

Environmental Control to be on-site, answerable to the local monitoring committees to inspect a site. It would also kick up from \$50,000 to \$100,000 per year the amount of money given to the final site local monitoring committees. I feel this is a very important amendment because it gets, cuts to the heart of what a lot of our problems are. The accountability of the site specific studies that are now taking place is very vital. We must consider that the man-made barriers that will be engineered in these sites will fail. The material of these highly touted barriers is unknown at this time. We're not even sure what they are going to be made of. They say how good they are going to be, but we're not sure what these materials would be constructed of, so the quality of our geological barriers must be guaranteed and unquestionable. Towards this end, I say that the local monitoring committees must have an active role in this process. The Department of Environmental Control has told me earlier that they will not have a man on the site on a daily basis. Now they are claiming that they will. Three weeks, four weeks later they have told me now that, yes, we will have a man on the site on a daily basis. Well I...that's nice, I hope they don't change their mind again later and decide not to. But even with the DEC on-site on a daily basis, I think that we need to allow these local monitoring committees the funding to do the appropriate monitoring themselves. That's what they're there for. My personal experience with state and federal inspectors on the railroad and on soil conservation dams has given me an impression that these local people must have a lot of control and a lot of say on these sites. In the past 16 years, with daily and weekly contact with these state and federal inspectors, I have seen the rules broken more often than I care to tell about. I think we can only consider that it might happen in this case, too. The Department of Environmental Control has told the local monitoring committees they will be very much involved in this process. I maintain that these people can be no more than token committees without the appropriate funding. To gain the acceptability and the trust of the communities, the trust that has been missing for years in this process, we must allow these people a say in their own future. A geologist or other experts accountable to the local monitoring committee will avoid the situation of US Ecology, again handing over the data to these people and say here it is, folks, trust us again. That has been one of the main problems all along. My questions is, can we trust US Ecology to spend 4 to \$6 million on these three remaining sites and then have the gumption to come back and say to us, no, folks, none of these