

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/9/2023 5:03:26 PM

First name: Richard

Last name: Brake

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am a retired Ph.D. Biophysicist, who worked 35 years at Los Alamos National Laboratory. I finished my career in senior management positions over ES&H, including NEPA compliance programs of this \$2B institution. I know two competing things about the collision of profit-motivated industry and environmental protection: 1) Industry, without fail, veils its profit-first motives in exaggerated environmental stewardship intentions. 2) Environmental protectors are always swept into uncompromising positions that weigh heavily every damage to land, water, and air - even those damages that are minimal in extent or persistence in time. I do not envy regulators faced with bringing all positions to the table in a fair fight to resolution, but such a fair fight **MUST BE COMPLETED** before decisions are made. The magnitude of the disagreements between the two sides in this Perpetual-vs-Environmentalists war tells me those difficult debates have not been adequately addressed. A simple example is the environmentalists' complaint that regional traffic impacts on ID-55 have not been addressed in the EIS.

Therefore, I suggest the following:

Regulators make a list of the most significant points of disagreement, perhaps 20 in number, and force fact-based final hearings on each in turn.

Final hearings should be moderated by unbiased parties who are proven experts in these areas and can work toward consensus around the facts.

Based on the hearings, the regulators must decide resolution and document their decision as a part of public record.

All parties at these final hearings must abide by the decisions rendered.

Good luck. I'm happy to be retired.

Rick