is the possibility not to construct the SSC at all.

This draft EIS identifies and analyzes the potential environmental consequences expected to occur from siting, construction and operation of the SSC at seven alternate sites. Let me again remind you where those sites are located. They are in Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee and Texas.

This draft Environmental Impact Statement provides as much information as possible at this stage of the project development regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed construction and operation of the SSC at each of the alternate seven sites.

However, the Department recognizes that further review under the National Environmental Policy Act will be necessary prior to a decision to construct and operate the SSC at the selected site.

So, after the site is selected, the DOE will prepare a supplement to this EIS to address, in considerably greater detail, the impacts of construction and operation at the selected site and the specific possibilities for minimizing those impacts.

Let me tell you a little bit more about the draft EIS. This is a large document; it contains more than 4,000 pages and it's organized into four volumes.

Volume I is entitled "Environmental Impact Statement." Volume II is the Comment Resolution Document and it currently doesn't exist. It's reserved for your comments and responses to your comments and will appear only in the final published EIS.

Volume III describes the methodology for site selection and Volume IV contains 16 appendices providing detailed technical backup to the conclusions reached in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Comments at this hearing given to us by you will be used by the DOE to prepare a final EIS to be issued this December. This document will identify the Department's preferred site. And then, no sooner than 30 days after the final EIS is distributed, the Department will publish its Record of Decision, which will include the final site selection and complete the site selection process.

This morning we will have the services of a professional moderator to insure that we have an orderly and fair proceeding. Measures have been taken to permit the maximum opportunity for interested citizens to utilize this session for expressing their comments.

We want to urge all participants in this morning's session to focus their comments on the draft EIS and avoid statements aimed solely at expressing opposition or support for the proposal by Illinois.

All comments will become part of the formal record of this proceeding. Those specifically addressing the draft EIS will be the most useful to us in preparing the final document. Now, as I noted earlier, in addition to this opportunity for oral comments at this session this morning, individuals may give us written comments. These should be postmarked by October 17th, the end of the formal 45-day comment period, to ensure that they will be considered in the preparation of the final EIS. We want to let you know, however, that we will consider comments received after this date to the best extent that we possibly can.

One final word on the role of the EIS and the site selection process. The National Environmental Policy Act requires that environmental impacts be considered by Federal decision makers, in making decisions on major Federal actions with potentially significant environmental consequences. An EIS is one of the methods used to do this analysis, provide for public comment and participation and make a final decision that meets the NEPA requirements.

The EIS will be considered by the Secretary in making the site selection.

We want to thank you in advance for your interest and participation with us this morning. This morning, you will be addressing a panel composed of myself and Linda McClain, sitting to the right of Barry Lawson. Periodically, you will see that I will be spelled off by Mr. Jay Hunze and Linda will be spelled off by Mr. Bill Griffing.

Let me now introduce Mr. Barry Lawson who will describe how we will conduct this morning's session. Barry.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you and good morning. My name is Barry Lawson and I am Community Relations Specialist and President of Lawson Associates, in Concord, Massachusetts. As an outside consultant, I have been hired by the Department of Energy to serve as neutral moderator and facilitator for this hearing.

As Mr. Nolan has said, the purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens an opportunity to comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement produced by the Department of Energy for the proposed Superconducting Super Collider.

In February, the Department conducted a scoping meeting here, in Illinois, to listen to and receive comments on what should be considered in the preparation of the draft EIS.

DOE has now prepared the draft and seeks comment on this document, which is more specific in detailing the potential environmental impact of siting the SSC here, in Illinois, and in six other states.

The court reporter for this hearing and sitting to my left is Tim Devine. When we begin the comment period of this hearing, I will announce each speaker, working from a list which will be provided to me by the people at the registration table in the lobby.

I will take the speakers in the order in which they have signed up in advance, with appropriate respect for public officials.

As this is a hearing to receive comments on a draft Environmental Impact Statement, your comments should focus on issues addressed in this draft document. If I find that comments are wandering from the topic of this session, I will remind you to focus your comments more sharply. This is not intended to limit your remarks, but rather to insure that they are as effective as possible in achieving the objective of this hearing as laid out by Mr. Nolan, the residing official for this hearing. And to provide interested people with a fair opportunity to express their views, I have established the following rules of conduct for today's sessions.

First of all, the sessions will meet this morning from roughly 9:00 'til 12:00, this afternoon from 2:00 to 5:00, and if necessary, this evening from 7:00 o'clock on.

Periodically, I may call for comfort breaks. All comments will be limited to five minutes, unless otherwise noted by me. I'll try to remind you when you have 30 seconds remaining and your cooperation will be appreciated by the panel and also by other members of the public who will then also have an adequate opportunity to share their views.

I will attempt to take people at their scheduled times, although if some of the presentations run less than five minutes, we may be able to run a little ahead of schedule. So, if you are scheduled to speak, I would appreciate it if you would be in this room probably at least 15 to 20 minutes ahead of your scheduled time because, if past practice is any indication, we probably will be able to take you ahead of schedule.

You are encouraged to submit written comments to me before or after your presentation and we have a black in-box down at the table to the left off the stage for you to put your comments in.

At approximately 30 minutes before the scheduled end of the session, I will call speakers who have registered at the door today. Some of these speakers may also be called earlier if we are running ahead of schedule. Therefore, any of you who wish to speak, but have not registered in advance, are reminded to sign up at the registration desk in the lobby.

Mr. Nolan pointed out, for those of who wish to submit written comments later, the deadline is October 17 and all comments raised on the content of the draft EIS, whether they be oral or written, will be made part of the record to be considered by the Department of Energy as it prepares the final EIS.

Now, the panel, Ms. McClain and Mr. Nolan's responsibility is basically to listen to your comments and to ask clarifying questions that may be necessary to create a complete record of the content of your comments of the contents of the draft EIS.

You are reminded that this is a smoke-free building. There is no smoking allowed in any area of the building. The cafeteria is for student use only and is not available to the general public. There is a snack bar directly opposite the entrance to the gymnasium which is available for your use. As the hearing is being held in a high school with students and faculty in attendance during many of our sessions, we request that you restrict your movement for this hearing to the meeting rooms and the registration areas. Please do not loiter in the corridors. And I have also been told that occasionally during the day, we will hear, may hear, sounds and buzzes for changes of classes, so don't be alarmed if we hear some of those during our session. And there also is a public address speaker in this room, although it isn't very loud, which is used to communicate school messages. We hope that these will provide very little interference with today's session.

The building will be open for public access basically one-half hour before the start of each of the sessions, so this morning it was at 8:30, and this afternoon it will be open at 1:30, and again this evening at 6:30.

I would like especially to thank the Waubonsie Valley High School and School District 204 for the use of their facilities for this hearing. We request that everyone attending and participating in these sessions respect high school property and help us to keep it clean.

You are reminded that today's hearing is being held in two rooms, the auditorium and the gymnasium. If you were registered to speak at the hearing, please make certain that you are in the room that has been assigned to you at registration. If there is any doubt, this is the auditorium and that's the gymnasium. If you are uncertain as to which room you've been assigned, please check with the registration table outside.

Finally, because this is an official public hearing and your comments are being recorded, I ask that you be courteous with respect to the speakers so that not only may they be able to make their comments clear for the record, but also that the transcript can be as clear as well. Therefore, if you have need to communicate with your neighbor or to discuss something, I would really appreciate it if you would take the conversation to the lobby.

I will announce any further procedural rules for the conduct as may be necessary. Again, your cooperation with the procedures in accomplishing the objective of today's hearing are most appreciated.

Now it is time to introduce our first speaker. I will also ask you, when called upon to speak, to move to this podium which is directly in front of us, and for the record, to introduce yourself, to give your address, if you will, and to state your position and organization, if any. Also, I would like to remind you that if, in your presentation, you are asking questions or you would like to have some comments made on your comments, it is critical that you place your name, address, including zip code, on the comments that you submit, and if you would, also your telephone number in case any questions of clarification come up there is a way for the Department of Energy to get in touch with you.

Again, I remind you that if you wish to speak to sign up at the registration desk, and when I call on each speaker, I will also call on the on-deck speaker, and when I announce the on-deck speaker, we have set aside a row or two in the front here, in front of me for those people to sit in, so that if you would please, when you are called upon to be the on-deck speaker, move down to this area, this will increase the amount of time that you have for our presentation.

The first speakers this morning will be John Sero -- excuse me, instead of John Sero, will be Kristi Fracasso, I believe, and Jenny Pankow, are they in the room? They will not then be the first speakers.

Is Oran Hark here? Mr. Hark, you'd be the first speaker and to be followed by Bonnie Wuensche, is that correct? Did I pronounce that correctly? Is Bonnie Wuensche.

Perhaps Hili Smith? Sue Evans? You'd be the second speaker, ma'am.

Mr. Hark, please.

959 STATEMENT BY ORAN HARK

MR. HARK: I live in Campton Township on Woodland Drive and I am one of the lucky ones. If they don't stay down deep enough, they can go right through my basement. I kind of wonder just what the value of this hearing is when we're here trying to present our side, yet our Governor and his entourage are in Washington meeting with the Head of the Energy Commission. I can only assume that there can be additional promises of funds that make this entire meeting unnecessary. I would like to know just how and who will determine the value of the great oak trees that are going to lie not only on my property but along the path of this collider. These trees, many in excess of a hundred years old, not only add great beauty to our property, but also protects in the winter winds and the summer sun. My heating and air conditioning bills are greatly reduced because of these trees.

Now, these magnificent trees will be around long after we're gone if left undisturbed, but will die quickly if the roots are bothered. The collider will long be forgotten before they could ever be replaced.

I keep hearing that the people of Fox Valley should accept decreased property values, loss of water wells and all of the known and unknown problems connected with this endeavor. All of this because it will bring jobs into the State of Illinois. As a Federal project, we all realize that bids will be let on a national basis.

Contractors, materialmen will come from all states, bringing with them their supervisory and key personnel. Arizona, Colorado, Texas have vast wastelands that can house this project with little disturbance to their people, and our contractors and materialmen would still have every right to bid the jobs.

I also hear the collider will be tied into the Fermi operation. This, again, is a joke. Just knowing anything about science and the improvements are made on a daily basis, this would be like tying an old one-armed adding machine into a modern-day computer system.

This entire vast expenditure which is opposed by many learned men of science, by many men in Congress, -- in fact, the funding of this whole completed. Anyway, this will enable us to understand the "big bang" theory and it creates to the universe. I don't think that you are going to change our mind, because most of us are still going to prefer the explanation in the book of Genesis.

The estimated $4 billion cost for this endeavor will run probably double that amount if it goes like most Federal jobs do. The State of Illinois, unable to supply money for education, for adequate prisons, for protection for people on the Chicago L trains and for other programs, could certainly use their share of this money for much better purposes.

I think we ought to drop the whole thing. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Hark.

The next speaker will be Sue Evans and she will be followed by Jay Wuensche, is he here? Edward Malek, you will be the next speaker, Sir.

958 STATEMENT BY SUE EVANS

MS. EVANS: Good morning. I am Sue Evans and I live in Campton Township. I have always believed that America is a fair and just place to live, but during the course of the last nine months, I have discovered that I have been living under a delusion.

The State of Illinois has not wanted to deal fairly or justly with the people of Illinois in regard to the placement of the Superconducting Super Collider. The purposes of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution were designed to protect the minority from the majority. The tyranny of the majority.

Clearly, in this case, the majority, the Illinois State officials, special interest groups and the scientists, have victimized the minority, the homeowner, the farmer and the small businessman. Why is it that the State of Illinois was not willing to disclose the location of SSC until the very last minute? I find it amazing that Illinois officials have had literally years to compile data, survey and do research while the general public has had a meager nine months to inform themselves and enlighten themselves on the SSC and its impact on their environment.

Can you truly believe that nine months of preparation time can compare to the years that the State has had?

One area of concern is the loss of no less than 59 businesses, which in turn will reflect a loss of jobs in the area. I know the argument is that the SSC will create new jobs, but the construction jobs are merely temporary jobs and the jobs that the SSC will create are a wash compared to the existing jobs it will displace.

Another concern that is very hard to comprehend is the confiscation of 6,500 acres of valuable farm land that will be needed for the construction of the SSC. Illinois has been blessed with fertile soil, but between the developers and the SSC, where will we turn to for fertile farm land that we need to grow the crops necessary to sustain this country?

The line has to be drawn somewhere. The country cannot keep taking valuable farmland. The State of Illinois is asking people to give up something that they have worked their lifetimes to achieve. The American dream is to own a home and some land in hopes that a citizen can live there free from harm and destruction.

How can the State of Illinois mitigate the dreams of 160 families and businesses?

The Environmental Impact Statement states that all the proposed sites, except Arizona, during the construction of the SSC would disturb or displace wetland habitats. Illinois has the second largest amount of wetlands to be impacted during the construction of the SSC. Illinois states to have 850 acres of wetlands tampered with during this construction procedure. How can the State of Illinois mitigate the animals and the plant life which have been living there in tranquility in the wetlands?

There is a time when things are not to be mitigated, but to be left as nature intended.

Another interesting point of impact to the environment are the 106 historical sites located in and around the 53-mile ring. I do not understand how anyone would not be concerned about the negative impact that the SSC could place on these historical sites.

It is imperative that the Government strive to preserve the special significances that these historical sites represent. One site specifically is located in the area where surface acquisition is imperative. How will this historical site maintain its importance if it is located in a cluster of west campus buildings? Would the State of Illinois surround Lincoln's home with office buildings and west campus clutter?

My five minutes is rapidly drawing to a close and I have not yet had a chance to comment on the negative impact that the SSC will have on 320 or more wells in the area, the noise level that the SSC will create in a highly developed area of human receptors, the thousands of families that have been asked to give a portion of their land for tunneling purposes, the disposal of spoils removed from the tunnel, the possible reductions to the aquifers and the fact that the Government has asked all of these people to live on top of an experiment with all of its uncertainties.

I could go on and on because I do not believe that this project belongs in the State of Illinois. We have not forgotten Weston, Illinois, and we are not about to let history repeat itself.

In closing, I would like to quote Woody Guthrie: "Now as through this world I ramble, I see lots of funny men. Some will rob you with a six gun, And some with a fountain pen. But as through this life you travel, And as through your life your roam, You won't never see an outlaw, Drive a family from their home."

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Evans. The next speaker would be Edward Malek. To be followed by Bonnie Wuensche, is she here yet? You'll be the next speaker.

1190 STATEMENT BY EDWARD MALEK

MR. MALEK: Before I begin my presentation -- by the way, my name is Edward Malek. I live in Campton Township and I am chief legal counsel for the Citizens Against The Collider Here.

1 Before I begin my presentation, because of time constraints, I do have a detailed analysis of the quote unquote Good Neighbor Bill that was submitted by the State of Illinois. I have noted that I am submitting this on the top of the document with my name and address and telephone number on it.

In addition, because of some additions to my oral comments, I will be submitting a final draft of my oral comments at a later time.

Since yesterday, you have heard many people come before you to comment on your draft Environmental Impact Statement. Those opposed to the project told you of the adverse environmental impact this project would cause to our community, as well as pointing out the numerous deficiencies and half truths of this documents.

2 If the SSC is sited in Illinois, the State has talked about how they would mitigate the impact. This morning, I am going to discuss with you how the people will litigate. Litigate the selection of this state in the final EIS, litigate the State and Federal violations to our pollution standards and litigate safety violations.

You can be assured that if you site the SSC in Illinois, your Department and citizens I represent will be in court for next 35 years.

3 Your draft EIS is devoid of any consideration of compliance with Federal and State statutes concerning the environment. If sited in the State of Illinois, we guarantee you that there will be close monitoring during construction, as well as operation of compliance with the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Quiet Communities Act of 1978 and the rules and regulations.

4 Furthermore, your document admits that it does not meet the pollution standards as enunciated by the Illinois Pollution Control Board. The draft EIS does not discuss compliance with the Illinois Groundwater Protection Act and the Prime Farm Land Preservation Act. Dewatering may result in violations and causes of action pursuant to the Illinois Water Use Act of 1983.

5 With regard to land acquisition, my chain of legal experts is preparing a constitutional challenge to the use of eminent domain proceedings in acquiring stratified fee estates. The quick-take provisions of this State are unconscionable and do not meet the minimal requirements of the Federal Land Acquisition Policy Act of 1969.

6 Most importantly, however, you cannot, as a matter of law, site the Superconducting Super Collider in the State of Illinois due to the substantial direct and indirect adverse impact to our communities' wetlands and waterways.

On June 8th of this year the Second Circuit of the U.S. Court of Appeals decided the case of Bersani versus Robichard, which is cited 850 Federal second 36 [sic]. This decision sets a legal precedent that unequivocally disqualifies the Illinois site proposal.

In interpreting the rule and regulations of the Clean Water Act, this court states that you must determine whether an alternative site is available that would cause less adverse impacts to our Nation's wetlands. If such an alternative site is a practicable alternative, then that site must be selected.

It is clear, based upon the draft EIS, that Illinois has the second highest acreage of wetlands directly affected, and in all likelihood, the largest area indirectly affected due to the proposed dewatering siltation of the Fox River Valley waterways during construction.

It is also very clear from your document that there exists five distinct, practicable alternative sites that would have a far less adverse impact to our nation's wetlands.

This recent U.S. Court of Appeals case instructs you to select one of those five other sites.

Your failure to do so will result in litigation by the citizens in this community opposed to the SSC and in all likelihood, due to the keen competition for this project, litigation in other jurisdictions.

This is not a threat; this is not a myth. This is merely a fact. A fact of the resolve of my clients to keep this project out of their lives.

Furthermore, you can be sure that this recent case has been distributed to the other states vying for this project, or will be so in the very near future.

7 Finally, Bersani versus Robichard instructs you that a 404 Clean Water Act study must be conducted and practicable alternative sites determined at the time you enter the market to search for a site, and not after a site is selected. As of this date, you have failed to conduct such an in-depth study pursuant to the applicable code of Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 2310, et sequitur, and you have so admitted in the draft EIS, C5.1.5-17 [sic].

8 In conclusion, I must caution you concerning the resolve of my clients. They have been and will continue to be steadfast in their resolve to have the SSC sited anywhere but in their community. They are articulate, intelligent and highly sophisticated people who have the resources available to continue in their goal of opposing this project.

Don't be as foolish as our local and State officials to underestimate them. If you are, and you select this state as the site of the SSC, you can be assured of legal and political confrontations. They are not opposing this project waiting to cut the best deal; they are opposing it because it is the right and just thing to do.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Malek. The next speaker will be Bonnie Wuensche. I'm sorry. I'm probably pronouncing that incorrectly. To be followed by Hili Smith. Is Hili Smith? Is Hili Smith?

MS. SMITH: It's Hildi, H-I-L-D-I.

MR. LAWSON: I'm sorry. You'll be the next speaker.

961 STATEMENT BY BONNIE WUENSCHE

MS. WUENSCHE: Gentlemen, thank you for this opportunity to speak. Regarding Table 3-6 which is a summary of sites specific land acquisition plans. At the bottom of the chart, it is shown that there are going to be 59 businesses relocated in Illinois if the SSC is sited here.

This number is in error because it is too small. It only reflects conditions as of January 1, 1986. That is the effective date of the tax maps used by the Illinois ENR to arrive at all of their affected parcel statistics. Due to the extensive development throughout the region during '86, '87 and during the current year, many businesses have been built on areas designated as surface take regions.

Many of them are located in the St. Charles Industrial Park area while others are located near Eola. We wonder whether or not the Illinois ENR has ever found time to notify these people that their property may be confiscated. If not, it may be interesting to note what legal action might transpire, if in fact Illinois becomes a selected site.

In any case, what is important to note is that Table 3-6 clearly shows that Illinois has by far the most number of businesses which must be relocated by the SSC. In fact, Illinois stands to close up shop on better than four times the number of businesses from all the other states combined.

This, again, points out the relative density and development of the Illinois site as compared to the other six states. What does this mean for the DOE? It should again translate into a more difficult land acquisition process in Illinois and increase the odds that tunnel construction in Illinois will not proceed on the DOE's time schedule.

Several key points of information are left off of this Table 3-6. Nowhere does it show how many employees will be displaced. Nor does it show what types of businesses will be confiscated. These are not simply retail outlets. Most are very complex, sophisticated commercial and industrial enterprises.

These 60-plus businesses happen to employ well over 600 people. This represents a sizable labor force, which will be lost to the Fox Valley. In fact, this loss in employment is greater than the 500 new employees that the SSC is supposed to create at Fermilab.

Any mention of the number of lost jobs in the EIS is glaringly absent. Doesn't it seem a little odd and economically unsound to only talk about the increase in labor that will result from the SSC when, in fact, there are real economic negatives involved also?

Each and every one of these businesses that must be uprooted and relocated had very specific and complex reasons for locating where they are. Their economic well-being obviously depends upon their location.

To find exactly the same set of circumstances again for them in another location will be extremely difficult, even more difficult than evicting people from their homes and finding them other places to live.

Many of these businesses will likely shut down forever. Others will not relocate in this area because they feel betrayed by their State Government and betrayed by their local politicians who had done absolutely nothing to stop the State and the SSC from disrupting their activities.

As a consequence, the bulk of these businesses and their 600-plus employees are going to be lost to the Fox Valley region forever. This negative economic impact is never considered in EIS and is a blatant error in true cost-benefit analysis.

What is very obvious about the EIS is the completely illogical economic argument which it portrays. It points up the fact that many noneconomists have been compiling the facts and figures and have been setting policy. This cannot be tolerated. Only in Illinois does this failure to look at the negative economic impacts of the SSC or the cost of the confiscated land become so important.

No other state stands to lose the commercial development property or the existing businesses that Illinois does. The economists from Illinois proponents and from the DOE must receive a failing grade on their illogical economic approach to Illinois.

Once again, it is clear that we people of the Fox Valley are being asked to pay too high a price for this supposedly national project.

I am sick and tired of the State of Illinois' deliberate and well-orchestrated plan of poorly informing the public, telling the public only what it wants them to hear, concealing information and placing the burden of disproving its plan on the opponents of the SSC.

I'd like to know how many of the people here today who say they support the SSC and those who signed their petition have actually read the site proposal, draft EIS, all the appendices cover to cover.

Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Wuensche. The next speaker will be Hildi Smith. She would be followed by Jay Wuensche, is he here?

If not, is Victor Temple here? Perhaps Kristi Fracasso and Jenny Pankow here.

You'll be the next speakers, please.

Ms. Smith.

1192 STATEMENT BY HILDI SMITH

MS. SMITH: I live in Campton Township in Kane County. I would like to address the economic alternatives and the emotions associated with this SSC project in Illinois.

One of the major reasons why Illinois should not be the final site for SSC is due to the extensive degree of development which exists at the Illinois site. Page 4-72 and Table 4-21 both indicate that Illinois has the most complex pattern of current land uses available.

Also, Page 4-76 states that "of all seven sites, only Illinois presents a situation where growth has triggered not only an intensification of current use but also major development classification. Remaining six sites do not portray this kind of future growth."

1 This is a key statement by the EIS. Only in Illinois are current land uses leading to property moving from one land classification to a higher classification. As a consequence, the land available at the Illinois site has potential alternate uses. This is not true at the other six sites.

The fact that the property at the Illinois site could be used for other purposes actually makes this property more valuable than the land located at the other sites.

The EIS that no future land use changes are expected to occur at the other basically remote and undeveloped sites. Only Illinois stands off by itself as having alternative land uses available for the proposed SSC acreage.

2 However, this opportunity cost associated with the Illinois acreage is never taken into consideration by the EIS or by any of the economic studies prepared by the Illinois ENR, SSC for Fermilab or by the Department of Energy.

The Illinois site is unique in its economic potential, yet this fact is completely ignored by the proponents of the Illinois proposal. All economic discussions have centered around the economic benefits that will be derived from the SSC project while ignoring many of the cost components which must be considered in a true cost-benefit analysis.

Either the economists involved in preparing the EIS have made a major mistake or there were no economists involved at all.

3 Another factor that is obviously missing from the EIS is an analysis of the psychological impact which the SSC project is already having upon the affected residents at each alternative site.

In Illinois, for example, there is no discussion about the degree of involvement necessary for people to fight this project. Nowhere does it describe the animosity which has developed between the affected property owners and the government of the State of Illinois. Nowhere does the EIS describe the tremendous degree of distrust which the local community has towards our Governor, our local political leaders,
4 the Department of Energy, and especially Fermilab.

The EIS is describing local attitudes and feelings toward the SSC and its proposers. As a result, you scientists do not understand the complete hatred which we affected property owners have towards the SSC in general.

Nor do you understand that from the EIS the resolve that we people have towards insuring that the SSC will not be sited in Illinois. We are prepared to do whatever it takes to impress upon you scientists that you are not welcome here in a professional capacity.

5 Every legal means will be exploited in an attempt to force you to set this intrusion elsewhere. The EIS has failed miserably in its judgment of local attitudes, and I just want to make one thing positively clear.

The only way the SSC can come to Illinois is through the courts.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Smith. The next speakers will be Kristi Fracasso and Jenny Pankow, who will split the five minutes, I understand.

1193 STATEMENT BY KRISTI FRACASSO

MS. FRACASSO: We're students from Waubonsie Valley High School and we don't think it's fair that they're ripping down the houses and the farms to put this thing up when they could put it somewhere
1 else and it wouldn't affect them.

And it's not fair that they're ruining these places just to put this thing up.

1194 STATEMENT BY JENNY PANKOW

MS. PANKOW: I feel that the people are for it, it really shouldn't be up to the adults. It should be more up to the kids because by the time they get it up, we're going to be, you know, we'll be the future generation, not them.

And they should not worry so much about it because, you know the older people, maybe some of them won't
1 even be here any more by the time this thing goes up.

And I just think the whole thing is stupid. That's why for us, we have our own name for the SSC. It's stupid super collider. That's how we look at it as. Because I think the whole thing is stupid. Because they have no right kicking people out or tearing down farms or anything. I mean they can, if
2 the people want to, sure, they can tear them if they want to, but half these people are getting forced to move out and they shouldn't have to do that. There is no way they should.

That's it.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you both. The next speaker would be Jay Wuensche, is he here now?

Perhaps Victor Temple? Martin Friel. Michael Panesenski. You'll be the next speaker, sir.

Is Ronald Semon here? Pam Patte. Steve Watts.

Mr. Panesenski, why don't you proceed and we'll see where we stand after that.

1232 STATEMENT BY MICHAEL PANESENSKI

MR. PANESENSKI: Okay. My name is Mike Panesenski. I live in Campton Township. I would just like to run through some negatives regarding the siting of the SSC in Illinois.

Some random prairie land loss is possible. Eight hundred and fifty acres of wetlands will be impacted in Illinois. This is the second largest amount of wetlands among the seven alternative sites.

Some wetland habitat will be adversely impacted or lost. More acres of prime farm land are being removed from production in Illinois than at any other site.

More property owners are involved in Illinois than in all other states combined.

More wells will be closed in Illinois than in all other states combined.

More businesses will be closed or relocated in Illinois than all other sites combined.

Because of the above, Illinois has the most difficult land acquisition process of any site. Illinois has a regional groundwater overdraft. Groundwater usage exceeds the replenishment of supplies. Both direct and indirect water usage of the SSC will worsen the overdraft water supplies. More water channels cross the proposed ring at the Illinois site than any other. The Fox River is the largest surface water channel with the largest watershed area to cross the ring at any site. This means that the Illinois site has the highest probability for siltation of streams to occur.

The presence of methane gas at the Illinois site will pose a tunneling construction problem. Groundwater leakage into the access shafts and tunnel will be the greatest of all sites. In fact, the five-mile stretch between E3 and E4 will leak at the rate of 5,200 gallons per minutes 100 feet or nearly 2 billion gallons per day.

This water problem will place the entire construction project in jeopardy. The entire Fox Valley SSC site is covered by flood insurance maps and therefore shows a high probability for damage due to flooding. This is not true at other sites.

The sedimentation ponds located at E and F shaft sites may or may not be large enough to hold the water long enough for adequate sedimentation. This could result in immeasurable sediment impact on streams in the adjacent area. Sedimentation of our streams remains one of our major concerns.

The Illinois site has the largest number of people living adjacent to the proposed SSC facility sites. As a result, more people in Illinois will be adversely impacted by noise pollution, air pollution, exposure to airborne radionuclides, adverse visual impacts of noise and vibration impacts due to dynamiting than any other site.

Illinois is the only site with an existing groundwater quality problem. Elevated levels of radium in our groundwater supplies. The surface water quality of the Illinois site is already the worst of the seven sites. The air quality of the Illinois site is already the worst of the seven sites. Ours is the only site which is in the region of nonattainment for both carbon monoxide and ozone levels.

Only the Illinois site is located in an area that already has two sources contributing to an increase in a natural background radiation level.

Fermilab and McGee Chemical Lab. Illinois is already the site with the greatest number of potentially hazardous or toxic material sources. Illinois shows the lowest levels of public services available at all seven sites.

Our student-teacher ratios are the worst. Our health care levels are the worst of any site. And our fire and police protection for DuPage, Kane and Kendall Counties are well below the national average.

The roads of the Illinois site are the most congested of all seven sites and not only are the roads subject to breakdowns from the flow of traffic, more travel time will be required to move from point to point around the ring in Illinois versus any other site.

Illinois is already the site with the greatest number of man-made sources of radioactivity. Illinois already has the highest levels of background noise adjacent to proposed E and F shafts access shafts.

Kendall County is only one of two counties of all sites where a negative economic benefit is anticipated for the life of the project.

Production in the number of spoils, dump sites, down to four quarries in Illinois, creates renewed problems of congested truck traffic on all whole roads and at the dump sites themselves. As many as 290 truckloads of material may be traveling towards Quarry No. 1 on any given day.

Quarry No. 1 is on the corner of Route 31 and McLean Boulevard near South Elgin.

There is direct hydrological connection between the surface waters and groundwater supply at the Illinois site. This creates the opportunity for our groundwater supplies to be adversely impacted by siltation or other pollutants entering our surface waters because of the SSC construction or operations.

The inclement Illinois winters can be expected to reduce the number of available working days and thereby increase total construction time.

Because of the large number of human receptors at the Illinois site and other closeness to SSC facilities, a greater amount of mitigation changes will be required versus alternate sites. This equates to increased costs and increased construction time.

The presence of the largest and most organized local opposition to the SSC in Illinois is a problem itself. Litigation against the State of Illinois and the U. S. Department of Energy can be expected to lengthen tunnel construction time in Illinois.

Illinois is the only site where land use patents are expected to change to a higher level without the SSC. The Fox Valley site is moving from agricultural to residential or commercial. Only the Illinois site has alternative land uses. This opportunity cost is never taken into consideration in any economic assessments.

The Illinois site has the most historical sites and the most prehistoric or archaeological sites that may be adversely impacted by the SSC.

We do not want the SSC in Illinois.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Let's see if we have any -- can I have a show of hands of those people who were signed up to speak this morning who were here? So, I'm going to go through the list and if I call your name, please raise your hand again.

Jay Wuensche. Victor Temple. Martin Friel. Ronald Semon. Pam Patte. Steve Watts. Patti Gilson.

You'd be the next speaker, ma'am.

John Stafford. Tony Milsted. Kathy Bennett.

You'll follow her, please.

Janet Manns.

VOICE: Mr. Lawson, Ms. Manns is here. She's just outside finishing up her speech. She asked me to notify her when her name was called.

MR. LAWSON: Okay, fine. Would you give me a high sign when she comes in.

Robert Cesario. Phyllis Markovic. Nancy Malek. Carolyn Ludeman. Donna Bryski. John Ross. Gerald Mathers. Robert McKinney. Carol Bayer. Janet Kral. Bob Bennett. And A. Glienke.

Looks like I should have started from the end of the list instead of from the beginning.

Okay. Then, the next speaker will be Patti Gilson, and she would be followed by Kathy Bennett.

Ms. Gilson.

1195 STATEMENT BY PATTI GILSON

MS. GILSON: My name is Patti Gilson and I live in the Campton Township. Page 4-21 is in error when it indicates that only 320 wells fall within the 1,000-foot zone of the collider ring in Illinois. This number is artificially low because it only reflects conditions as they existed as of January 1st, 1986.

1 The real truth is that over 650 wells lie in the 1,000-foot path and hundreds more are in extreme close proximity to the ring boundary. The Illinois ENR has refused to upgrade their information and further lawsuits can be expected to result from the fact that hundreds of potentially affected individuals have
2 never been notified by the State or the DOE.

Page 4-21 of the DEIS is also in error when it makes the broad generalization that groundwater is not projected to significantly increase at any proposed site. The current growth statistics indicate that Kane County's population may double by the year of 2010.

If these projections are accurate, wouldn't it seem logical that groundwater use would also increase?
3 And isn't a doubling of residents significant to the DOE? Once again, subjectivity on the part of the EIS writers is evident.

This erroneous assumption is based upon two things. One, the use of outdated growth statistics as presented in the Illinois proposal and two, the erroneous assumption that the municipalities in Kane County will switch over the Lake Michigan water.

The land acquisition for Illinois that appear at the back of Appendix 4 of the DEIS are totally inadequate for the purpose that they are intended. Each site was asked by the DOE to supply detailed up-to-date property maps for their inclusion in the DEIS. Upon examining the maps from each ring superimposed above the parcels that are going to be affected through surface take or ground -- underground easement acquisition. However, you will notice that the maps for Illinois don't show any property that is adjacent to the ring. Every other state very conveniently shows the DOE how the ring lies in relation to the property adjacent to it.

The Illinois maps are the only one which try to mask the density of the population and development that exists next to the collider path and adjacent to SSC's facilities such as E, E, F and J sites.

4 In fact, numerous access shaft sites such as E8, F8, E9, F9 and J sites 1, 3 and 4 are all very conveniently left off the maps. The DOE requested specific detailed maps, and yet, Illinois failed to comply. Once again, the State ENR can be faulted for trying to obscure the public knowledge of where these facilities will be located.

Upon talking with the land management division of the Department of Energy in Washington, CATCH has learned that even the DOE is appalled by the quality of the maps as presented by the State of Illinois.

The normal procedure for an entity that is trying to win a project such as the SSC is for that organization to present as much and as detailed information as possible in the hopes of coming out on top.

Illinois, however, has chosen to deal in misinformation, secrecy and inaccuracies. The land acquisition maps provided by Illinois are simply not examples to us -- are simply another example to us that the DOE in Illinois does not want to win the SSC based on merit. They want it handed to them on a silver platter.

That is the professional side of the speech, but there is also, and I believe more importantly, a personal side. The personal side of the approximately 4,000 families that will be affected.

5 I, myself, am getting very frustrated and annoyed at the continual comparison at this project's effect on the community with the effects of the original Fermilab project.

Yes, they are both fruit, but a different variety. Fermilab, at the onset, bought up the land and homes so that the project was on Government property, so that when the experiment was in operation, no one was in jeopardy.

Do we have this security? I think not. Not when this tunnel is going right under a high school of approximately 2,600 students. I quote an article in a Dallas paper that reads, "Scientists have said
6 the resulting collision of protons would, for a fraction of a second, produce high energy conditions similar to those that may have existed in the creation of the universe." I stress the words, at the creation of the universe. How can any Government agency, State agency, et cetera, even think of putting such a project under a school?

Secondly, another statement that I hear constantly is that Fermilab didn't affect the property values
7 of the homes surrounding it. I believe this may be true, but how can this be compared with the appraisal of homes with tunnels underneath them to those homes with not. It is a ludicrous comparison. And with the legislative bill with the words, "may negotiate with" instead of the words, "must negotiate with," it is even more ridiculous.

8 If the Fermilab and State wanted this project, why not follow the first Fermilab's success? None of us want to leave our homes, but if the SSC has to come into our State, why not buy up the land that is within the 50-mile radius, or at least give the families the right to leave without penalty.

And, there would be no risk. Even the minutest chance of it, to any individual. If the Governor and officials feel that the State wants this project, why hasn't there been an official counting or ballot
9 of people within this 50-mile radius?

And I think it is because our illustrious Governor and officials are doing the proverbial, and I hope you people have seen "The Best Little Whorehouse in Texas" -- because our Governor is doing the little sidestep.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Gilson. The next speaker will be Kathy Bennett. She will be followed by Janet Manns. Is Janet Manns here?

VOICE: I'll go get her.

MR. LAWSON: Okay, if you would, please.

Ms. Bennett.

1196 STATEMENT BY KATHY BENNETT

MS. BENNETT: Good morning. My name is Kathy Bennett and I reside in Campton Township.

1 Table 3-7 indicates that Illinois has the most historical sites which may be affected by the invasion of the SSC. Also, this same chart shows that Illinois has the most prehistoric or archaeological sites that may be affected by the SSC project. Table 3-7 indicates that the Fox Valley area will experience an increase in school enrollment by 2,004 students by the first year of operation, should the SSC come to Illinois. An additional 99 teachers are expected to be needed by that time.

2 This places an additional tax burden upon the local taxpayer, a burden that we already are finding too heavy a load. Our local communities are being asked to subsidize too much of this national project.

3 Table 4-27 indicates that Illinois already has the next to worst student-teacher ratio of the states. If, in fact, we can't afford to hire these 99 new teachers, then our local student-teacher ratio becomes even worse. Is this the beautiful, socio-economic atmosphere that the State of Illinois has painted for you scientists?

4 Table 3-7 also gives the false impression that a very small amount of acreage in Illinois will receive adverse noise levels while the SSC is under construction. The small acreage figure is misleading because due to the density and the development of the Illinois site, the background noise is already the highest.

As a consequence, even though the SSC construction will make it even higher, the degree of increase is not as great as those for the other states. However, you scientists cannot ignore the fact that the overall noise level, while the greatest in Illinois, will be the greatest in Illinois, and that the greatest number of people will be the most annoyed in Illinois. The vast numbers of annoyed human receptors in Illinois should be your major concern when comparing the noise levels and statistics between the states.

5 Chart 3-7, Page 3-57 indicates that Illinois will experience a net loss of over $6.5 million during the peak year of construction in the primary counties where the SSC will be located. Yet, all along we have been told by the SSC proponents that this is supposed to be an economic boom to the area. Only the State of Arizona shows a larger anticipated loss in Illinois and that can be explained by the large amount of infrastructure improvements which must be built and financed by the state.

We might therefore ask the SSC for Fermilab to explain why this fiscal loss will occur right during the peak of construction.

6 Of perhaps even greater significance is that Table 5.1.8-8 shows that Kendall County will lose $400,000 during the first year of construction. And an additional $300,000 per year for the remainder of the life of the project. Kendall County is one of only two counties among all the counties involved in the seven states that will experience this negative financial impact.

Just why has this never been mentioned by the State or Governor Thompson and why is this project being portrayed in such a positive light when there is so many glaring negatives involved for Illinois and their taxpayers?

7 In conclusion, I would like to mention that my house is not on the ring. But, as an Illinois taxpayer and resident of the Fox Valley area, I am definitely affected.

The State of Illinois does not have the right to be spending tax monies on a project like this when it can't afford the existing projects in their budget, such as the education of its youth.

8 I ask you, where is Governor Thompson's fiscal responsibility? The construction of the SSC would be like Illinois buying the DOE a Cadillac when Illinois can only afford a Volkswagen, and because of the Congressional funding, the DOE could not afford the gas to put into that Cadillac.

The State of Illinois cannot afford this project and the citizens don't want it.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Bennett. The next speaker, instead of Janet Manns, who will be here a little bit later, is Carol Bayer. Is Carol still here? And following her would be Janet Kral.

1197 STATEMENT BY CAROL BAYER

MS. BAYER: I'm Carol Bayer and I live in St. Charles. I am for the no-action alternative. I am opposed to our tax dollars being used for the collider because of the impact on our schools, on our children.

1 The temporary transient people will increase our already overcrowded classrooms. I am for our tax dollars being used in our classrooms, not under our classrooms.

This magnetic field will go under our 3,600 children at St. Charles High School. The impact on the other schools around the desertron is just now being addressed.

2 Was this a slip-up that is wasn't discussed in the Environmental Impact Statement?

Also was deleted the discussion on increased traffic on roads past our schools and the impact this could have on our children.

3 These issues must be addressed. When I said desertron, it wasn't a slip-up. Just a reminder and a quote from Leon Lederman, Director of Fermilab, our good neighbors. Yes, he called it the desertron because he thought it needed to be built someplace undesirable and cheap.

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't know what your tax base is, but mine has been raised three times in the last year. It's not cheap.

It hasn't taken us long to feel the negative effects from the Super Collider. As we listen here today and yesterday, human beings are now being referred to as human receptors. I don't like my children being referred to as human receptors.

4 Our politicians don't know what they're talking about. In one statement in our 14th District, it has been stated that while 80 percent of the people favored the collider, the very same publication stated only nine percent of the people wanted their tax dollars spent on research and development.

Somebody out there doesn't know what the collider means. Or what it's for.

Our politicians are playing games with us. Using our tax dollars for a world collider Olympics. This race is promoted as necessary research and development. Yet, it seems to be more of a quest for setting a world record.

Please, let's leave our games at the Olympics. I support the no-action alternative.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker will be Janet Kral and she would be followed by Jay Wuensche, if he has arrived. If not, is Victor Temple here? Martin Friel. Ronald Semon. Pam Patti. Steve Watts.

VOICE: Okay. Then you will be the next one I would have called. You will be the next speaker after Ms. Kral.

963 STATEMENT BY JANET KRAL

MS. KRAL: My name is Janet Kral, and I live in Campton Township to Illinois taxpayers. In all the hoopla over the number of jobs which this project would supposedly create, the State of Illinois and the DOE have avoided discussion of the cost to Illinois taxpayers. Those costs are significant and should be considered in evaluation of the project.

They include the publicly known subsidy of $570 million from the State of Illinois to the Federal Government, plus its financing cost, plus costs of lost property tax base, local government commitments, and lower property values.

The value of the secret sealed incentive should also be included, but of course, only James Thompson supposedly knows that amount and is not telling.

The result is that the State of Illinois will be paying $1.7 billion for this project plus the value of the secret sealed incentive and its financing costs. But most of this amount is not considered in the socio-economic section of DEIS. The cost of the publicly known incentive and the secret incentive are not part of the DOE assessment. DOE answers that they are not allowed to consider these costs, even if they are public knowledge, because of the Domenici amendment. This being the case, I submit that this process of side evaluation is flawed and because of the obvious inconsistency and is therefore invalid.

If a valid socio-economic assessment is to be made, it must consider all costs including the publicly known incentive and the secret incentive. To hold that a comprehensive review of socio-economic effects has been made when these costs are omitted is lack of rigor and outright dishonesty.

The Domenici amendment supposedly protects the small states in this siting evaluation. But in fact, the effect is just the opposite. This amendment allows the States to make huge incentive offers and allows them the luxury of not having to reveal the amounts of these incentives to the taxpayers that will pay them. This situation is an outrage.

It is the result of the combined efforts of the State seeking the SSC and the DOE to deprive the taxpaying citizens of their homes, their land, their privacy and even their right to know how many of their tax dollars are to be taken for this dubious project.

And finally, I have attended this hearing yesterday, last night and this morning. I find it surprising that all the proponents there claim to be with this project, that only a handful have come to speak at this final hearing.

I think this is telling you something, gentlemen. That we are dedicated group of people and we are committed to the end. You will not put the SSC in Illinois.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Kral. The next speaker will be John Stafford and he would be followed -- is Janet Manns here yet?

If not, then Mr. Bob Bennett would be the next speaker. Mr. Stafford.

964 STATEMENT BY JOHN STAFFORD

MR. STAFFORD: I would like to thank the DOE for this opportunity to comment on the EIS and for the first, what I consider, real information on the impact of this new machine that you are trying to place someplace in the United States.

First of all, I would like to call your attention to the errors in Figure 9-20, Human Receptors Illinois SSC Site. Regarding the area shown on your drawing, PM-E3, the E9 site in Figure 9-20, you do not show the St. Charles High School containing some 2,600 students and faculty, nor the Norris Recreation Center serving 1,000 people per day.

In addition, you do not show the development of Hunt Club and Royal Fox which will add about 1,000 new homes well within a half a mile of the E9 site.

Figure 9-20 also fails to show several other schools near or on the ring such as the Kaneland High School. I have provided maps here which I will hand over to you showing the location of these sites.

I comment on this only to point out that the density of people involved in the Illinois site is much more than indicated by the State of Illinois by an order of magnitude.

The area I live in on the ring is much more densely populated than is indicated in any data provided or anything published by the State of Illinois as I have said. I do live on the ring.

When things go wrong, a lot more people are going to be affected than our politicians are willing to admit. I will speak to that later.

Concerning the densely populated E9 and the moderately populated area F9 adjacent to each other, and that a major educational complex is located almost at E9, it is difficult that the accident rate during construction will only increase by ten accidents per year.

In fact, I suggest you have to look at the local accident rate. In fact, a triangle consisting of Kirk, Dunham and Route 64 is consistently the scene of many major accidents and deaths because of the mix of trucks, commuter and school traffic.

As indicated in Volume I, Chapter 9, Section 25.2.4 [sic], Illinois is already designated as a non-attainment for ozone and/or carbon monoxide. Just how is additional traffic, with 48 to perhaps 190 additional trucks a day, leaving site E9, going to make things better? Dust, dirt, debris blowing from uncovered trucks will already be a source of additional pollution.

Illinois simply does not enforce existing laws in this area.

I would like to now address the issues concerning those of us who will be forced to live directly on the ring. Concerning those of us who will be forced to sit on top of this monster, just how safe is it?

We are told, don't worry about low level radiation. I think you've probably heard enough about that; I am not going to address that. Don't worry about the effects of -- of the magnetic and electric fields up to seven test loads of the magnet.

Don't worry about construction damage. I'm not going to address. You've probably heard enough about that already.

Don't worry about explosions in the tunnel from magnets blowing because the crunch protection does the work the coolant has lost.

That, I would like to address. At one of the informational meetings, Dr. Louch got up and said there is no chance of magnets blowing, any explosions within the ring. I found that curious.

I refer you to the book Scientific Temperaments. When Fermi was first built, in that, we find out that there was shorts to the grounds in the magnets, and magnets did blow consistently. As a matter of fact, it was almost to a point of National concern whether Fermi would even work.

Magnets have insulators in them, which may or may not be flammable. So, in fact, magnets do blow.

I now find after having a chance to read a summary of the conceptual engineering design and I am looking at the introduction of the bipole magnets and the quadrapole magnets. I find that two: One, first the magnets themselves are an evacuated pressure vessel. Hum. A pressure vessel. They can explode or implode. Two, they're evacuated through very high pressures, which would indicate if your quenching control does not work, you've got an evaporator.

Three, in fact you do use flammable materials, certainly at least in the quadrapole magnet area -- fiberglass epoxy tubes. There is uncertainty in placing this tunnel in a densely populated area.

I ask if you do or have done a downside analysis. You say here you provide redundancy in the cryogenics area by connecting a number of F sites together.

Have you asked yourself, what happens if none of them work. What happens if there are breaks in the lines? What happens if you lose current control? What happens? Do we really know? On the downside analysis, if the worst case condition should happen, is this the place to have it happen? In the most densely populated area of all? Is it?

Do these things happen? The best of engineering problems, everything is interlock. Things should work.

Well, we're familiar with a number of cases that haven't worked from the Challenger program to Chernobyl to Three Mile Island, and in fact, we find out here, even in some of our most sensitive areas, and I will leave this with you. It's from the Tribune. The Department of Energy said Wednesday that chronic equipment failure, poor operating procedures, caused nuclear reactors in the Savannah River plant to shut down unexpectedly 10 to 12 times a year for nearly two decades. Are we twice that of the civilian nuclear power industry.

All I want to say is, have you considered the greatest of all engineering principles? Murphy's law. If it can happen, it will happen.

Finally, the poignantest point I would like to make, this is an experimental project. The point is that this whole project is fraught with uncertainty. That's exactly why you are building it.

It does not belong in any populated area. This project doesn't belong in the State of Illinois. The damage that you will inflict on us is not necessary. Please do the right thing and put the SSC in another state in an unpopulated area.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Stafford. The next speaker will be Mr. Robert Bennett, Bob Bennett, and Mr. Bennett, before you begin, let me just do a check and see, are there any speakers who have registered to speak this morning who are now in attendance who have not spoken?

Okay. You will be the next speaker, ma'am.

1199 STATEMENT BY BOB BENNETT

MR. BENNETT: Good morning, gentlemen. My name is Bob Bennett and my family and I live in Campton Township, about six miles west of St. Charles. We've lived there for 15 years.

1 I am one of the authors of the CATCH document titled, "Detrimental Effects of Locating the Superconducting Super Collider in Illinois." I sincerely hope that you have had the opportunity to read the report because it seems that the EIS was modified to skirt many of the issues brought up in that document.

2 If you remember, the Illinois DOE originally had identified 46 dump sites around the ring to dispose of the excavated materials. The EIS has now identified four quarries as dump sites per Volume IV, Appendix 10, pages 13 and 14.

3 Unfortunately, in doing so, they have compounded the traffic and road maintenance problems by increasing the tonnage miles that our local road must withstand. I might add Kane County roads, not State roads. Of course, the State of Illinois will repair our local county roads. Or will they?

4 They seem to have a somewhat shady history in budgeting for highway maintenance. In the socio-economic area, a major argument used by supporters of the SSC, both in Illinois and in the Federal Government, is that there will be numerous spinoff industries. I strongly disagree.

5 I certainly cannot an industry in Illinois which was born as a result of the direct technological advances in Fermilab. Regarding the claim that great advances in technology will occur, James Krumhansl, Cornell University professor and President of the American Physical Society has

said that the SSC does not any immediate relevance to our technological or economic competitiveness. Many scientists feel that more economically productive small science is being crowded out by relevant large science projects.

Over the past day and a half of hearings, we've heard numerous evidence of discrepancies and contradictions and assumptions on the EIS.

I'll add my own very small contribution. In Volume I, Section 5.1.6.2, page 5.1.6-5 states that the depth of the tunnel in Arizona varies from 50 to 810 feet, in Colorado from 75 to 250 feet, in Michigan from 80 to 210 feet, in North Carolina from 35 to 274 feet, in Tennessee from 290 to 615 and in Texas from 65 to 230 feet.

6 In only one state -- Illinois -- does it state that the tunnel will not vary in depth below the surface. The depth is stated as exactly 432 feet. Good luck in designing the magnets for a tunnel that will not vary in any surface or depth below the surface.

This is obviously an error in which the average tunnel depth replaced the range of tunnel depth. The problem is that I sincerely doubt if anyone in the DOE edits their own documents. This is not a typo, gentlemen, it is another basic error in the data.

As scientists, you must realize that many of us now regard the EIS as theoretical science. A wish list, rather than a factual study.

You must realize that there are just too many of these types of discrepancies and discontinuities in the document. At this point, the document reflects poorly on the competence and the credibility of the DOE.

7 I advise you and implore you to correct these inadequacies in the final document. Get the facts straight. Do some investigation. Don't rely simply on the data from the State of Illinois.

A decision to select Illinois as a site for the SSC based on the existing data and analyses would be foolish.

The next report must be correct in every way because as a study using the correct data, no one would recommend Illinois as a site for the SSC.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON. The next speaker will be Janet Manns, and she would be followed by anyone else who is here who is signed up to speak this morning, by a show of a hands.

Your name, please. Okay, you would be next.

1200 STATEMENT BY JANET MANNS

MS. MANNS: Members of the DOE, I appreciate your patience. I am not a morning person.

My name is Janet Manns. I live in Campton Township.

My home, at least at this point, is not on the ring, so I am not affected.

I oppose this project for its impact on my community.

1 Our environment; I think science in some respects is raping the environment of this county, and I am greatly concerned for my neighbors, the safety of the children as they stand at the corners and wait for buses on country roads, and many other reasons aforementioned.

I would like to cite specific quotes from the Environmental Impact Statement. I believe these words, your words, disqualify Illinois as an appropriate site for the SSC.

From Volume IV, Appendix 15 through 16, page 23 from the Chapter titled, Scientific and Visual Resource Assessments, "Residential land uses are not visually compatible with the proposed project because of the obvious functional and structural contrasts between project features and residences."

2 Given the fact that are more affected land parcels residents in Illinois that in any other state combined, this is clearly the most disruptive of the seven sites and is therefore most inappropriate for Illinois.

3 From Volume IV, Appendix 5b, F16 [sic], page 37 through 38 on the subject of groundwater, "The present and projected groundwater use shown in Table 5.3.2-6 locally exceeds the estimated yield of the Cambrian-Ordovician aquifers, as is documented by the declining water levels. This overdraft condition is a significant groundwater issue in the area of Illinois."

We have said all along that we have a water problem in Illinois. Thank you for verifying that fact.

This issue alone should disqualify Illinois. Eight wells within one mile of E8. In Deer Run Subdivision when dry this summer.

The SSC will certainly compound an already existing serious problem.

Also on the issue of groundwater from Volume I, Chapter 4, page 4 through 18, "One unique groundwater quality feature identified is naturally elevated radium levels in the region of the Illinois site."

4 In Geneva alone, where I used to live, monthly water bills included warnings of high radium levels. I work for the American Cancer Society and I know that there are currently projects in the State of Florida that are investigating the problems in terms of leukemia and that as related to people drinking this water.

Illinois is the only one of seven sites with this problem. Again, we don't need the SSC to compound its existing problems.

My favorite quote from the EIS, from Volume I, page 4 through 76 is the section titled, Plan Future Land Use: "Of the seven sites, only Illinois presents a situation where growth is triggering not only an intensification of current use but also major changes from one category of land use to a new, higher development classification. The remaining six sites do not portray this kind of future growth."

Since the DOE visit in March in Campton Township alone, near the site of the proposed ring, six new subdivisions have either been started or planned. At this very moment, 219 acres of land are being cleared at the corner of Burlington and Bulkham Roads on the other side of Deer Run Subdivision.

5 The Tribune recently reported an increase of 44,000 people in one year in the counties most affected by the SSC.

The implications are far-reaching. We have tremendous growth in this area. Campton Township in Kane County in particular, has been reported as the fastest-growing area. This means their land is the most valuable in the seven sites. I'm not sure if you are aware of what the housing prices are in these areas.

Therefore, the detrimental impact to property value will be much greater for the Illinois site. Nowhere in the EIS is the subject of opportunity costs even mentioned. This is a fundamental flaw in the report.

Another factor to consider, but not mentioned in the EIS, is namely the question of whether Fermilab facility will have to be shut down to retrofit to the SSC ring, and for how long?

If the answer is yes, then the question becomes whether the United States can afford to its premiere high energy physics lab.

In the beginning of my speech, I indicated some of my reasons for opposition to the SSC in Illinois. I feel, as a taxpayer, it is prudent for our State to first consider the needs and wants of its citizens and to pay its bills.

And by the way, I've covered a lobbying effort in Springfield, and I talked with people from around the State that did not even know what the SSC was and when told, of course my view -- and I tried to research both sides of the issue initially -- they were appalled that when hospitals in their areas were closing down, our State was considering this project.

6 It is prudent for our State to first consider the needs and wants of it citizens and to pay its bills. That means to me education for our children, home, health care, et cetera. The cost of this project, as stated many times, is a plum our State cannot afford. Governor Thompson stated in the previous DOE hearings that the SSC project would be paid for out of Build in Illinois funds. And I think this is something that the DOE should pay attention to.

Last night and this morning on WFX, WNN, on a local station there was a story reported that our State Controller, Roland Barris, indicated that the State of Illinois would have to divert $47 million from its general funds purpose to build Illinois funds to cover the deficit. The spokesperson for Barris, Jeff Davis, indicated as did Governor Thompson, that these general funds are used for education and other similar purposes.

How do you think the people of Illinois will feel when taxes continue to be raised for schools and hospitals are closed for lack of State funds and our comprehensive health insurance goes unsigned and unfunded while Governor Thompson promises Secretary Herrington financial support of the SSC.

I ask you, is this prudent financial management? And does the DOE want to seriously risk this project by siting the SSC in a state that is not meeting its obligations and manipulating the taxpayers monies?

I have further issues that I would like to address and I will do so in written comment later on, to your office.

I'd like to conclude by saying that this project is the most obnoxious example of Government on the backs of the people, particularly in the State of Illinois.

7

President Reagan himself stated at the Republican Convention that it was time to get the Government off the backs of the people.

I say to you, get this project out of our communities, out of our back yards, off our backs and out of the State of Illinois.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Manns. The next speaker will be Nancy Malek.

And she would be followed by anyone else who was signed up to speak this morning in this session. Is there anyone else here currently.

All right, we'll see how we are afterwards. Ms. Malek.

966 STATEMENT BY NANCY MALEK

MS. MALEK: My name is Nancy Malek. Campton Township.

Gentlemen, I have read your draft EIS and its appendices and I would like to address my comments to two comments.

The first is Appendix 15 on the archaeology of the Illinois site. It states in Appendix 15 and I quote, "Because identification procedures are not complete, specific mitigation measures cannot be provided at this time." This is an admission that the archaeological research is unfinished. Completed archaeological information will not be made available to the public until after site selection.

Given the incomplete of Appendix 15, this information could be radically different. Data presented to the public and the Department of Energy in this appendix is not enough on which to make a sound judgment for the location of the SSC.

The information in Appendix 15 is not only incomplete, it is not uniform. Most of the data used to compile this section is information that the individual states submitted to the Department of Energy in their proposals. The quality and scope of the data was dependent on the individual state's research methods.

Information presented in Appendix 15 is based on predictive models. In other words, it assumes inventoried archaeological sites will foretell possible locations of other sites. A prominent archaeologist, who is an expert in the archaeology of northern Illinois, Dr. Charles Markham of Northern Illinois University and Johns Hopkins University, says he wouldn't give two cents for predictive models. He calls them simply an academic exercises that quantifies what collectors think they know.

This expert points out that the predictive model used in Appendix 15 was created from a data base made of information, 90 percent of which was collected by amateurs in an unsystematic manner.

In North Carolina's archaeological evaluation, the writer admits that information available is not adequate to predict numbers of archaeological sites in North Carolina.

One must wonder why the information about Illinois makes further sites predictable, even though the writer of Appendix 15 admits the survey of Illinois is incomplete.

The use of predictive models such as the one in this appendix is not adequate to evaluate much less protect Illinois archaeological resources.

The research methods in Appendix 15 are definitely lacking. The Department of Energy must recognize that siting the SSC in Illinois, based on information that is not uniform, complete or reliable, is a very irresponsible and dangerous action.

The second topic I wish to comment on concerns the map of sensitive noise receptors in Illinois. Sitting in the gym here yesterday, I heard many people mention the deficiencies of this map. I will make only one more observation.

I believe the purpose of including this map in the EIS is to illustrate to the reader where isolated homes, schools and subdivisions lie within 5,000 feet either side of the proposed SSC path. In the upper quadrant D area of this map, the State shows seven subdivision areas from site F6 just west of Elbourne to E9 in St. Charles Way.

This is a gross underestimation of the number of subdivisions are in reality a part of this area.

There are, in fact, 53 subdivisions within this corridor. Since the State has neglected to supply you with accurate data on this map published three times in the 17 volumes, I will be happy to. I am submitting to you with my notes a 1988 Fox Valley Board of Realtors map, which has all these subdivisions indicated.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Malek. Is there anyone now in the room who was scheduled to speak, in particular, Ronald Semon. Pam Patte. Steve Watts or Tony Milsted.

Yes, ma'am.

VOICE: Donna Bryski, 11:20

MR. LAWSON: Would you like to speak at 10:48?

MS. BRYSKI: Is that next?

MR. LAWSON: It is. Thank you.

MS. BRYSKI: You're ahead of schedule.

MR. LAWSON: Well, it's all messed up. I hate to tell you what my sheet looks like. Please. Thank you for coming.

1201 STATEMENT BY DONNA BRYSKI

MS. BRYSKI: Okay. Gentlemen, can you hear me?

The State and the DOE gloat about the number of jobs that will be created in Illinois by the SSC, but what if that the taxpayers are being told to commit to the SSC were elsewhere put into public or sector.

1 Wouldn't there be jobs created in this case as well?

There certainly would, and they would be jobs producing goods and services that meet the test of the competitive marketplace, not the bureaucratic boondoggles such as the proposed SSC.

Increasing land value for residential and for industrial and commercial purposes in the Illinois site area is recognized by the following statement from the DEIS Volume I, Chapter 4, page 76, and I am sure there was just someone before me that quoted this. "Of the seven sites, only Illinois presents a situation where growth is triggering not only in intensification of current use, but also major changes from one category of land use to a new, higher development classification. The remaining six sites do not portray this kind of growth. This means that only the Illinois site has alternative land uses
2 beyond the SSC. Land at the Illinois site has an opportunity cost associated with it that does not exist at the other sites. As a result, the Illinois land is much more valuable and potentially productive. In one particular case alone, 500 acres of industrial zoned land will be taken for the SSC project. This 500 plus acres in the St. Charles and West Chicago Industrial Parks has an inherent value due to the fact that it is located immediately adjacent to other commercially zoned property which currently provides over 10,000 jobs for the Fox Valley area and provided thousands more during its construction over the past 20 years.

This land to be taken would support over 8,000 permanent jobs. These potential jobs will be lost to
3 provide just 500 to 3,200 permanent jobs at the SSC, provided on whether you accept the estimates of the State or of the DOE.

4 Proponents claim that DuPage County Airport expansion will be allowed on this surface take area, but cites specific mitigations listed in the DEIS do not deal with these 500 acres.

It is said that leaseback of agricultural lands for purposes which do not conflict with the SSC might
5 be allowed. But this is preceded by the statement, these mitigations may or may not be feasible or even desirable depending upon the outcome of final project design.

But even though the DOE recognizes the facts presented above concerning development in the proposed Illinois site area, these facts are not considered in their socio-economic assessment. They only discuss positive employment impacts. And, excuse me.

6 MR. LAWSON: They have left, fortunately.

MS. BRYSKI: Okay. They only discuss the positive employment impacts and not the employment opportunities lost because of the SSC land seizure. This failure renders their socio-economic invalid.

Why would the State want to forfeit the industrial area jobs for the lesser employment projected for the SSC and why did they want to subject the Fox Valley to the environmental catastrophe that will undoubtedly result if the SSC is sited here?

The answer lies in political ego. Take an objective look at this project, Illinois. Consider all the facts, DOE. Illinois is losing more than it is gaining.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Is John Markovic here? You would be the next speaker, and is there anyone else in the auditorium at this time who is scheduled to speak this morning?

If not, Mr. Markovic, you will be the last speaker after which we will take a ten-minute recess.

Whenever you are ready, sir.

1202 STATEMENT BY JOHN MARKOVIC

MR. MARKOVIC: My name is John Barry Markovic. I live on the northern part of the ring, although I am just over the northern part, I'm not on the ring. I am within a quarter mile, though, of the access that's going on Denker Road, so I've got kind of a vested interest.

I guess I am concerned about a number of things. One of them is water and in the study I notice it mentions, which I didn't realize, we've got a local overdraft north Campton Township and that's where I'm at.

1 I have no idea what local overdraft means, other than we're short of water. I have been out there now about three years, and in the time I've been out there, the number of new subdivisions going in has increased tremendously. The amount of water this is going to be needed and used is going to keep getting more and more. There are more and more subdivisions going in.

The SSC, I understand, that while it's being built, uses up quite a bit of water. I don't know where that's coming from and once it's in place, I assume it also needs water for cooling, I think.

So, to me, that's a big problem.

The other thing that I am concerned about is traffic. There -- even in your study, it mentions you project one death per year, which I understand that's reality. Any new building, any big construction, people get hurt, whatever.

2 Traffic accidents out in that area, I don't know what problems there are now, but increasing that on a small rural area with the number of trucks coming by is going to just increase that.

My kids go to school around there. They wait on corners for school buses. Other people's kids are out there too. I assume it's the same in all the other sites. I don't know if we're any different, but that concerns me.

One thing, though, that Illinois has against is the weather. If you have ever been out there, and this is a good time of year, you get out there on some early mornings, it's foggy, you don't see till 10:00 o'clock. Are those trucks going stop and not run, and what does that do to the construction time line?

3 The winter ice and snow, yes, that's a problem. I hate to admit it, but once a year, I end up in a ditch just -- you hit an ice patch and you lose it, and for a truck, a semi, fully loaded, to lose it, it's going to cause a lot more damage than my little car and that's something to -- that I get concerned about.

Blasting. It was difficult to tell exactly from the report whether, a quarter mile away, I'm going to be affected or not. I'll go back to a childhood experience.

4 I lived a little over a quarter mile away from the Stevenson Expressway when they were blasting to put in the big foundation for that. My home was affected. We were in an apartment, and it was a little older than my home now, but got affected. Walls got cracks, et cetera. As far as I know, the State of Illinois, although they passed some sort of a law covering it, it's only for those people on the ring, not for me, right next to it. So, that's another concern I have.

Hauling of waste. I went through and I don't have the appendices that I think had exactly where the waste was going to be hauled, but out of here I got that we got four sites in Illinois. I don't know
5 where they are, but again, that kind of concerns me. What are they going to do with these umpteen million cubic yards of whatever that they are hauling up, and how does that affect streams, et cetera. I don't know, again, where they're going to put it, but that one worries me too.

One thing that I didn't see in the study is the effect on the local schools. In terms of in St. Charles we just had a tax increase which was probably warranted, that with all the new people moving in, we had a shortage of schools. So they said, fine, we'll pass a referendum and took a couple times, but they have finally passed it, and we've got another school in there.

My understanding, which I didn't get out of this, but did at the hearings earlier, is that one of the schools in St. Charles is getting lost. It's a small school, but I don't know if that's true. It's
6 hard to get straight answers sometimes.

But, that's one thing that -- are we losing schools at the expense of the SSC and are we going to get hit with another tax referendum? That concerns me.

The one thing I noticed is that supposedly, I think, we have a higher student ratio and will this influx of new construction people with their families, et cetera, is that going to just expand on that problem?

Let's see. There is probably a number of other items that I'm sure other people have covered. Those were my main concerns. I just got one, I guess, from a country's aspect. You people are working the Department of Energy, which is not working for the State of Illinois or the State of Texas or the State of Arizona, et cetera.

In my mind, one of the things you should be looking at is, what's fair? Who are you going to affect the least for the common good of all. I probably shouldn't say this in front of all these CATCH people, but I'm in favor of research and for the biggest amount of our -- if the SSC is where we're going to get the best research for our dollar, and I guess you guys decide that, then I'm in favor of it going
7 in.

But where it goes in, I think should have the least impact on people involved. One of things that came out of here is that we have "more parcels affected" that all the other sites.

Which, to me, says we're going to have more people affected here, in Illinois, and those are going to be the ones negatively affected.

I'm not saying that it's not going to not help people in Illinois, but you are going to hurt the most here, of all the sites, from what I gather out of here.

That, to me, goes back to as a country, if you are going to do something for the common good, it should be at the least expense of those involved. And I think Illinois definitely is at the wrong end there. That it just shouldn't come in here.

That's it. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Before I make a final determination on whether we take a short break right now, I would just like to ask if Robert Cesario is here. Okay. If not, we will take a short break, but before we do, I wanted to say three things.

One, I very much appreciate people's flexibility in changing their times around. We've had people who have been scheduled at 11:50 who have taken, been taken an hour ahead of time, and I've done that without asking you whether you wanted to do it or not, and I appreciate your flexibility in doing that.

Number two, I want to thank you all for your thoughtful comments that you have and the time that you have taken to come to do that.

And third, I also wanted to express my appreciation for the courtesy that you have shown to the speakers and you've set a good model which I hope that we can maintain for the rest of the day.

We will now take a ten minute and reconvene -- let's make it a 15 minute break. We will reconvene at 11:15.

Thank you.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

MR. LAWSON: I'd like to reconvene this session of hearing if I might. Just a reminder. My name is Barry Lawson and I have been hired by the Department of Energy to serve as neutral moderator for the hearing sessions yesterday and today.

We have had quite a shake-up so far in the schedule of speakers and we have bounced all over the lot taking people who were supposed to speak an hour from now or whenever, and it's important for me -- I was just checking at the break to see how many people, who have been scheduled to speak are here.

Could I have a show of hands, those who are scheduled to speak at this morning's session here who are now here.

Three of you. May I have your names, please?

VOICE: Robert McKinney.

MR. LAWSON: McKinney.

VOICE: Gerald Mathers.

MR. LAWSON: Yes.

VOICE: Cheryl Moore.

MR. LAWSON. All right. Thank you very much. Give me one second to see here where we are. Is that right, Cheryl Moore. All right, fine. Thank you.

And you two gentlemen scheduled at 11:30 and 11:35. And even if I am not on time, you are. I appreciate that.

If that's the case, then Mr. Mathers, you would be the next speaker to be followed by Mr. McKinney and then Cheryl Moore, you would follow those.

Would you please take a place at the podium.

1203 STATEMENT BY GERALD MATHERS

MR. MATHERS: My name is Gerald Mathers, and I live in Campton Township, approximately 100 feet from the E8 vertical shaft.

1 I am sure by now you have heard about the all the impact on this Kane County that this collider will bring, so I don't think I'll bore you with a whole lot of reiteration.

I do feel that we are divided into two groups here for various reasons. Those that are here to support the collider want it mainly for its economic impact and their politicians need it because they know they've already bled all the local population dry.

Those of us who are here in opposition to this site are here to try to protect our homes and businesses, or if you will, our environment. And don't want your money.

2 My home is about 800 feet from the access shaft called E8 in Campton Township. I grew up in an area of deep shaft coal mines and I understand the damage that the blasting can do to property.

I don't expect my house to withstand any of this blasting without serious structural damage, and those of my neighbors. It is my understanding that the normal method for digging a vertical shaft of this type requires that you start by drilling wells around the circumference of the shaft and continue to pump out any water coming into the shaft area 24 hours a day.

3 When you do this, you will be in the aquifer that I and all my neighbors shares, and we have seen after the summer's draught a lot of wells that had to be either dropped or dug deeper.

Therefore, I feel that my well will probably be one of them that will go.

My third concern is our county road system. This system was never built for any kind of volume or
4 weight of the construction equipment that will be needed to build this project.

So, at the completion of that, I assume we will be left completely to rebuild our county road system.

I'd like to close by saying that I hope you can see that although our local political hacks like to
5 portray us as a few wild-eyed radicals that are really of no consequence, we are, in reality, a good sized group of citizens just trying to protect our property and our families.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: The next speaker will be Robert McKinney, to be followed by Cheryl Moore.

MR. McKinney, please.

1204 STATEMENT BY ROBERT McKINNEY

MR. McKINNEY: My name is Robert McKinney. I live at 951 Maloogins (phonetic) Road, Compton, Illinois.

1 I do not live in DuPage County; I do not live in Kane County. I am Lee County; that's three counties away. We are now feeling the effect of the SSC. We are being left out of the information system that has developed for Kane County and DuPage County.

Just recently there was a large farm progress show. At that farm progress show, if you went around and asked how many of the people from that area were familiar with the SSC, the word was, was is it?

2 They aren't aware that the farm land is being taken away in the local area, what effect it will have on them. We know that our taxes will have to go up to pay for this giant balloon they want to float here.

3 For the first time, we're getting to know a little bit of what is going on out there. Yes, information has been available, but it hasn't hit the local papers once you get out of these two counties.

4 The State is not really aware other than locally what is going on. The people out there have not been informed. We are concerned out in those areas with the opposition that is here as far as dumping the waste coming out. What effect will it have on us? We don't know yet where this waste will be dumped.

5 Economically, it won't affect us that much out there, other than taxes. We don't feel we have to pay for a billion-dollar project that we feel could be put in an area that would affect far fewer people.

We would like our politicians to inform us a little bit in the outlying areas.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Besides Cheryl Moore, who will speak next, is there anyone else here who is scheduled --

VOICE: John Ross.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Mr. Ross, you will follow Ms. Moore.

967 STATEMENT BY CHERYL MOORE

MS. MOORE: Hi. My name is Cheryl Moore. I live in Kendall County in the town of Montgomery. I am in the Border Hills subdivision and I'm supposed to be one of the houses on top of the collider ring.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my opposition to the location of the proposed Superconducting Super Collider in the State of Illinois.

In particular, I am opposed to the location of this toy for scientists because it has not been demonstrated to me, either in writing or in any of the lectures presented, that it will be totally harmless to the Fox Valley resident.

My concerns, in fact, have been dramatically increased since I have read the Environmental Impact Study. If there are truly no reasons for me, my family and my neighbors to be concerned, why does the EIS concern itself with vibration sources located near the ring? It is clear that vibrations will have an impact on the collider.

In the Environmental Impact Statement, Appendix 5b, you have listed, freeways and et cetera, but even more importantly, you list railways with type 3 and total number of lines 8, rock quarries 3, sand and gravel pits 38, and an additional five.

There is no real mention of local drilling activities of wells in the area considering the projected growth.

Why has the EIS concerned itself with listing these sources of vibration? Will impact -- will, excuse me. Will these sources impact the collider to create maintenance costs not figured into the costs of operation through cracked magnets?

Referring to the earlier question regarding a lost beam, could the beam contaminate someone's water supply or even endanger their life?

Before you scoff at these questions, please take a moment to reflect on the number of times during the past 50 years our Government or rather our politicians have asked us to trust the Government's decisions

We have our best interests at heart and yet 20 years later, when the true impacts are known, all they can say is, we are sorry. We didn't know.

We, the people of the Fox Valley area, disagree with our Governor, a man for whom we have little respect given his callous and cavalier approach to his constituents.

I say, say no to the SSC in Illinois.

MR. LAWSON: *The next speaker will be Mr. John Ross and he would be followed by Carol Ludeman.* Is she here?

And, if she's not -- excuse me one second, sir. Is A. Glienke here?

VOICE: She will be back in a second.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. She is the only other speaker that I have scheduled this morning, so when she comes in, I am going to give me a little high sign.

Thank you very much. Mr. Ross, proceed.

1205 STATEMENT BY JOHN ROSS

MR. ROSS: Thank you much. Today we meet to discuss the future of the Fox Valley and the welfare of this nation.

That much has been made of the arena of science and politics. The need for pure science -- for a pure scientist to sell the politician by giving him a pork barrel instead of a direct result is the same tactic that was used to create Fermilab and destroy the Village of Weston.

The merits of this project are lost on the idea of job creation. Who is the direct beneficiary? Well, it's not the general public. No, this will not benefit -- be the benefit for the pure science at the cost of the applied science and the general public.

Will Illinois be ahead of our foreign competitors because of the SSC? I think a big no.

They want us to build it; then they will reap the benefits. Look at the flags at Fermi and see its beneficiaries. Example, Poland, China and other countries. The return to Illinois and the United
1 States are doubtful.

We will have to spend money to improve a small segment of the scientific community to the detriment of the whole. This project will not save American jobs. It will not create new small industries. It will not improve health care or cure AIDS. It will not raise the minimum wage or set better standards than the EPA or OSHA. It will not help public housing or feed the hungry.

It will not give Illinois or America an economic security for the 21st century. I have joined the political arena and I am opposed to this project in Illinois or in the Nation.

Now, I will address a few areas of concern for me. These are three areas of concern.

They are the radioactive dump at Fermilab. The SSC generating of low-level radioactive in the future expansion site for the SSC.

Your DEIS, in Volume IV, Appendix 5 on page 78 fails to address the Fermi facility as a site for radioactive waste storage are dumb. I must raise the concern of the SSC as an onsite dump for low-level radioactive and radioactive hazardous mixed waste by the DOE. But the tighter controls of radioactive hazardous mixed waste by the DOE.

2 With the tighter controls of radioactive hazardous mixed waste, off-site storage is a problem for Fermilab. Also, old radioactive parts from other DOE site such as Brookhaven, Argonne and other areas as Oak Ridge and others, have been shipped to Fermi, along with Fermilab parts are dumped on the site.

This dump area of Fermilab is called the bone yard and Fermilab's 1987 report, environmental report states, "The primary radioactive waste storage area on site, the bone yard, is also the primary source of off-site gamma radiation, activated accelerator components and shielding primarily are in concrete and stored at the bone yard for future disposal or reuse following radioactive decay." In addition, there is an area nearby designated for radioactive material for future use. A large amount of low-level radioactive material has been placed in that area. The extent of this radioactive waste dumped on-site at Fermilab should be made by the DOE and the State at this Environmental Impact hearing.

I must also note that the DOE's estimate of 8,000 cubic feet of low-level radioactive waste for the SSC, using the Fermi models disputed by Lawrence Jacobi of the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Depository Authority.

3 In June 1987 issue of Nuclear Waste, Jacobi puts the figure more accurately at around 30,000 cubic feet of radioactive waste and radioactive hazardous mixed material. He states his reasons.

First of all, the SSC is twelve times as large as Fermilab and second, the 8,000 cubic feet of waste reported by Fermilab is the volume shipped annually, not the volume produced. A high guess of 6,500 cubic feet is gained by Jacobi in conversations with Charles Zonick, Fermilab's manager, waste services.

So, with the range of 8,000 to 6,500 cubic feet, I am expressing concern that this will represent 3.5 to 28.6 of Illinois' total low-level radioactive waste. I feel this volume of low-level radioactive waste could have a severe impact on the Central Midwest Compact Site.

I would also like to challenge the Governor and the State of Illinois to publicly state for the record if the Butterfield homes would be purchased now or in the future for the future expansion of the SSC.

Volume IV, Appendix 5, page 114, Table 5.3.10-1 and Volume IV, Appendix 5, page 112 raise concerns about the Butterfield area. Both the State and the DOE templates for the SSC show the south Butterfield area as a site for future expansion of the SSC. I must note that this purchase for future expansion is last on the timetable for the SSC acquisitions.

4 The State has only made oral assurances that this area is not in the State's proposal. As noted in your DEIS, it still mentions this area in tables and comments for future expansion.

This DEIS does not have any references to a State withdrawal of the Butterfield area.

The Butterfield question should be out on the table and not under the table. These Butterfield residents deserve a better fate and a better answer from the State and the DOE.

Now, I'd like to close with a statement from the book of Proverbs and I will just change the words "king" to "government."

5 In Proverbs 29, Verse 4: "When a government is concerned with justice, the nation will be strong. But when it is only concerned with money, it will ruin their country."

Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Ross. The next speaker will be A. Glienke, is that correct?

1206 STATEMENT BY A. GLIENKE

MS. GLIENKE: I can't begin to give you all the figures that he has. I'm just an ordinary housewife very concerned with my home.

Mr. Chairman and committee, my husband and I moved to St. Charles three years ago. We will have to live above the tunnel. If we had any idea that they were going to put it here, you can be sure we would have never moved here.

1 The rest of our lives will be devastated by this as we are senior citizens.

When this site was picked for the SSC, did they even give a thought to how many people would be devastated by it? How can you even think of putting such a gigantic project in an area that has so many people, homes, business, farms and schools?

2 How can you ask we, the people, to take a tremendous loss on our homes, and we will.
3 How can you ask the people to live through ten or more years of blasting, dynamiting and having damage to our homes?

How can you take a beautiful, heavenly area, a populated area and cover with much ugly cement, factory-
4 like structures? Why should we, the people, have to live above a tunnel -- a 53-mile tunnel where they play around with atoms and components? The scientists cannot prove that it could not explode. They said if it did, it would blow out all the magnets and the radiation would go into the rocks.

5 Can you ask so many people to live above and around this danger? How can you ask us to take a chance on our water? We can't afford to lose any wells. With all the new homes being built in this area?

The scientists are predicting our weather is going to get hotter and we had better take care of our water. Remember last summer?

6 Our streets are crowded now. We don't need many more trucks loaded with rocks crowding and destroying them too. Where will 53 miles of rock go? We are looking for places to put our garbage. We can't handle 53 miles of rock.

7 Most of all, how can you even think of putting, think of putting the SSC under our schools?

It would be cheaper and safer to put the SSC under open land, the Government has a lot of it. Illinois
8 can't afford the SSC. We are closing hospitals for lack of funds. Criminals are being let out because there is no room for them.

Governor Thompson wants to raise our taxes because we are in trouble.

I could go on and on.

9 And last but not least, the experts and the scientists have been wrong many times in the past on safety. Remember Three Mile Island, remember Love Canal. Asbestos in our schools. Agent Orange. Chernobyl. DDT. And now we have to face radon?

Please, please, don't put that here.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, ma'am. Are there any other people here who are registered to speak this morning.

If not, what I chose to do is to recess at this point and we'll reconvene this afternoon at 2:00. However, I would like to ask the panel and the recorder to remain until ten minutes to 12:00 just in the small case that somebody who was pre-registered shows up late and we can take them this morning.

Assuming that they don't show up, we will now recess this session until this afternoon, and we thank you for your cooperation. And I remind you that the building will not be open until 1:30, one half hour before the start of this afternoon's session.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

(Whereupon the hearing was recessed to reconvene at 2:00 p.m. the same day.)

FOURTH SESSION

(October 7, 1988: 2:00 p.m.)

MR. NOLAN: Good afternoon. I want to welcome you to the Department of Energy's public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Superconducting Super Collider. For those of you who have been with us this morning, or yesterday, these remarks may be a little bit redundant, but we would like to offer them to you anyway. Particularly for those who have not been in our hearing session so far.

My name is Dick Nolan and I am the deputy executive director of the SSC Site Task Force. I am the presiding official for this session of this public hearing. You probably know that a concurrent session of this hearing is taking place in the gymnasium next door.

The purpose of my brief remarks is to tell you why we are all here. After my remarks I will ask our session moderator Mr. Barry Lawson, who is seated here to my right, to outline how we will conduct the meeting this afternoon.

The purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens an opportunity to comment in person on the draft Environmental Impact Statement. This hearing is not your only opportunity. You may also send us your written comments which must be postmarked by October 17, 1988.

We want you to know that we are sincerely and genuinely interested in your comments on the draft EIS and that each of your comments will be considered and responded to in the final document. Let me go back now and refresh your memories as to how we got to this point in the site selection process. In January of 1987 President Reagan's decision to proceed to the SSC was announced and he in turn requested construction funds from the Congress.

In April 1987 the department issued an invitation for site proposals. We subsequently received 43 proposals and 36 of these were found to be qualified. These proposals, the qualified ones, were forwarded to the National Academies of Science and Engineering for further evaluation. Based on a criteria that we laid out in our invitation, the Academies recommended back to us a list of the eight most excellent sites that they felt best represented our needs.

One of those proposals was later withdrawn by the Department. Following a review and a verification of the Academies' evaluation, Secretary Herrington announced the Best Qualified List, the most excellent list of sites, including the State of Illinois proposal, on January 19, 1988.

On January 22, 1988 the DOE formally announced that it would develop an Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed SSC. In February of 1988 we held scoping meetings in each of the seven states to obtain public comment on the nature and the scope of the environmental issues to be considered in the EIS.

Scoping meetings were held here in Illinois on February 18, 1988. Out of this process in Illinois and at the six other sites, we received about 2,000 comments on the nature of the issues that should be considered in the EIS document. These comments were in fact considered in the preparation of EIS. That is the subject of our hearing this afternoon. Following public hearings here and in the other six states, and those other six state hearings are now completed, we will develop a final EIS to be issued in December 1988.

The draft EIS that we are talking about today evaluates and compares four alternatives. First, the site alternatives. That is looking at the environmental implications of siting the SSC at the seven site locations.

Technical alternatives, those include considering different technology equipment or facilities. Programmatic alternatives, using other accelerators, international collaboration on the project, or delaying the project.

Finally four, the no-action alternative, which is in fact the option not to construct the SSC at all.

This draft EIS identifies and analyzes the potential environmental consequences expected to occur from siting construction and operation of the SSC at the seven sites. Let me again repeat to you where they are. They are located in Arizona, in Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee and in Texas.

This draft EIS gives us as much information as we now have at this stage of the development of the project regarding potential environmental impacts of the proposed construction and operation of the SSC at each of the alternative sites. However, the DOE recognizes that further review underneath is required prior to construction and operation of the proposed SSC. Accordingly, following selection of the site for the proposed SSC the DOE will prepare a supplement to this EIS to address in considerably greater levels of detail the environmental effects of siting the machine at the selected site and measures that could be considered for minimizing impacts at the selected site.

Let me tell you a little bit more about the draft EIS. It is a very large document. It involves more than 4,000 pages. And it is organized into four volumes. The first volume is entitled, Environmental Impact Statement. Volume II does not exist yet. It is reserved for your comments and responses to your comments. It will appear published only in the final EIS.

Volume III outlines for you the site selection methodology that we are pursuing. Volume IV contains 16 appendices providing detailed presentations of technical information which back up the conclusions in the EIS.

Comments received at this hearing will be used by the DOE to prepare the final document this December. It will identify the department's preferred site, which I said will be designated in late November.

No sooner than 30 days after the final EIS is distributed, the department will publish its record of decision, which will include the final site selection and complete the site selection process.

This afternoon we are going to use the services of a professional moderator to assure a fair and orderly proceeding. Measures have been taken to permit the maximum opportunity for interested citizens to utilize this session for expressing their comments. We urge all participants in this afternoon's meeting to focus their comments on the draft EIS and avoid statements, respectfully requesting that you avoid statements aimed solely at support or opposition for the State of Illinois proposal.

While all comments will become part of the formal record of this proceeding, those that you give us that specifically address EIS will be the most helpful to the department in preparing the final document.

As I noted earlier in addition to this opportunity for oral comments, individuals may also provide us written comments. They should be postmarked by October 17th. That is the end of the formal 45-day comment period. If we receive them on that kind of a time scale it insures that we can consider them and include a response in the final document. We will, however, to the extent that we can possibly, consider comments received after October 17th.

One final word on the role of EIS and the site selection process. The National Environmental Policy Act requires that environmental impacts be considered by Federal decision-makers in considering actions with potentially significant environmental consequences.

EIS is one of the methods used to do this analysis, provide for public participation, such as the hearing event this afternoon, and prepare a complete and total document. This afternoon you will be addressing a panel composed of myself and Linda McClain to the right of Mr. Lawson. You will see that sometime during the course of the afternoon Linda and myself may be spelled off by Mr. Bill Griffing and Mr. Jay Hunze, respectively. Now I would like to introduce Mr. Barry Lawson who will outline for us the rules and conduct of how we will proceed with our meeting this afternoon. Barry.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you and good afternoon. Once again my name is Barry Lawson. I am a community relations specialist and president of Lawson Associates of Concord, Massachusetts. As an outside consultant I have been hired by the Department of Energy to serve as a neutral moderator for this hearing. A court reporter for this session is Tim Devine, to my left.

As Mr. Nolan has said, the purpose of this hearing is to give interested citizens an opportunity to comment on the department's draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Superconducting Super Collider.

In February the department conducted a scoping meeting here in Illinois to listen to and receive comments on what should be considered in the preparation of the draft EIS. DOE has now prepared the draft and seeks comment on this document which is more specific in detailing the potential environmental impact of siting the SSC here in Illinois and in six other states.

When we begin the comment period in a few minutes I will announce each speaker, working from a list which will be provided to me by the people at the registration table. I will take the speakers in the order in which they have signed up in advance, with appropriate respect for public officials.

As this is a hearing to receive comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, your comments should focus on issues addressed in the draft document. If I find the comments are wandering from the topic of this session I may remind you to focus your comments more sharply. This is not intended to limit your remarks, but rather to assure that they are as effective as possible in achieving the objective of this hearing as set forth by Mr. Nolan, the presiding official for the hearing.

To provide interested people with a fair opportunity to express their views, I have established the following rules for the conduct of the hearing this afternoon. Also I should mention that there will be a session this evening starting at 7:00. Advance registrants will be meeting in the gymnasium. Many of you may have heard that the evening session will be in the auditorium. It will be in the gymnasium. However, this team will be in the auditorium for people who are walk-in registrants.

All comments will be limited to five minutes, unless otherwise noted by me. I will try to remind you when you have 30 seconds remaining and your cooperation will be greatly appreciated by the panel and of course by other members of the public, who will then have an adequate opportunity to share their views as well. I will attempt to take people at their scheduled times, although if some of the presentations run less than five minutes we may be able to run a little ahead of schedule. You are encouraged to submit written comments to us before or after your presentation. We have a black in-box at the table to the left of the podium, to your right, for you to put them there if you will.

Also I should mention that we had a considerable shake-up in our schedule today. So that if you are scheduled to speak sometime during the afternoon I would appreciate you sticking around because the way the schedule works we may be able to take you considerably earlier than your scheduled time.

Nevertheless, at approximately 30 minutes before the scheduled end of the session, I will call speakers who have registered at the door today, or who have registered but had not been called earlier. Therefore, again, any of you who do wish to speak I urge you to sign up at the registration table in the lobby.

For those of you who may wish to submit written comments later, the deadline is October 17. All comments, whether they be oral or written, raised on the content of the draft EIS will be made part of the record to be considered by the Department of Energy as it prepares its final Environmental Impact Statement.

A couple of words about the use of this building. You are reminded once again that this is a smoke-free building. There is no smoking allowed at any time in any areas of the building. The cafeteria is for student use only and is not available to the general public. A snack bar directly opposite the entrance to the gymnasium is available for your use. As the hearing is being held in this high school with students and faculty in attendance during many of our sessions, we request that you restrict your movement for this hearing to the meeting rooms and the registration areas. Please do not loiter in the corridors.

This building will be open for public access this afternoon and again this evening beginning at 6:30. We all would like to thank the Waubonsie Valley High School and the School District 204 for the use of their facilities for these hearings. We request that everyone attending and participating in these sessions respect high school property and help us to keep it clean. You are also reminded that again that today's hearing is being held in two rooms, this auditorium and the gymnasium.

If you are registered to speak at the hearing please make certain that you are in the room assigned to you at registration. If you are uncertain as to which room you have been assigned, please check with the registration table.

I would like also to make one more comment about noise. We are a little more fortunate here than in the gymnasium because the acoustics are that much better. Nevertheless, I must request that we keep noise and conversation to an absolute minimum, both out of respect to the presenters and to the panel who will be trying to hear and understand the comments being made. And particularly for the recorder who is making sure that we have a complete record. For that purpose and for that reason I ask you that if you do feel it necessary to have some conversations that you do so in the outer lobby. I will announce any further procedural rules for the conduct of the hearing as may be necessary. Again, your cooperation with these procedures and accomplishing the objectives of today's session I greatly appreciate.

I must note that I congratulated the people who were in here this morning as being most courteous as well as thoughtful in their comments. They set a good example and I trust that that example will continue over to this afternoon.

It is now time to introduce our first speaker for the afternoon. I will also ask you when called upon to speak to move to this podium which is in front of me and for the record to introduce yourself, give your address if you will, and state your position and organization if any. Also, I would like to remind you that if in your testimony you are asking questions or submitting a written testimony, that you include your name, address including zip code, as well as your phone number in case any clarifications are required of your question so that they may be answered appropriately in the final EIS.

I remind you that the panel to my right has the responsibility, number one, to listen to your comments and if necessary to ask any clarifying questions necessary to create a complete record of your comments for the contents of the draft EIS. Once again I remind you, if you wish to speak and you have not registered so far, that you do so at the registration desk. Now I will be calling each speaker in turn and at the same time announcing the follow-up speaker so that you may be prepared. We have set aside the first row of seats down here in the lower left for upcoming speakers. So if you hear your name called as the next speaker, if you would approach the on-deck circle, which happens to be these seats, it will facilitate the movement of the program and of course give you a greater period of time in which to speak.

The first speaker this afternoon would be Brian John Stafford. Is Mr. Stafford here? Very good You will be followed by Ms. Lucille Denker. Is Ms. Denker here? Very good. You will be the second speaker, ma'am. Mr. Stafford please.

1207 STATEMENT OF BRIAN JOHN STAFFORD

MR. STAFFORD: My name is Brian Stafford. I am from St. Charles. I am a student at the University of Chicago. I would first like to thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak.

1 The first thing I would like to talk about is the congestion that this project would cause on our highway system. The SSC would have a great number of roads available to it in this area. But ours are only ones which are subject to stop and go traffic.

2 An increase generated by the SSC traffic would only make matters worse. It would take more time to travel from point to point around the Illinois ring than any one site, than any other site. Perhaps an even greater importance is the fact that the EIS facts do not take into account the abnormally harsh winters in Illinois. There is quite a bit of snow drifting onto the roads in this area that can make it even impassible to four wheel drive vehicles.

3 Section 3.6 of the EIS indicates that there are three specific types of mitigation which the DOE considers. The third type which is described are those which could be but are not required to be developed during the final project design in order to reduce the anticipated adverse impacts of the project.

Included in this group of mitigations are proposed changes that would reduce noise impacts, air quality problems, blasting and vibrational problems, et cetera. The key thing for everyone to remember here is that the DOE and the EIS specifically indicate that they need not make any changes in their plans if they desire not to. All such mitigative measures are something that could occur rather than should or will occur.

This leaves far too much control in the hands of the scientist from the DOE. It seems that the only way the SSC can be mitigated in the Fox River Valley is that it is mitigated right out of the state.

4 The last thing I would like to talk about is in fact the Environmental Impact Statement itself. I did not have as much time as I would have liked to to go over it. I just returned from basic training with the Army and I went right back to school. I only had this morning and parts of last night to go over it and I specifically concentrated on Chapter number Five which deals with the impact on the environment.

I do not have a large background in ecology. But I did take several ecology courses when I was a biology major. It appeared to me that the whole statement was hastily done and incomplete. There were things discussed and you were given the facts this could happen or might happen. We were not told how much of it would happen or where it would happen.

5 One example of this is, I am sure everybody uses this example quite a bit, it is the Indiana bat migrates north here in the summertime to breed and raise its young and then it migrates back south. The Environmental Impact Statement mentioned that these bats need a tree with a diameter of I believe it was 16 inches in order to raise their young. The statement did mention that during construction of the ring they would leave these trees alone for the period when these bats were raising their young. Then they would be taken down.

The statement did not address what percentage of these trees would be destroyed in construction of the ring. It did not address the effect that this would have on the following year of the returning bats. Would there be enough trees for them to maintain their population, or would the number of trees be so depleted that the number of the species would fall off?

6 There was mention of a ground sink where certain portions of land could fall. Where along the ring would this happen? Just in certain areas, or around the whole ring? How much, how many feet, inches? No mention of this at all. What would the effects be on certain habitats? We have various habitats around the ring, everything from wetlands to tempered woodland forests. You can change a habitat very significantly by dropping its altitude two feet. You can take something that was a tempered woodland and turn it into a marsh, if it is next to a marsh. You can take something that was a marsh and turn it into a lake. Again, not addressed at all. Absolutely no statement as to the effect it would have on the habitats.

7 As far as the blasting goes, I read in there about decibel levels, how much noises would occur. My question in that area is, what effect is this going to have on livestock? I have been working with and training horses my whole life. They scare very easy. It does not take much, horses or cattle, to start them running around the pasture. My question is, if some of these horses and cattle run through barbed wire fences, are the farmers going to be reimbursed for the loss of these animals? Again, nothing in there about the effect it would have on livestock.

The statement also mentioned certain birds. The most notable of them were falcons and the bald eagle. Claimed that the SSC would have no effect on these animals whatever. Birds are very susceptible to any type of contamination in the environment because whatever they eat goes into the makeup of their egg shells.

8 There was a very large problem with the bald eagle several years ago because of DDT building up in the eggshells. The eggshells were extremely weak and therefore the embryos could not develop to maturity. Will the SSC and the water it dumps into the rivers and creeks be putting any kind of contaminates in there that can contaminate the fish that these birds eat? I do not know that, but it should have been addressed in the statement.

Also the water levels will be changed evidently, from what I read. There will be a certain amount of seepage into the tunnel, pulling it out of the ground, that will be put back, pumped out of the tunnel and dumped back into the rivers. Well, is it going to be dumped back where it came from? Again, you
9 are thinking about you lower the ground level and you are going to be drying out marshes and wetland. If you dump it back into areas that are not capable of handling the drainage you can end up flooding farmers' fields and again changing habitats. It seemed like from my reading it, all that happened was it raised more and more questions in my mind that were not answered and that should be answered because they are important to all of us here.

That is really all I have to say and I would like to thank you for this opportunity.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Stafford. The next speaker this afternoon will be Lucille Denker and she will be followed by Judith Hemingway. Is Judith Hemingway here? You will be the next speaker. Ms. Denker please.

968 STATEMENT OF LUCILLE DENKER

MS. DENKER: Thank you. Department of Energy, fellow Americans, I am not opposed to furthering science for the benefit of mankind. But I am opposed to putting the Super Collider in St. Charles and Illinois.

Have you looked at the back of the ring? Have you seen that the collider is to go under our newly built high school? How could you do a thing like that? What right have you to endanger the lives of our youth? Our high school is the result of the kindness of its benefactors, the Norris family. They loved St. Charles. They wanted to help our youth. Now you come along and want to put their lives in danger.

Do not tell me the collider will be safe. So were the others until they blew up. The Pledge of Allegiance to the American flag states with liberty and justice to all. Putting the collider under some people's homes and not others is not justice to all.

Foreigners have the American dream. Come to America. Build your own home and live in peace. Putting the collider under people's own homes is absolutely wrong. It is absolutely wrong to endanger their lives in their own homes.

This is a moral issue also. Fermilab is not built under homes. No matter how much you pay a person, your money can never bring back a loved one killed in an accident. Think about it. This is America. Do not put the collider in St. Charles. Put it in the wide open spaces. Put it where people will not be hurt. We have plenty of space. Use it. All mankind will benefit from it wherever it is. Give us the peace in our homes we are entitled to. Do not put the collider in Illinois. Lucille Denker, thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mrs. Denker. The next speaker will be Judith Hemingway, to be followed by Carol Williams. Is Carol Williams here? Thank you. Ms. Hemingway please.

1208 STATEMENT OF JUDITH HEMINGWAY

MS. HEMINGWAY: My name is Judith Hemingway. I am from St. Charles, Illinois. Ladies and gentlemen, the industrial style facilities of the proposed SSC have no place in our residential communities. If this were not a political money grab our local zoning ordinances would not allow this to be built.

We must recognize that the effect of the SSC will be distressing, intense and gravely offensive to those of us forced to live inside, over and around the ring. It will be like having a ball and chain
1 on and not being able to escape.

The information and solutions offered to the public in Appendix 16 of the EIS are an inadequate attempt to mitigate the offenses that the SSC will have on the scenery on and near the proposed site. Appendix 16 has admitted that there are many inconsistencies. Decided what is significant, decided how sensitive the public was in the area and offered decisions based on opinions by people who are not in [copy missing] professions.

Appendix 16 makes two important admissions. One, the residential land uses are not visually compatible with the proposed project because of the obvious functional and structural contrast between project features and residences. Two, the industrial appearances of the proposed structure is not in keeping with the predominantly agrarian look of the land, nor are the facilities compatible with the natural appearing lands. These are very strong statements concerning what will be built if the SSC comes to Illinois.

Also listed in Appendix 16 are some of the impacts of construction. This list speaks for itself. The appearance of cut-and-fill slopes. Clear areas before they are revegetated. Excavated areas prior to building construction. Stockpiles of dirt, sand and gravel. Spoils disposal areas. Temporary water supplies. And utilities including night lighting, waste systems, fence laid on areas for building
2 materials, equipment yards and contractor offices.

Appendix 16 shrugs off the impacts of construction by saying that they can be expected to occur for less than two years. But we all know that Government contracts conducted on a cost-plus basis tend to go on and on and on.

The writers of Appendix 16 obviously have underestimated the impact of truck traffic and constant construction noise on residences nearby. Two-lane roads where our children wait for school buses will
3 be turned into four-lane highways.

The disturbance of the dynamiting alone much less the view of endless streams of truck traffic is case enough to site the SSC in an area of lower population. This intrusion is inexcusable to our neighborhoods.

Appendix 16 also discusses the sensitivity of the public. How did the DOE decide how sensitive the Illinois public was? Texas was allowed to vote on whether they wanted the SSC. Did the State of Illinois or the DOE take a poll or a survey to determine how sensitive the Illinois public was near the
4 proposed site? If this was done it was not mentioned and I was not asked. The only attitude that we can be sure of is the lack of sensitivity of our area politicians to the voice of the Fox Valley. The politicians must have been the ones who decide how sensitive the Fox Valley was. Their decision was wrong. We are very sensitive.

What is said is that with a project of this size so many people are motivated by greed and the promise of large Federal spending. In discussing the screenings done at individual construction sites, Appendix 16 states best professional judgment was used. Those mentioned as contributors were listed as a quality control technician, an administrative assistant and a secretary. Do these persons have the qualifications to render judgment on visual aesthetics?

5 Finally, Appendix 16 admits that the structures connected with the SSC will not be compatible with our scenery. It leaves important decisions about visual impact and the sensitivity of the public up to people who are not professionals in this field.

If this continues to go any further in the Fox Valley, resistance will continue to grow, just as it has since your first hearing. The DOE must realize that the citizens of the Fox Valley are highly sensitive and we will resent in the long term the presence of the SSC in Illinois. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Hemingway. The next speaker will be Carol Williams. She will be followed by Eileen Haslem.

1209 STATEMENT OF CAROL WILLIAMS

MS. WILLIAMS: My name is Carol Williams and I live at 7 N 140 Nancy Lane in St. Charles. I would like to address the groundwater issue.

Page 5.1.2-29 of the EIS indicates that impacts to groundwater resources during the operational phase of the SSC will be the greatest at sites which have currently overdrafted groundwater resources and/or where increased groundwater use would create or worsen an already existing groundwater overdraft.

Both of these conditions exist at the Illinois site and we can therefore expect the day-to-day operations
1 of the SSC to have a greater impact at our proposed site compared to the other alternative locations.

Our regionally overdrafted groundwater situation is well documented in the EIS. However, the local groundwater situation is not. The EIS only replies to information as presented to the DOE in the individual site proposals presented by each state. It is an error on the part of the EIS and our State Department of Energy and Natural Resources not to have included the fact that a groundwater supply problem exists in Campton Township on the northern arc of the ring.

State Water Survey members of the Kane County Board and the Kane County Building and Zoning Department are all well aware of this local groundwater shortage situation which is developing. Numerous indi-
2 viduals have recently been forced to either dig entirely new wells into the underlying sandstone -- or to have had to redrill their existing well to adapt where the pump can be lowered into a more adequate source.

This can be verified by talking to any of the well drillers in the local area. And I personally live next door to someone who had to do this.

Indications from the State Water Survey are that further development in the northern Campton Township area may have restrictions on the number of private wells which can be drilled. Instead developers may find it necessary to provide a common water source for any new subdivisions which may be proposed in the future. This information has not been provided by our State to the DOE and it is about time you scientists became aware of the truth.

The EIS is completely lacking any information about this very real local groundwater problem. The DOE must be required to verify the true existing conditions at each and every alternative site. You must ask questions. You cannot assume that the wonderful State of Illinois has provided you with all the pertinent information about our Fox Valley site.

In fact it should be quite obvious by now that the State of Illinois has very obviously attempted to keep the DOE and the citizens in the dark about the SSC. You have, according to the newspapers and television reports, had more opposition to the SSC in Illinois than in any of the other proposed sites. Had the State of Illinois been honest and upright with its citizens you would have had more opposition much earlier. We do not want the SSC in our community. Please listen to what we are telling you and do not locate it here. Give it to a state that wants it and leave us who do not want it alone. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mrs. Williams. The next speaker will be Eileen Haslem and she will be followed by Paula Hemmer. Is Paula Hemmer here? Thank you.

1210 STATEMENT OF EILEEN HASLEM

MS. HASLEM: My name is Eileen Haslem and I live in St. Charles. My main objection is to have this circle put under the high school. I live very close to that. It makes me rather uneasy to know that I am going to have all that construction and work there. But I think it is unheard of that we would put it under our high school.

This is what I am objecting to. I am objecting also to doing away with the town of Eola; also the people in Kaneville who are going to be losing farms, and homes, and businesses they have had for years.

I just think we are too busy an area. I know there is at least one state that has plenty of room for it. In fact a lot of that property is already owned by the government and they would have to only acquire extra area to get the required amount. I just feel that we as citizens do not need this. We are too busy an area already. We do not need more of it. That is my main objection, mainly the high school. That is all I have to say.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Haslem. The next speaker will be Paula Hemmer and she will be followed by Agnes Heisley. Ms. Hemmer.

1211 STATEMENT OF PAULA HEMMER

MS. HEMMER: My name is Paula Hemmer. My address is 4 N 668 Burr Road, St. Charles. After receiving my Environmental Impact Statement I tried to sit down and make my way through this fascinating reading material and focus in on one particular area that I would discuss.

As I read, the one statement that kept coming back to me was a statement from the very first page, which is repeated several times throughout the text. It states, "The Department of Energy has proposed to select a site for the Superconducting Super Collider, a laboratory facility for the study of high energy physics in the United States. The proposed SSC would be the largest scientific instrument ever built." The largest scientific instrument ever built.

The SSC could create particle collisions at the energies of 20 times higher than can be achieved at existing accelerators. If Illinois is chosen, the largest scientific instrument will be going under people's homes, under our schools, our parks, stores, farmland, et cetera. The people living above, around and within the ring of the Super Collider will be your guinea pigs.

I have heard over and over again comparisons of this SSC to Fermilab, but no one has lived on top of Fermilab. The fact that Fermilab has been safe is of no comfort to me. The fact is you do not know what effect living above and around the Super Collider will have on us, our children, and our children's children. The SSC is a high energy physics experiment. And I underline experiment. We are your white mice.

If our Government wants to study the fundamental structure of matter it should not be done under our homes and our schools, affecting our air, the wetlands, the wells and destroying the quality of life in the Fox Valley.

On page 1-6 of the summary of the EIS states, "The SSC may produce very small amounts of radionuclides regardless of where it is sited. In addition very small releases of other types of hazardous emissions would occur." Is not this rather vague?

We do not want radionuclides or other types of hazardous emissions in the Fox Valley. Many people maintain that the SSC is safe. But the fact is it is the largest scientific instrument ever built. And it is an experiment and there are no guarantees.

There have been many things that people believed were safe at the time and many years later that was proven incorrect. Asbestos was used in building 50 years ago. No one thought it was a carcinogen.
4 And now schools and homes and public buildings are spending tremendous sums of money to remove asbestos.

Agent orange was sprayed in Vietnam and people thought it was safe to be exposed to agent orange. And 20 years later there are people who were GI's in Vietnam dying of liver cancer. People who believe that the SSC is safe because the DOE and Federal Government say it is safe are being very naive. The point is that there are places in our country where the SSC could be sited that would not go under people's homes and schools, cause people to lose their farms that have been family farms for generations.

After reading through the EIS I have a hard time understanding how any state could determine if they wanted to bid for the Super Collider before knowing what the impact on the environment would be. Did not this all come around in a rather backward manner? We should look at how this would impact our environment and then decide if we want to bid for the SSC.

But our Governor and State and local representatives decided without the people who are going to be
5 directly affected having any say so. What we have here is taxation without representation. Why are not Governor Thompson and Representative Dennis Hastert and our other elected officials here right now to listen to the concerns of the people who elected them?

Citizens who are against siting the collider here are not a lynch mob. But we are people, we are moms, and dads, and grandparents, homeowners, and farmers, business men and women who want to protect our homes and our community and our children and the wildlife. Our way of life. The bottom line is we do not want your experiment under our homes and schools. It does not belong there.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Hemmer. The next speaker will be Agnes Heisley and she will be followed by Janice Latter. Is Janice Latter here? If she is not is Pat Lindholm here? She will not, okay, thank you very much, I appreciate that. Barbara Hogan.

971 STATEMENT OF AGNES HEISLEY

MS. HEISLEY: Good afternoon. My name is Agnes Heisley and I live at 4 N 844 Burr Road, St. Charles. I want to thank you all first for my appreciation for being here to speak to the Department of Energy and to you all personally for providing me and other concerned citizens for the opportunity to speak to you.

There have been and will be a number of more qualified people who will speak on the technical features of the SSC and why it should or should not be placed in Illinois.

However, there is one subject on which I am qualified to speak and which cannot be stressed too strongly. That subject is the destruction of the quality of life as we know it in the Fox Valley.

Change, development, increase in population are all part of the growing pains of any successful community. Like it or not, change is a fact of life with which all citizens must learn to cope. But we are talking about evolutionary change, not the massive, disruptive revolutionary change that will come with the proposed SSC.

The change to our way of life as represented by the construction of the SSC will be so dynamic that our communities will not be capable of absorbing it. The decision by the State of Illinois to propose the Fox Valley as a site of the SSC simply to utilize the facilities of Fermilab shows a callous disregard to thousands of citizens of this area who will be severely impacted. The impact on our schools which are struggling just to accommodate current growth will be devastating. We have just passed a referendum in St. Charles for our schools which caused property taxes to almost double. The tax increase necessary to handle the school enrollment increase from the SSC would be huge.

The cost of housing, services and other necessities of life will surely escalate making it impossible for large numbers of our senior citizens on fixed income to live in a community where they spent most of their lives and were responsible for helping to build.

But there are other factors you must also consider. First, every location that you are considering has thousands if not millions of people who favor the selection of their site. But some locations such as Texas have not only a small amount of people who are proposed to this selection. Not so in Illinois,

a site located in a populated area that has a large number of people who are adversely affected by the SSC and are vehemently opposed to its location here.

I urge you to think first of the thousands who are injured, not just those who benefit. There are other sites in which all are winners and none are losers.

In addition the Fox Valley and Illinois have already benefited from the installation of two major Federal projects of this type, Fermilab and Argonne Lab. At the present time our economy is strong, construction is booming and unemployment is down. But Texas and other proposed sites are suffering from economic recession. Would not it make a good economic and political sense to select Texas or another site in need of the economic stimulation. In summary let me say that I have heard all kinds of numbers thrown around about the cost of the SSC. I submit to you that the major cost of the SSC if it is located in Fox Valley is the almost certain destruction of our social systems and the years it will take the communities to rebuild them.

The DOE has within its power to do much good for some of our depressed states such as Texas, or to do much harm to a number of strong growing prosperous communities such as Batavia, Geneva, St. Charles and Kaneville. Please do not make us pay the awful price. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Heisley. The next speaker will be Barbara Hogan and she will be followed by Don Price.

1212 STATEMENT OF BARBARA HOGAN

MS. HOGAN: My name is Barbara Hogan from St. Charles, Illinois. The draft document as it now stands did not show the existence of Lily Lake School. Yet it has already been affected by test blasting. On March 19th at the corner of Route 47 and Empire Road where Lily Lake School is located, at about 3:00 p.m., the school, and school was in session, the building was rocked and shaken as if an earthquake had hit it. The windows rattled and the light fixtures swayed. Plaster dust came down. The teachers and children were frightened. Some of the early ed children even cried.

1 It was verified by Mr. Bauer of the Illinois Geological Survey that Walker Geological was dropping five ounce charges down 20 foot bore holes to check the bedrock in the area. The trembling of the building carried on every few minutes and lasted several seconds. During this period the children were dismissed to the school yard. Near the school yard was a truck, probably carrying the other charges.

They stayed on the yard until the school buses came and then were dismissed while the shaking was going on. One of the children related to me later that "I went home alone to my house, no one was there and I was afraid." So for the sake of the children of the Fox Valley area I ask you to place the SSC in a safer geological area.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Hogan. The next speaker will be Don Price, to be followed by Janice Latter. Is she here yet? Pat Lindholm? Elizabeth Grant? Steven Jones? You will be the next speaker, Steven. Mr. Price please.

973 STATEMENT OF DON PRICE

MR. PRICE: The scope of this report centers around one of Illinois' most important resources, human life. The proposed location for the SSC in Illinois is located in fastest growing area in the state and right in the middle of one of the biggest population booms in the Midwest, a population according to the Chicago Tribune that exploded by a stunning 44,000 people in the five-county SSC area during 1987.

These are facts. Facts the State of Illinois refuses to address. As tables 5.1.8-9 and 10 indicate, the traffic impacts due to the SSC are letter F. This means that there will be a forced or breakdown flow with traffic demand exceeding the capacity resulting in unstable stop and go traffic. Illinois is the only state of the seven where this condition will exist.

Please note also that the statistics in this table are based on the lowest level of service. In other words, this is the absolute minimum problem that will occur. And yet within the same tables the State of Illinois claims that there will be no disruption to existing traffic patterns.

Not even the State of Illinois could misinterpret the horrendous traffic problems created by the thousands of vehicles already in this area. As page 5.1.8-27 states, areas around the SSC facility might experience an increase in traffic of between 200 and 1,250 vehicles per day. The State of Illinois is very quick to point out to the DOE in Table 5.1.8-9 that Illinois will only have to add eight miles of new roads to accommodate the SSC. This is the least number of new roads of any of the seven states competing for the SSC.

This simply means that all excess traffic, as much as an additional 1,250 vehicles, will be using and sharing the existing roads which have already exceeded their design capabilities. Using all of these facts, how can it be determined on page 5.4-2 that the State of Illinois will have an increase of only

ten injury accidents per year due to the SSC? Common sense alone tells one that when you add between 200 and 1,250 more vehicles, the majority of which will be huge trucks, to an already overburdened traffic area, a massive increase in accidents will occur.

Once again the State of Illinois has done a masterful job in tricking the DOE. As is explained in Table 5.1.5-4, the way the injury fatality accidents were determined was by including all types of vehicles and as a statewide average value.

Illinois has thousands of small, sparsely populated towns and hundreds of miles of roads with only country traffic. Yet these areas were used to help lower the Illinois injury fatality accident rate considerably. Such facts dealing with human life have to come from the area directly involved.

Approximately 90 percent of the SSC will be located in Kane County, Illinois. According to the State of Illinois Accident Reports Division, Springfield, in 1987 Kane County alone had 44 fatal accidents with 54 deaths. They also had 3,598 injury accidents with 5,447 injuries during 1987. These facts seem to be a contradiction to the facts given to the DOE by the State of Illinois. There are absolutely no mitigating strategies that can cope with the enormous increase in traffic-related injuries and deaths created by building the SSC in the State of Illinois.

Life is too precious to gamble with statistics. We will not let either you or the State of Illinois gamble with the lives of our children and loved ones. You might succeed in siting the SSC in Illinois, but we will never let you build it here.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Price. The next speaker will be Steven Jones and he will be followed by Mr. Carl Adams. You will be the next speaker, sir. Mr. Steven Jones.

1213 STATEMENT OF STEVEN JONES

1 MR. JONES: My name is Steven Jones. I live in Campton Township. I am eight years old. My family is very much against the Superconducting Super Collider. It will go under our house. Look how many chances these people are taking.

2 I have a friend who lives near a lake and if this SSC goes in it will dry up. If this project goes in it will ruin our wells. If it does go in our property value will go down a lot. Look how many dollars
3 this SSC will take, $570 million and 290' trucks a day going up private roads and our beautiful homes will be nothing. We all have nice houses and trees and they will be ruined.

I wrote this speech myself. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Steven. The next speaker will be Mr. Carl Adams and he would be followed by Janice Latter if she is here. Is she? Pat Lindholm? Elizabeth Grant? Carlyn Luerquin? She is not here. Margaret Hemmer? Jean McMahon? You will be the next speaker, ma'am. Mr. Adams please.

977 STATEMENT OF CARL ADAMS

MR. ADAMS: I would like to preface first of all, on hours of sitting here and listening to the problems that could arise, I went home last night and I had to rewrite what I wanted to say. The water problem has been brought up. The damage to property has been. Really I am a little tired of it.

So I went home and I thought to myself what would be a good opening statement. What would wake up the crowd. I came up with, ladies and gentlemen I would like to thank all of you who have voted for Thompson, put him in office, giving us all the biggest possible shaft we could ever have.

The problem I have with the DOE Department and the Governor of Illinois is very basic; truth, freedom of information, simple statement not understood by the politicians of Illinois or the U.S. Government politicians.

I am referring especially to a St. Charles town meeting held early spring 1988. At the city hall we were shown a film produced by Governor Thompson in 1983, describing the open, wide open area of Kane County that would be suited for the SSC. The year 1983, five years before the homeowners were notified that our towns, our homes, our land would be put up to the highest bidder so that a few Government scientists would have a 53-mile toy to play in.

Whatever benefit can be corked out of this I just cannot answer. Had I known of the coming of the SSC prior to the purchase of the land and building of our home I certainly never would have purchased or invested in the Ferson Wood Area in St. Charles Township. As a homeowner sitting on top of the SSC, I was not notified until February 3rd, 1988 by the DOE. The following week, February 9th, I was finally notified by the State of Illinois, DOE Department, a five-year lapse of time.

The Governor claimed Kane County in 1983 the least populated and best location for the SSC. Time has passed. Kane County has grown. New homes, new industries. Thompson should renew and review his view of Kane County and produce a new film for the Federal DOE.

The local, State and Federal Government politicians do not live on or near the SSC. They could care less. Politicians have become so paranoid with the prestige of SSC they have forgotten the people. The disruption of the land. The effect it will have on the tax base. The draft of the Environmental Impact Statement has been gone over, read and reread, discussed at meetings, this meeting, and last night in particular.

I cannot add much more about the fear of losing our water supply, loss of jobs and property. The possible pollution caused by the SSC is enormous. The promise of future temporary jobs at best cannot influence me in thinking the SSC is best suited for Kane County. The promise of 10,000 jobs is a politician's way of stirring interest in the project, getting the general public on his or her side. How can any sane person make a promise of 10,000 jobs when the project costs have never been decided on? The published cost of SSC varied between $4 to $7 billion. The planners cannot decide on where to build it, what buildings to erect, or what is needed to make the SSC a reality. To let the politicians of Illinois have a hand in building the SSC would be a total disaster.

The total cost would automatically double. Example, the Governor of Illinois pushed for a new State of Illinois building in Chicago. It was built at twice the original estimate. Still the money ran out. There are no doors on the office. The building cannot be cooled. It cannot be heated properly.

Another pork barrel the Illinois politicians got their hands into, the Chicago Deep Tunnel. No one knows what that whole underground will cost, or if it ever will be finished. The people who want the SSC cite Fermilab as an advantage. Not so according to Robert Deblow, director of the Super Collider division, U.S. Department of Energy, quoted in the Tribune February of this year.

In closing, I would like to just have everyone remember something I have learned, something I have kept with me all my life. It is called the forgotten man. Delving away in patient industry supporting his family, paying his taxes, casting his vote, supporting his church and schools, but he is the only one for whom there is no provision in the great scramble for the big divide. Such is the forgotten man. He works, he votes, generally he prays. But his chief business in life is to pay.

Who and where is the forgotten man in this case? Who will have to pay for it all? Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Adams. The next speaker will be Jean McMahon. She will be followed by Karen Heidenreich. Ms. Karen Heidenreich? Has Janice Latter arrived? Pat Lindholm? Elizabeth Grant? Carlyn Luerquin? Margaret Hemmer? Ms. McMahon, I am going to have you speak and then perhaps we will take a recess afterwards. But I will determine that when you finish. Please proceed.

1214 STATEMENT OF JEAN McMAHON

MS. McMAHON: Thank you. My name is Jean McMahon. I live on Caribou Trail in Campton Township. I am going to be speaking about the wetlands.

There are four SSC site facilities. F5, K4, J3, and J6 which all have potential for floodplain encroachment according to Section 5.1.2-9 [sic] of the EIS. The J6 site covers the entire width of the floodplain area of Crest Creek. The EIS states that this may be significant long-term impact of local scale and is designated as having a measurable impact.

The significance of this location is even more important when you consider that the entire Illinois SSC area is covered by flood insurance rate max. This means that there is a high probability of flooding
1 that occurs in the area and that any encroachment by J6 on the Crest Creek floodplain will hinder the normal flow of water and could lead to even greater flooding problems.

The EIS very clearly indicates on page 25 of Appendix 5b that damaging floods have occurred in the Fox River basin and its major tributaries during all seasons of the year. As a result, the Illinois site and the large drainage area of the Fox River has a potential for being the SSC site with the greatest probability of damage occurring from siltation or other contaminants entering our water system.

Section 11.3.3.3 states that northeastern Illinois contains one of the state's major river systems and the state's largest concentration and diversity of wetlands. Not only are the 850 acres of potentially affected wetlands numerous, they are also quite different in type from one another. That is all the more reason not one acre of this valuable resource should be disturbed.

2 This happens to be the attitude shared by Vice President Bush. His policy is that absolutely no further reduction should occur to our wetland acreage in the United States. And yet the EIS in Appendix 11, page 17 under Illinois indicates that some wetland habitat would be adversely impacted in Illinois, or lost.

Also the EIS indicates that the hydrological effects of seepage and pumping of water from shaft con-
3 struction could have an impact on surface waters including wetlands adjacent to shaft sites E1, J2, J4 and J5. And what about the creek pond and wetland that is near the E8 site off of Danko Road. This unique area must be protected.

4 A recent court ruling in the Second U.S. District Court of New York, Bersani versus Robichaud, may preclude the Department of Energy from building the SSC in Illinois. There happens to be alternative sites for the SSC project and this recent court ruling tends to indicate that projects with alternative sites must choose the site with the least impact to wetlands.

5 They should automatically eliminate Illinois from consideration. The Department of Energy and the ENR can expect legal actions along these lines. The SSC can only come to Illinois through the courts. In conclusion, I would like to quote the naturalist Aldo Leopold: "We abuse land because we regard it as a commodity belonging to us. When we see land as a commodity to which we belong we may begin to use it with love and respect. There is no other way for land to survive the impact of mechanized man. This is your country. Do not let the big men take it away from you." Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. McMahon. Before I determine to have a recess here I would like to check to see if there are other people here who are scheduled to speak later in the afternoon. Perhaps if there are at least three of you who will be willing to speak now, we will take you now. Your name please? Rose Haggerty, fine. Is there anyone else? Ms. Heath, okay. Is there another one? Your name please? Linda Voelker. Well, given that case I think we will proceed and I would call the next person to be Christy Heath and Christy would be followed by Linda Voelker.

975 STATEMENT OF CHRISTY HEATH

MS. HEATH: My name is Christy Heath and I am 15 years old. These are my friends and neighbors and we live in Kaneville. Our town is located at F5 on your map. I want to speak to you today on behalf of the children of Kaneville. Our parents have been fighting the SSC and now it is our turn to be heard.

If the SSC comes to Illinois these kids and I, we will have to move, because you will take our homes for the west campus. We want you to know that the decision you make will not only impact the environment, but will impact our lives.

Your DEIS talks about the plants, birds and animals affected by the SSC. But where is your concern for us? The collider not only affects the environment, but directly affects humans and the quality of life.

The DEIS says 160 homes will have to be relocated. We do not know if that number is right. The state officials will not tell us. But we think even that is too many people. We think you should be put the SSC in a wide open area where you will not affect so many people. The Government owns miles and miles of wide open vacant land. Why do not you put the collider there?

It is easy for you to say, "so what, you will find another house, your kids can make new friends and your parents can find another job." But it is not that easy. You do not know that our houses in Kaneville are our homes, our security. You do not know that our neighbors are also our best friends, kids and parents alike. Our parents chose to live in Kaneville because it is a great place to raise a family. We do not have drug problems or street gangs in our town. We can play in our yards, ride our bikes, horses, and walk around the neighborhood without being afraid.

We are surrounded by beautiful open country. Kaneville is very special and towns like ours are becoming rare. The DEIS does not tell you by putting the SSC in Illinois you destroy our town. The State of Illinois does not want to admit that Kaneville will be so strongly impacted. They do not even put our town on some of their maps.

If you put the collider in Illinois you separate us and take away a very special part of our lives. We have grown up together and know each other well. We play together, and go to school and church together. We are all different, but we love and respect each other. Our parents work hard to make good homes for us. We do not want to move and we do not want the SSC here.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Thank you all very much. Ms. Voelker, this is a tough act to follow, but take your time. The microphone is yours.

1215 STATEMENT OF LINDA VOELKER

1 MS. VOELKER: My name is Linda Voelker. I live in Aurora. I am opposed to the siting of the Superconducting Super Collider in Illinois. I oppose the siting here for many reasons.

I am a certified clinical social worker in the State of Illinois. I work in our social service system. I am extremely concerned about the negative impact which the Super Collider would have upon all our social problems and our community's social service system.

2 We are a community beset with extremely serious social problems. This community is the dumping ground for Elgin State Hospital. This includes not only the mentally ill, but also the criminally insane. This community has the third highest rate of reported child abuse in the State of Illinois.

I could go on to discuss our community's high rate of drug abuse, drug dealing, alcoholism, crime and the financial crisis in our schools. However, time does not permit.

Ten thousand, nine hundred and ninety-six persons would be required to build the Superconducting Super Collider. Many of these persons would be coming to our service area from outside the community. They would be bringing with them their own set of personal and social problems.

The Super Collider would bring drastic change to our communities. Change translates into stress. Stress translates into further demand upon a social service system which is already burdened down and struggling to maintain itself. This is an issue which must be addressed.

3 Water. Water is of course an ongoing concern to those of us who live in DuPage and Kane counties. Our concern about the supply and the quality of our water is completely aside from any question of whether or not a Super Collider is ever sited here.

4 Wildlife. The Super Collider would decrease our wildlife population. We have always enjoyed and loved our wildlife in the Fox Valley.

5 The Superconducting Super Collider would be harmful to our farms, our farmers, our farmland and our farm families. Our roots are deep in this Illinois soil. We do not want the Federal Government and their Superconducting Super Collider coming here and interfering with what we have always loved and valued.

David fought Goliath and won. We too intend to win. We will win in the courts. This is our mission and we shall complete it.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Voelker. Our next speaker this afternoon would be Greg Vanzandt. He will be followed by Margaret Hemmer. Is she here? Or by Karen Heidenreich. If neither of these ladies are here after you speak, Mr. Vanzandt, we will take a recess afterwards. Mr. Vanzandt, the microphone is yours please.

976 STATEMENT OF GREG VANZANDT

MR. VANZANDT: Thank you. My name is Greg Vanzandt. I and my family live in St. Charles. We were relocated to Illinois from mid-state New York April of last year. We find the Fox Valley to be similar to the serene and beautiful surroundings of that of the mid-Hudson Valley area.

You may also recall that Stewart Airport is also located in Orange County, New York. Stewart was one of two site proposals of the SSC, both of which were turned down by the State of New York by approximately 20,000 signatures against it, which occurred six months prior to this past January silent public notice here in Illinois.

In fact there were no newspaper or other public media used by the State of Illinois for the public notice other than quiet placement of site proposals on the shelves of our libraries.

This is a very discouraging example of government for and by the people. If it took 20,000 signatures to protest in New York to defeat this project there, how many more do we have to have here to throw it out of our state.

We already have 20,000 signatures strong opposing the siting of the SSC project in the Fox Valley and we are getting more every day. My wife and I purchased our property last September 11, 1987 and had our new home built through the winter and moved in March 15th. Never once did we receive a letter or any notification by the State or DOE that we would be an affected landowner. Actually even until today we still have not received anything. Our property is approximately 500 feet west of the access shaft E8 according to the site proposal map.

With such poor solicitation methods and record keeping by the State of Illinois I became quite interested in the rest of this site proposal. You have already heard other Illinoisans point out facts and discrepancies in the EIS released this past August and other released that you have had.

Personally my concern, besides that of extremely poor research and facts into the consequential damages to our environment, is about the draining of the aquifer supply in this region, which was expressed by many other people here. Not just for individual dwellings, but for the entire communities, cities surrounding the ring.

According to the EIS report only 30 or so wells will be affected. There are just that many or a few more just in my subdivision alone, of split rail, which is right over the ring. Certainly they all will be affected just as equally. The actual construction of the project will require vertical shafts to be blasted approximately every two miles and a hauling of over 190 semitrailer tractor loads and spoils daily.

What is this project going to do to the quality of life, let alone life itself, without water? Sure we could, I guess, pipe in Lake Michigan water, but who is going to pay for that? Which brings me to another gross act of political negligence by our governor Mr. Thompson: The Good Neighbor Act, which is to be like an insurance policy to protect affected homeowners against having to pay for damaged homes from blasting and other hazards of construction.

From the outside it sounds very responsible, very neighborly. But it does not take very deep scrutiny to see that there is absolutely no support of funding behind this. It is basically a sheet of paper with nothing behind it.

Kane County has grown geometrically every year. Maps provided by the State of Illinois are grossly incorrect to today's environment with regard to population density, new subdivisions and the influx of new young families with children.

Fermilab is an extremely important facility to this country and high energy physics, and will continue to be so with or without the SSC here. One very important fact was overlooked when this project was first conceived, which was the building boom that would be resulted from the falling interest rates that we have all experienced in the last five to eight years.

No, Kane County is the wrong place for this project. With the resulting groundwater depletion, vertical blasting, rapidly growing population densities and necessary State funding with little or no financial rewards, Kane County Illinois is not a reasonable or practical site for the SSC.

In fact the siting of this project here demonstrates a willful criminal act on the part of both the State of Illinois and the DOE with regard to public safety and welfare. And if sited here, CATCH of Illinois, amongst other people, will take every action possible to pursue this matter through the court system of this country. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Vanzandt. We will now take a recess until 3:50. It is now 3:32. I would ask you if you know any of your friends and neighbors who are scheduled to speak for the remainder of the afternoon to ask them to please come here early as we may be able to take them far ahead of their other time. We will now recess until 3:50. Thank you.

(Whereupon a brief recess was taken.)

MR. LAWSON: I would like now to reconvene the hearing this afternoon on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Superconducting Super Collider. For those of you who have not spoken yet my name is Barry Lawson. I am the neutral moderator that has been hired by the DOE to facilitate this hearing.

Before we get started in this last session of the afternoon I would like to just check to see who is registered to speak, who is in the hall right now, so that we can move as quickly as possible through the afternoon.

First of all, is Margaret Hemmer or Karen Heidenreich here? They are not. May I have the hands of those of you who are scheduled to speak. All right, we have three of you. Your name please? Elizabeth Davis, okay, very good. Rose Haggerty and I bet that is Dennis Haggerty. Any relationship? I will not tell your wife. What I am going to do is I have several other speakers who are scheduled, but they are scheduled starting at 4:00. So if you folks do not mind, what I probably will do is move ahead with you who are walk-in speakers. Ms. Elizabeth Davis will be the first speaker. You will be followed by Rose Haggerty. Ms. Davis.

1217 STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH DAVIS

MS. DAVIS: Elizabeth Davis, Big Rock, Illinois. Just as we expected the EIS makes it very clear that siltation of our streams and waterways will occur if the SSC is sited in Illinois.

Appendix 7, page 40 indicates that sedimentation ponds will be required to partially control the water removed from the shafts and tunnels during the dewatering and construction process. The key word here is that this water will be partially controlled and not completely controlled.

A total of 22 ponds will be located around the ring at various E and F access shaft areas. The EIS states that each pond site may not be large enough to allow sediments to properly settle out. Why is this so? Why will the sedimentation occur and why will not the Illinois ENR's design of these ponds properly handle the large volume of water removed from the tunnel?

/ To begin with, sediments can be expected to occur in the infiltration water because of the nature of the tunneling process. The use of tunnel boring machines actually breaks up the shale and the [copy missing] deposits into small chunks. Results of similar boring operations indicate that as much as 17 percent of excavated rock will be less than one two-hundredths of an inch in diameter. Pressed rock this small size can easily be helped in suspension by the water that will be entering and covering the tunnel floor. Removal of this water carries the suspended particles up into the sedimentation ponds. This problem is anticipated. That is why there is sedimentation ponds. The sole purpose is to allow all sediment to be removed from the water prior to allowing it to enter into normal drainage patterns of the surrounding countryside.

However, the EIS says that they may not be large enough to allow enough time for proper sediment to occur. Why? There are 19 ponds one-third acre in size which holds approximately 500,000 gallons each. The exception is at site F3 where three ponds each, two acres in size, are planned. This allows for ten million gallons of storage at just this one site.

The larger holding area is required because of the massive amount of water that is expected to be infiltrated, to infiltrate the tunnels over our five-mile stretch between E3 and E4, as much as 5,200 gallons a minute. A hundred feet is expected to flood the tunnel in that area during construction.

If you multiply this rate by the five mile distance involved you can calculate that as much as two billion gallons of water will be pumped from the tunnel and into these three acre ponds. However, they only hold ten million gallons of water. What happens to all the excess water that cannot be held by these ponds?

How can the Illinois ENR expect to find the [copy missing] to be removed when this water cannot possibly remain motionless long enough for proper sedimentation to occur? This same problem exists in other smaller 19 ponds. They are designed to hold about one half the volume of water that can be expected to flow into them day in and day out. How can proper sedimentation occur? Simple, it cannot. Will this water be allowed to overflow the ponds and enter the natural drainage systems around each E and F site? If so, suspended particles of finely ground dolomite and shale can be expected to infiltrate our many gullies, creeks, lakes, streams and eventually even find its way into the main drainage channel of the entire area, the Fox River.

After the preliminary EIS hearing held in February, the DOE mentioned that one of the problems of the Illinois site was a possible siltation of streams which may occur. Now that we know a little more about the Illinois geology and design it becomes clear that the siltation of our stream is a strong possibility.

This cannot be accepted. And simply one more explanation why the DOE personnel termed the Illinois SSC proposal is dirty.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Davis. The next speaker will be Rose Haggerty to be followed by Dennis Haggerty.

993 STATEMENT OF ROSE HAGGERTY

MS. HAGGERTY: My name is Rose Haggerty. I live in St. Charles Township. I am speaking for myself as a wife, mother, high school teacher, citizen, and an EIS human receptor.

The DOE has heard many major objections to the siting of the SSC in Illinois. I concur with all those points of opposition and will not repeat them. I certainly hope you have listened with an open heart and an open mind.

Today I am going to comment on two other issues concerning the EIS study. The first issue I wish to address is false economic benefits. The State of Illinois and the DOE presented economic assessments that use multipliers to show the effect that jobs of the proposed SSC will have on the remainder of the local economy.

They claim that expenditures of the workers at the SSC itself will generate even more local jobs. While there is an omen of truth in this argument it can easily be grossly overstated because of loss of subcontracts and employment to out-of-state funds.

Consider the following examples. The Deep Tunnel Project. Seventeen firms were involved in contracting for the tunnel and reservoir plan in Chicago which is probably pointed to by the State to show experience in tunneling. Of these 17 firms only four were Illinois firms.

Illinois subsidized Mitsubishi Chrysler to the tune of $86 million to persuade that plant to locate in Illinois. Many thousands of new jobs from subcontracting activity were promised in order to justify this State subsidy. But only 16 percent of the subcontracts from that plant went to Illinois firms as of April of 1987.

It is also interesting to note that nearly every managerial level job has gone to immigrating Japanese rather than to local talent.

A recent article in High Technology magazine describes the benefits from the SSC that will accrue to firms in the cryogenics and superconductivity industries. The firms that will benefit are listed. Not one has an Illinois address.

Argonne National Laboratory, a facility which unlike Fermilab or the proposed SSC has have spinoff of applied technology, recently licensed a technique for manufacturing superconducting wire. The firm involved is, you guess it, out of state, located in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Will the State never learn? How many of our tax dollars will be spent before they understand that the multiplier effects they count upon are neither as predictable nor as large as they would hope. It is inexcusable for the State of Illinois to artificially inflate their employment numbers through the use of multipliers that are designed solely for the purpose of making the SSC project appear more attractive than it really is.

In the remaining few minutes I would like to speak with gentlemen about a concern incredibly lacking in the EIS. It is a factor which is sadly missing because of the greed of major corporations and because of the lust of power and prestige of our State politicians. Gentlemen, when we are stripped of our ambitions, the power of our careers, our various levels of education, our adornments and affectations, we should realize that we are all the same.

We are human beings with common desires for happiness, love and tranquility. The EIS study does not take these basic human needs into consideration. It does not address the human factor.

In 1967, the State of Illinois by the law of eminent domain took my father and mother's thriving place of business and our home for the construction of I-55 near Joliet. This happened only a few months after the death of my father. The amount of money paid to my mother hardly compensated for our loss, which resulted in a very difficult life for us. She had no personal input into decisions surrounding the construction, nor consideration for our needs. Not without protest, Joliet, a super highway was built in our neighborhood. There simply was no alternative.

Now, the proposed Tollway is already, as a consequence of my father and mother's and all that I have endured in my lifetime, are again being threatened. I appeal to each of you gentlemen who undoubtedly have some of my concerns and experiences in your own personal lives to consider my family and the multitude of other families who would be forced to endure sacrifices for this scientific project. This scenario is perhaps, the EIS, should be placed in a location where people would not be so adversely affected. Gentlemen, the EIS is not a super highway. You have a choice of locations including an uninhabited desert. In conclusion, please remember that the prosperity of a country depends not on the abundance of its revenues, nor on the strength of its fortifications, nor on the beauty of its public buildings, but it consists in the number of its men of enlightenment and character. Remember the human factor and we could in our beautiful Fox River Valley.

Mr. Lynch: Thank you, Mr. Massarti. The next speaker will be Dennis Massarti to be followed by Linda Jones if she is here. Sandra Sullivan? Robert Mattchewski? Margarite Jensen? Janet Illsack? Mary Grant? Is there anyone here who is scheduled to speak? Yes, sir, please? The next speaker is Dennis Massarti. Mr. Massarti, you will be followed by Mr. Jerome Blanck and then we will have Margaret Jones.

Mr. Massarti: My name is Mr. Dennis R. Massarti. I have been a lifelong resident of the Fox River Valley. I am a doctor of podiatric medicine practicing in Aurora, Illinois for 18 years. I am a member of Aurora, a wife, a homemaker, I am a mother, a concerned citizen, I am going to address such a tremendous subject in such a short time because I thought I'd be up for certainly less than one and a half minutes.

Number one, the discussion of fire protection for the Aurora area would imply the fire protection to the north side of the city. If the city and county authorities, there should be a treaty of agreement between the parties. If the fire protection is coming from the main fire facility this would be a disadvantage and would be the cause of all of its ills to be changed.

The EIS does state that hazardous chemicals will be on the site. It would appear that there would be some estimate of the chemicals and the amount that has to be transported on the facilities along the ring road. The provisions of the hazardous communications standard and the SAR Title 3. This information should be transmitted in the EIS. Also this information should be provided to the local fire department so they are prepared for fire protection.

Noise levels, there is no indication on the statement what the noise is going and construction the noise level, the noise level, the traffic on the ring, the ring that is not connected to the other highways, the interstate and tollway. The EIS states that all noise levels will be [illegible] the statement. This is a great concern on the northern part of the ring. This is the [illegible] Aurora [illegible] Dwight or taking water supply.

[illegible] Volume 1A

You state that your wastewater treatment and the disposal that injections and experimental facilities will have laboratory drains run through separators and then to the storm drainage systems. This is an unacceptable procedure. Laboratory waste that have to be collected and treated, this procedure will potentially contaminate the groundwater. The same statement is made for the collection facility, for equipment drains. This has to be redesigned or the city, State and county should not allow you a building permit.

Number eight, I do not think the service areas can be treated by septic tanks or leech fields. There is no documentation to show that you have evaluated this possibility. This should be discussed in the final EIS.

Number nine, the draft EIS states that any radioactive waste will be sent to Richland, Washington. However there is no discussion on the ability of Richland to accept these waste in the year 2000. At the present time it does not appear that Richland will be able to accept this waste unless other facilities are constructed in the U.S.A.

Speaking for myself, this Super Collider has been a nine month nightmare for my family, for my neighbors, for the people I have been involved with, for CATCH organization. It is an atrocity. I do not want the collider in Illinois and I am sure that you can find another place to put it.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Haggerty. The next speaker will be Mr. Jerome Mrozak to be followed by Margaret Hulka. Mr. Mrozak.

991 STATEMENT OF JEROME MROZAK

MR. MROZAK: I am Jerome Mrozak, a resident of Warrenville. In 1978 and 1979 I worked at the Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory in Pennsylvania. While there I helped to decommission some of the Navy's atomic reactor sites. Because of my background, the decommission plan of the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Superconducting Super Collider caught my eye.

The decommissioning plan as it appears in the Environmental Impact Statement is sketchy. It basically says that easily removed radioactive material and hazardous wastes will be removed from the Super Collider sites. The access doors to the tunnel is sealed off and the service area is demolished. But since the great bulk of structures for the Super Collider project will never be removed, this Environmental Impact Statement should address the final dispositions of the occupied sites in greater detail, because the Super Collider project will have a permanent impact on the environment.

First, the report suggests that numerous access doors and shafts to the collider's rings are to be sealed off. More correctly the access shafts to the collider's rings should be completely filled up with dirt and rubble to permanently discourage unauthorized access to the rings. Otherwise a permanent guard will have to be maintained at each shaft location.

Second, even after removing radioactive material from the project some measurable radioactivity will remain at various sites. Government regulation will require that Department of Energy radiation specialist monitor these locations, possibly indefinitely. Because of this these sites might never be turned over to other governmental bodies or private parties. Also the Environmental Impact Statement does not say whether the buried beam zone access areas will or will not become partially radioactive. If they become so and they are failed to require constant monitoring and restrictive access to them, is it wise to locate these access areas within already existing subdivisions as the Illinois siting proposal does?

Third, it has been traditionally hard to obtain needed government funds to clean up or shut down major projects. The pollution Superfunds is one such example. But if money is available, will the work be done satisfactorily? The Environmental Impact Statement assumes that the Super Collider project will be properly decommissioned. But since the likelihood exists that the job will not be done right, the Environmental Impact Statement should examine the consequences of even properly decommissioning the Super Collider project.

Specifically, what if the service areas are not demolished, the access shafts are not filled in and the radioactive and hazardous materials in the tunnels not removed? Can the decommissioned Super Collider be safety-guarded against willful unauthorized access?

In summary the decommission plan published in the Superconducting Super Collider draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate. It does not fully address long-term land use, personal hazards, or non [copy missing] decommissioning scenarios. I urge the Department of Energy to expand this decommissioning section. It should discuss the long-term hazards and risks of the decommissioned Super Collider and whether these risks are appropriate for a heavily populated area like the Illinois site.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. The next speaker will be Margaret Hulka and she will be followed by Jim Cinto. Ms. Hulka.

994 STATEMENT OF MARGARET HULKA

MS. HULKA: My name is Margaret Hulka and I am from Kaneville. AT&T and other designers and builders of electronic equipment have made a great effort to protect their communications and computer equipment. From internally and externally generated EMI, which is electromagnetic interference and [copy missing] pulses.

Most of this equipment is run on 110 volt currents drawing less than 30 amps. I studied electrical engineering at Purdue for five years. My studies impel me to ask this. My question is, what electromagnetic interference will be generated by the proposed 53-mile electromagnetic ring using 20 trillion electron volts of power?

What effect will the electromagnetic interference have upon the human life which is forced to live above it? What effect will it have upon communications in the area? What effect will this electromagnetic interference have upon the radar equipment, the DuPage Community Airport which will have runways directly over the tunnel? I have seen none of this is covered in the EIS and is an extremely grave omission. But you consider the extremely large 20 trillion electron volts of power being used.

Just a very small amount of static electricity generated from unsheltered contacts of plastics, carpets, nylons, et cetera, can basically destroy sensitive electronic pulses. What protection is going to be made to eliminate any static electricity from having influence on other magnetic fields generated by the SSC? If these dramatically strong electronic impulses produced by 20 trillion electron volts can escape the tunnel and bombard the surrounding bedrock, could these pulses actually reach ground level, and if so, what effect will these electronic impulses have on the human self? None of these questions have been addressed by the EIS but are extremely important for anyone forced to live above the SSC tunnel.

The potential health hazards such as increased percentage of cancer in children associated with living in close contact with high transmission power lines is well documented. What might happen to the people who are forced to live between the magnetic field at the SSC tunnel and under the high power transmission lines that run through Boulder Hill? Why have not these problems been addressed by the EIS?

Just because they are omitted does not mean it is not a potential problem. This inadequate handling of the entire magnetic field information cannot be tolerated. More facts are necessary before the scientists can properly make a decision on where the SSC ring and its enormous electronic field can be allowed to have an impact upon human life and the rest of our environment.

The unknowns that are associated with the SSC and magnetic fields is indicative of the experimental nature of this project. And it should therefore only be allowed in a laboratory setting, not under our homes, our schools or our businesses in the Fox Valley. Illinois is not the logical place for the SSC. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Hulka. The next speaker will be Jim Cinto. Before you speak, Mr. Cinto, I want to check, is there anyone else here who is scheduled to speak this afternoon? Wallace Depp. Is there anyone else who is speaking? Mr. Depp, I will have you speak next after Mr. Cinto and then we will see if we have anyone else before we decide whether to have a recess. Mr. Cinto please.

1218 STATEMENT OF JIM CINTO

MR. CINTO: My name is Jim Cinto. I am resident of Oswego, a student at Yorkville High School and active volunteer for the SSC for Fermilab.

Since the beginning of my support for the SSC in Illinois I have been confronted by many adults asking why I supported this project and then having them proceed to tell me why I should have no view because I was a teenager, not old enough to make decisions and too irresponsible to realize what my decision means.

I want to let you know today that I am sick and tired of being told that I do not matter. If I do not matter then why does my Government give me the right to vote for president? Since I have this right to vote for president, why cannot I have a view on the SSC.

If I am too young to realize what I am doing, then so must be the numerous other youth who have attended these hearings the past two days. But since we are here it must mean that we have some comprehension of what might happen to our lives and what effects it could have on our generation, a generation that will probably be the most affected of any.

By the time the SSC is fully constructed my peers and I will be freshly out of college. If the SSC were built in this area it would open up countless employment opportunities for those of us pursuing a career in scientific areas. Not only will it benefit my peers and I, but also the likes of my ten-year old brother and his peers who will benefit from the research that results from the operation of the SSC. And if I am too irresponsible to understand the implications of where I stand on the SSC, then why was I given a chance to voice my opinion to involved officials?

Last April I travelled to Washington with local legislators, school district superintendents and other teams to voice our opinions on the SSC in Illinois. Not only did we speak with other legislators, but we also spoke with representatives from the Department of Energy. These representatives informed us of the current standing of the SSC and listened to what questions and comments we had.

I ask you, if it is true that my peers and I are too young and irresponsible to understand our decision to support the SSC in Illinois, then why have we been able to maintain our position on this issue so maturely? Speaking on behalf of my peers I ask you that you consider seriously our opinions.

By our support at these hearings and throughout the controversy of the SSC we have shown that we are mature and responsible enough to know that we want the SSC in Illinois.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Cinto. The next speaker will be Wallace Depp. As Mr. Depp approaches the podium I would like to ask if there is now anyone else who is scheduled to speak this afternoon who is in the auditorium? Mr. Depp, would you proceed please.

1219 STATEMENT OF WALLACE DEPP

MR. DEPP: My name is Wallace Depp, formerly executive director of Bell Laboratories. Since I have retired I have been a management consultant for companies in U.S.A. and Japan.

1 I wish to talk about the environmental impact of the proposed SSC on Fermilab. This is a problem peculiar to the Illinois site so it has not been considered in any detail in your EIS. However, I feel it should be a very important consideration in making your final site selection.

2 What I wish to talk about is the impact on the internal workings of the Fermi Laboratory by the overlay of the SSC. We can all agree that Fermilab is a world class facility. Certainly has the most powerful particle accelerator and it has done very good work over the last 20 years. We can also agree that we should do all we can to preserve the effectiveness of this facility which represents an investment of about $1.4 billion and about 1,000 man-years of effort.

3 How do we preserve the effectiveness of Fermilab? From my experience and research involvement in over 40 years, with 27 years concerning large systems, is my strong feeling that if we attempt to overlay the SSC on top of Fermilab we will be making a serious mistake. A mistake that would seriously impair the effectiveness of the Fermilab operation.

4 I have hastily put this together, this talk, because a number of other talks here supporting this overlay have depended upon certain information and certain misinformation in this document, which if you do not have a copy of it I will leave a copy here, which has been distributed. For instance, on page two it says Fermilab has the manpower and brain power for the SSC already in place.

On page three it says Fermilab has the tools, technicians and material resources the SSC will require. Well those are rather ridiculous statements. If Fermilab has to do their, work they will have to be using their manpower and their brain power and their technicians and tools and materials to do their job.

MR. LAWSON: Mr. Depp, I am sorry to interrupt you, but could you for the record please reference which document you are referring to?

MR. DEPP: This is this document here.

MR. LAWSON: Could you read the title for the record please?

MR. DEPP: Yes, for the record it is "SSC, The Case for Fermilab," which is being distributed widely around the lobby today.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, that is fine.

5 MR. DEPP: If you take the statements literally you would conclude that no more manpower need to be hired over and beyond the 2,000 people now in Fermilab. It would mean that we might even dispense with the Central Design Group if you believe that particular document which resides in Berkeley at the moment.

I understand DOE is seeking a contractor probably from the private sector to manage the R&D and design and construction of the SSC. I guess proposals are being prepared now. When this new contractor arrives on site, or a team contractors, as it may be, if they had read this document they would feel that they would be able to talk to Dr. Lederman and said, "Well could you turn over X number of engineers and physicists and computer experts to me so I could go ahead with the work that is necessary here."

We hope that the contractor does not read this document and hope he does not arrive at that conclusion. Because I think Dr. Lederman would be surprised to give up 20 percent or 30 percent of his work force to this new contractor.

We know if there was that extra manpower in Fermilab there would be too much fat there. But we know darn well there is not that fat there because in talking with your associates from DOE they say it is a lean operation there. They have not extra manpower over and above what they need. In fact they would like a little bit more operating funding because now they are doing more work, they are doing fix target and they are doing collider experiments both at the same time, or in sequence here, where before they were only doing one set.

You see, there is a conflict right away between two different missions: the important, ongoing work of Fermilab which has these world class facilities and the huge new SSC project which could be launched with considerable publicity and perhaps a lot more funding than Fermi has at the moment.

At this same location we will have two management teams with two different missions competing for the same technical personnel, the same computer and shop facilities and the same secretarial, clerical, all other support facilities. This is not a workable situation at all. You will have perhaps a very unpleasant daily competition for facilities and personnel. The people at Fermilab now would probably become second class citizens because of the superior funding of the SSC. Some of these people may say, the hell with it, I am going to leave.

Large industrial laboratories have faced this type of problem before. They have found that when you have a large ongoing project you do not superimpose upon that a new project that would say, we will obsolete you. You cannot put that in the court of an existing project and build it up to something that begins to swallow up the other ongoing project.

A couple of illustrations --

MR. LAWSON: Mr. Depp, I am sorry to interrupt you, but you are several minutes over the five minute limitation. I would like to ask you if you could summarize your final comments in around 30 seconds or so.

6 MR. DEPP: Yes. In industrial laboratories they go away from that original illustration. [copy missing] went 30 miles with new administration and there was no real contract. IBM, when they had to go to many computers, they went from [copy missing] to Boca Raton with new location and new administration and they did not have that conflict. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. I would like to ask once again is there anyone here who is scheduled to speak in the auditorium this afternoon? I still have several people who have registered in advance. So what I will do at this point is recess this session until 4:45, it is now 4:32. If other people have arrived we will take them at that time. The hearing is now recessed until 4:45.

(Whereupon a brief recess was taken.)

MR. LAWSON: I would like to reconvene this afternoon's session on the hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Superconducting Super Collider. Once again my name is Barry Lawson, neutral moderator for this session. I believe we have three more speakers. But before we get into that I just want to make sure that besides the three, Mr. Raymond, Ms. Hooley and Mr. Peters, is there anyone else who is scheduled to speak this afternoon who has not yet spoken? Okay, very good.

The first speaker in this session will be Mr. James Peters and he would be followed by Ms. Molly Hooley.

997 STATEMENT OF JAMES PETERS

MR. PETERS: Good evening. My name is Jim Peters. I am the director of the Midwest Regional Office of the American Farmland Trust which is a national nonprofit organization whose aim is to protect prime farmland from unnecessary conversion to nonfarm uses.

AFT is well aware of the important scientific and technical impacts of the proposed Superconducting Super Collider, as well as the many advantages the Illinois site offers to the site selection committee. However, we are concerned about the potential and we feel unnecessary loss of thousands of acres of some of this Nation's highest quality farmland which would be caused by the land acquisition policies for the SSC western ring, what is known as the far cluster.

The soils in western Kane County are among the most productive in the U.S. The result is high crop yields, stable rural communities and local land use controls that are designed to prevent costly and unnecessary urban sprawl.

It is our belief that the SSC can be sited in a way that will coexist with the area's natural resources and existing communities. However, the impact suggested by the draft Environmental Impact Statement do not reflect these methods to minimize unnecessary loss of excellent farmland. Specifically we have three main concerns. First, the EIS definition of the conversion of high quality farmland seems to be erroneous. According to the draft EIS only 163 acres of prime or important farmland will be converted for SSC use. However, in actuality a total of some 4,000 acres of privately owned, high-quality farmland will actually be purchased for the SSC project.

Most of this acreage would be located in a half-mile-wide ten-mile-long strip of farmland located in western Kane County, approximately between the communities of Big Rock and Elbourne. Why the discrepancy between 163 and 4,200?

The EIS contends, and this seems to be true for each of the seven states under consideration, that the farmland in the project area will not be converted unless it is covered over by a building or parking lot. We feel that the very purchase of this farmland by a public agency actually comprises farmland conversion. Once ownership is taken from the person who farms the land, that use changes and from the surrounding area permanently.

For instance, while public ownership in the case of the SSC may allow a farmer to temporarily lease back the land for agricultural purposes, it also makes it impossible for that person to plan for the property's future use. Investment and permanent conservation practices, construction of required farm structures, or roads where the acquisition of additional land becomes impractical simply because a farmer no longer has any guarantee that another SSC-related facility will not spring up tomorrow. And for all intents and purposes, land purchased by a public agency is land lost to agricultural production. EIS should consider this in its conversion figures. However, there do seem to be alternative acquisition approaches that could minimize the amount of land conversion. At the very least the owner should be entitled to right of first refusal in the event the land reverts from public ownership. And even more far appropriate given these circumstances would be for the Government agency to purchase easement over most of the prime farmland that is absolutely not required for the SSC.

This would enable the government to control activities that might interfere with operations but keep the ownership where it belongs, with the person who farms the land.

Second, no consideration is given in the EIS to the significant impacts of a proposed interchange at Dauberman Road and the East West Tollway. This interchange in the EIS is identified simply as an ancillary facility. And as anyone familiar with development knows, any new interchange can have disastrous impacts on land uses.

The common scenario: first the land speculation followed by increased property values and taxes. Then scattered suburban development. Finally farmers forced off the land well in advance of the natural course of development.

An interstate interchange at this location also would be at odds with local land use policy. Kane County's own development plan for the year 2000 shows the entire area around this far cluster and stretching three to four miles in either direction to be exclusive agricultural use. The county's own zoning policy reinforces this plan with the district that requires minimum lot sizes of 15 acres to prevent land speculation. And in fact Kane County traditionally has opposed new interchanges in areas targeted for long-term agricultural use.

We feel that SSC can be built without a second interchange. But if one is planned its impacts should definitely be considered in any revised EIS.

Third, the EIS misrepresents local land use regulations. The area is referred to as mixed suburban zoning. This is inaccurate. Except for a very small portion of land near the towns of Elbourne, Kaneville and Big Rock the entire 10-mile-long, half-mile-wide strip is zoned and planned for the next 20 years. And the land is planned for agricultural use, not mixed suburban use.

In fact the county has been consistent in regards to its plans for this region, in every effort to continue agricultural use until suburbanization and public services have a clear need to spread to this area of accounting.

The EIS also states that the agricultural productivity trends in this area are declining. They continue to decline as a result of suburban pressures. Try telling that to a farmer in Kaneville Township who continues to produce corn and soybean yields that are among the highest in the nation. Or tell that to the communities of Elbourne, Kaneville and Big Rock who continue to vote against expansion of public services that will change the stable rural character of their towns. Granted, suburbanization has spread into eastern Kane County. But as most local planners will tell you development very likely will not occur in the Kaneville area for the foreseeable future. That is, unless it is encouraged to do so by needless and costly public improvements.

In conclusion, as I stated at the outset, our organization is not opposed in principle to the siting of the SSC in Illinois, or for that matter in any of the other six states. However, we feel that the final EIS must reflect the true impacts that major public investment of this size will have on the environment and on the existing communities.

The placement of this facility will be regulated under State and Federal laws, the Illinois Farmland Preservation Policy Act and the Federal Farmland Protection Policy Act. These statutes require that proper measures be taken to minimize the disruption of these communities and the valuable farmland that surround them. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Peters. The next speaker this afternoon will be Molly Hooley and she would be followed by Mr. Robert Raymond. Ms. Hooley.

1220 STATEMENT OF MOLLY HOOLEY

MS. HOOLEY: I would like to take the opportunity to tell you first that I am just a middle class citizen who lives in St. Charles. Although I do associate and even have a friend who's a member of CATCH, I am not.

1 I feel that this project should not come into our residential area just as an average citizen. I am not the most intelligent person in the world. When I first started trying to sort out some of the facts about the SSC and its impact I called my brother-in-law who is a geologist for the State of California. What I did not realize at the time is that he actually worked on the proposal to the Government when California was trying to be one of the sites for the SSC.

I said to him, [illegible] about? The first question [illegible] "[illegible] are you talking about?" He said, "You live in a residential area. You live on a fault. There is a lot of construction involved. I do not understand why we are talking about this type of area for this type of construction."

2 The concerns were not for the project itself, but for the construction of the project. Again, some of my points might seem minor. I am not a technical person. But looking at some of the information, they talk about methane gas. We hear a lot about these things. They talk about its effect. Evidently out near Silver Glen Road in Campton Township they hit a pocket of methane gas and blew a drill out of the ground. That sounds fairly dramatic to me. But when they [illegible] this well, that gas was used to heat that home for a year. I am sure if they could air condition their home for the summer they probably would have been happy about that. But that seems to me to be quite a fair amount of gas, particularly with the kind of climate we have here and the weather.

I called the Tribune because it was told to me when I moved to this area that if it was in the Tribune it had to be true. But I wanted to find out what some of the impacts were with the construction of the deep tunnel.

The methane gas explosions that they had in the deep tunnel project, they attributed two deaths to that. One was by asphyxiation. [illegible] and the [illegible] they were not.

3 My understanding is that the level of methane gas out [illegible] this area, as my brother-in-law told me, is slightly higher than the area that they are looking at for the deep tunnel. [illegible] are certainly looking for some deaths, because large construction projects bring death with them. That is just the way it is.

4 The other thing that concerns me is they are talking about truck traffic. I do not know how many of you are native Illinoisans, or how many of you are from the [illegible]. But we have the dubious honor of having 17 of the 25 worst freeway systems in the United States. These roads cannot handle the kind of traffic we have here now. St. Charles is struggling to try and find a way to relieve its just day-to-day congestion. Bringing in up to [illegible] trucks, because with that size ring you are definitely going to have to do some major excavating. [illegible] our school buses to school on time. I find it very difficult to [illegible] how we are [illegible] going to go on with our day-to-day lives [illegible].

You are moving massive amounts of dirt. You are talking about heavy tonnage on roads that are not kept up [illegible] and [illegible] of [illegible] you are going to bring a construction project of [illegible] residential area like this.

We have a lot of [illegible] around here. A lot of people [illegible]. We use our downtown area. We are [illegible] close community here. We get out in the streets. We [illegible] the [illegible] is [illegible] type of area that we want [illegible] disruption.

[illegible]

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Hooley. The next speaker will be Robert Raymond. Mr. Raymond.

[illegible] STATEMENT OF ROBERT RAYMOND

[illegible]

The draft Environmental Impact Statement demonstrates that Illinois not only has much of the infrastructure to handle this project, but also offers several unique advantages over other site locations.

The single greatest asset we in Illinois have is the Fermilab. Millions of dollars can be saved on both construction and operating costs by using the Fermilab facilities in the construction of the SSC.

The analysis outlined in the draft Environmental Impact Statement shows that less new roads would be needed here in Illinois and the Fermilab's excellent location, or major transportation arterials, can save many project dollars. The analysis also shows that existing infrastructure in Illinois would mean less improvements would be needed to provide electric power and natural gas. Water and sewer services are also available on the site.

The Fermilab site includes few ecological natural areas and would result in negligible habitat loss. Some prime farmland would be lost as a previous speaker mentioned. But as the report points out continuous suburbanization without the SSC would also result in loss of farmland. Fewer acres of prime farmland would be converted to SSC use here in Illinois than in any other location under consideration except Arizona.

The summary table shows a large amount of wetlands at the Illinois site. Although wetlands comprise of about 11 percent of the site, as the statement points out, much of the wetland property lies within the existing Fermilab property and makes up a portion of the prairie Fermilab restoration natural area.

The report concludes that permanent conversion of wetland habitat would be minor in terms of real extent and value of the habitat. Mitigating wetland damage would be undertaken by the Department of Energy.

The analysis also shows that the increased population with the incumbent housing and public service needs of that population could be more than adequately accommodated here in Illinois. Increased housing demands could be easily met by the area's construction industry. Increases in public service employment would be very negligible.

While the existing Fermilab facilities and surrounding infrastructure would result in lower costs and lesser impact on community facilities, it would also mean more in economic benefits. More indirect peak year construction jobs for 7,044 jobs would be created at the Illinois site. More indirect jobs, for 3,776 jobs would be realized during the first year operation. Finally, higher SSC-related earnings and sales both during construction and during the first year of operation would occur at the Illinois site. Creating the greatest economic benefit and the lowest cost is the unique opportunity available only here in Illinois. Fermilab's existing facilities afford us this opportunity.

The draft Environmental Impact Statement outlines many of the advantages of siting the SSC here in Illinois. As chairman of the DuPage Development Community and a member of the DuPage County Regional Planning Commission for the last 20 years I strongly endorse the selection of Fermilab as a location of the SSC and feel that the Illinois site is the best possible and most economical choice. Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else here this afternoon that is scheduled to speak? I suspect not. Therefore I will call a recess for this session. There will be a reconvening of the session at 7:00 in the gymnasium. Understand that this auditorium will remain open in case there are walk-in speakers and it may also be possible for some of the people who are scheduled later in the gymnasium to give their testimony earlier here if they wish.

I want to say that I deeply appreciate everybody's cooperation this afternoon in following the procedures of the hearing and the courtesy that was shown to all of the people, and special thanks for taking the time to make such thoughtful comments. The meeting is now adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 5:05 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.)