

DOCKET NUMBER

PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-15FSI~~DOCKETED  
USNRC

**From:** Bushnell Mart H Contr 388 RANS/JT3 <Mart.Bushnell@HILL.af.mil>  
**To:** "hearingdocket@nrc.gov" <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 5, 2002 11:41 AM  
**Subject:** Salt Lake Hearing in Nuslear Waste

2002 APR -5 PM 1: 24

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Trish, could you please list me as a speaker at the Salt Lake City hearings in Nuc Waste Storage on 8 April at 7 p.m. I am representing the Utah Defense Alliance and Ms Vicki McCall who is a candidate for congress. Thank you.  
Mart Bushnell ph 801 777 9527 fax 801 777 9521

SERVED APR 10 2002

**CC:** "drneilso@deq.state.ut.us" <drneilso@deq.state.ut.us>, "vickiel@webpipe.net" <vickiel@webpipe.net>

Template = SECY-038

SECY-02

DOCKET NUMBER

PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-15FSI~~DOCKETED  
USNRC

**From:** John Hadder <hadder@citizenalert.org>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>, <mrm@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Sat, Apr 6, 2002 4:41 PM  
**Subject:** Request for speaking at 4/8/02 ASLB hearing Salt Lake City

April 8, 2002 (11:47AM)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Hello,

I wish to be scheduled to give comment at the upcoming Nuclear Regulatory Commission Atomic Safety and Licensing Board evidentiary hearings in Salt Lake City Monday, April 8.

Thank you

John Hadder

--

John Hadder  
Citizen Alert  
P.O. Box 5339  
Reno, NV 89513  
775-827-4200  
775-827-4299 (fax)  
hadder@citizenalert.org  
www.citizenalert.org

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-1551~~

DOCKETED  
USNRC

**From:** <Mdraperhome@aol.com>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Sun, Apr 7, 2002 9:46 PM  
**Subject:** REGISTERED COMMENTER FOR SLC HEARING, 4/8

April 8, 2002 (11:47AM)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

I am writing this e mail on behalf of my neighbor, Barbara Gander, or Salt Lake City. She does not have access to the Internet.

She is currently a registered speaker at the hearing in SLC tomorrow, but in the session running from 2-5:00 PM. She has small children and that will be a difficult time for her to get childcare. She would greatly appreciate being registered instead in the session beginning at 7:00 PM, so that her husband can take care of their little ones after he returns from work.

As soon as you can, can you please reply to this request? Thanks very much.  
Mary Draper

**CC:** <mrm@nrc.gov>

April 1, 2002

April 8, 2002 (11:47AM)

Office of the Secretary  
Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff  
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Re: In re Private Fuel Storage, LLC  
Proposed ISFSI Facility, Skull Valley, Utah  
Written Comments Regarding Environmental Impact Statement (NUREG  
-1714.

Dear Sir/Madam:

On behalf of our children and ourselves, we would like to express our general opposition to the above NRC licensing application (and the application for a BLM right-of-way) for an independent spent fuel storage facility (ISFSF) in Skull Valley, Utah, unless the staffs of the NRC, BLM, STB and BIA properly assess and consider the environmental impacts in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and applicable CEQ and NRC regulations, including 40 CFR 1500 *et seq.* and 10 CFR Parts 51 and 72, and NUREG 1567. We request that the NRC, BIA, STB and BLM deny the licensing and right-of-way applications unless or until their respective staffs remedy the defects in their FEIS.

First, it is not clear from the FEIS which of the four agency regulations controlled the preparation of the document, but it appears the FEIS does not comply with at least some of all the respective agency regulations. As drafted by the NRC, BLM, BIA and STP, the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) fails to comply with NEPA, the CEQ regulations, and the NRC regulations in a number of areas. Our concerns focus on, but are not limited to, the lack of an adequate assessment of the hydrogeology of the site and transportation areas and the impacts to groundwater quality. Some of our specific concerns follow:

- NEPA requires that EIS mitigation plans be described in "sufficient detail" to allow the decision maker to properly consider whether the mitigation will minimize adverse impacts. Although the Skull Valley FEIS states that someday, someone, somewhere, may prepare a groundwater monitoring plan to mitigate the groundwater impacts,<sup>1</sup> we are unable to find any details of this hypothetical monitoring plan in the FEIS itself. The material terms of the hypothetical monitoring plan must exist before they can be considered by the decision maker.
- NEPA requires, and the CEQ and NRC regulations state that issues identified in the EIS scoping document will be analyzed in detail. One issue identified in the scoping document is groundwater quality. As near as we can tell, the FEIS contains only one

<sup>1</sup> We were surprised to see a reference to a future groundwater monitoring plan in the FEIS because we did not see any reference to any groundwater monitoring plan in the Draft EIS.

paragraph pertaining to groundwater quality, and it only makes a vague reference to groundwater quality apparently taken from an old reconnaissance report. This single paragraph,<sup>2</sup> without any site specific groundwater quality data fail to satisfy the “detailed” analysis mandated by NEPA and NRC regulations.

- Among other things, NRC regulations require that EISs comply with the requirements of Part 72, Subpart E. Clearly one paragraph on groundwater quality, without any site specific data, or assessment is insufficient to comply with Part 72, and the applicable parts of NUREG 1567, including §§ 2.4.5 and 2.5.5.
- The applicant places far too much reliance on the integrity of its storage canisters to prevent spills or releases of radiologics. Although the NRC may have a policy of limiting safety concerns under the Atomic Energy Act to “credible” accidents, we do not believe NEPA and the related NRC environmental regulations allow such a limitation., i.e., releases of radiologics and non-radiologics should be assumed to occur even if the exact release mechanism is unknown. Put another way, NEPA requires an assessment of impacts from releases of radiologics and non-radiologics, not an analysis of *how* a release may occur. Intentional or unintentional releases are an assumed event, and therefore should be part of the groundwater quality analyses.
- NRC environmental impact guidance for ISFSIs states that, if a groundwater production well is to be placed onsite then the aquifer, its different hydrologic units, and the specific hydrogeology of the site, as well as groundwater fate and transport modeling should be assessed and performed. See e.g., NUREG 1567 §§ 2.4.5, 2.5.5., 2.5.4.9. Clearly the FEIS fails to include any information of this type, not to mention why this hydrogeologic information is absent from the FEIS. CEQ regulations are clear that the absence of information and data should be discussed and unless the cost of acquiring the information is exorbitant, the information should be acquired.
- Finally, the FEIS is required to discuss the good with the bad, i.e., the EIS should not discuss only the information which supports the proposal. This the FEIS fails to perform, especially in the context of hydrogeology and groundwater quality. For example, the FEIS indicates the native surface soils are allegedly of low permeability and will prevent infiltration of spills and releases to the groundwater. Among other things, the FEIS fails to adequately note that there is no site specific data to support that conclusion; that there are dozens of open or improperly sealed boreholes across the site which may act as direct conduits to the groundwater (or zones just above the groundwater); that soil types vary widely across the site, and therefore, so will the hydraulic conductivity of the soils; and that without site specific data, there simply is not enough data to reach *any* scientifically supportable conclusion regarding the hydrologic connection between the surface soils and the groundwater.


None of the above *factual* information is new and was known to the staffs because it is in the applicant's submittals (or is the position of the applicant). We appreciate your consideration of the above concerns and recommend that the NRC, BLM, STB and BIA

---

<sup>2</sup> See final paragraph of FEIS section 3.2.2, pgs. 3.13 – 3-14.

staffs supplement the FEIS to correct the above deficiencies before the Commission and other agencies reach their respective decisions.

Very truly yours



Kurt E. Seel



Sheryl D. Seel

Kurt and Sheryl Seel  
3207 Nutree Drive  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84121

cc: Licensing Board  
PFS Limited Appearance Box  
Mail Stop T-3F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Skull Written Comments

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-ISESI~~

**From:** "Lyn BENNETT" <bennety@uvsc.edu>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Sun, Apr 7, 2002 10:08 PM  
**Subject:** High-Level Nuclear Waste in Utah

DOCKETED  
USNRC

April 8, 2002 (11:47AM)

To Whom It May Concern:

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

As a Utah resident I wanted to take the opportunity to respond to the proposed use of the Skull Valley Reservation as a dumping ground, albeit temporarily, for high-level nuclear waste.

I am adamantly opposed to not only storing high-level nuclear waste anywhere in Utah but I am equally opposed to transporting it through this state. My response is primarily based on two ideas which are linked to each other: 1) the inherent danger of nuclear waste (radiation) and 2) the environmental impact on lands under consideration for wilderness designation in the America's Redrock Wilderness Act (especially the Cedar Mountain unit).

Although the NRC may point to its good record of no transportation accidents involving high-level nuclear waste, I would simply state that it only takes ONE accident to devastate the surrounding human population and natural habitats. I am NOT willing to sacrifice lives or environment if such an accident should occur. No one can guarantee the safe transportation or safe storage of nuclear waste.

I believe it is time this nation started to seek safe and environmental friendly sources of energy.

Please include my comments in your Public Comments Report.

Lyn Ellen Bennett,  
Utah Resident  
P.O. Box 1272  
Orem, Utah 84059

**CC:** <SENATOR@bennett.senate.gov>, <SENATOR@bennett.senate.gov>

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-ISFSI~~

**From:** <TMBawden@aol.com>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Sun, Apr 7, 2002 10:48 PM  
**Subject:** NRC Public Hearing on April 8, 2002

DOCKETED  
USNRC

April 8, 2002 (11:47AM)

My name is Michele Bawden-Medura, and I would like to speak at the April 8th hearing in Salt Lake City which is scheduled at 7:00 p.m.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Thank you.

**CC:** <mrm@nrc.gov>

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-2-1~~ ISFSI

**From:** <DTBawden@aol.com>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Sun, Apr 7, 2002 10:51 PM  
**Subject:** NRC Hearing

DOCKETED  
USNRC

April 8, 2002 (11:47AM)

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Noelani Tobler, and I would like to speak at the NRC hearing scheduled in Salt Lake City on April 8th at 7:00 p.m.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Thank you

**CC:** <mrm@nrc.gov>

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-ISESI~~

DOCKETED  
USNRC

**From:** Deb Holling <alla-100@amc-inc.com>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 8, 2002 10:22 PM  
**Subject:** Utah Nuclear Waste

2002 APR -9 AM 7: 58

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

I am against having a "temporary" nuclear waste storage facility in Utah. Frankly, I am appalled at how materialistic this world has become and that people would do anything for money, including putting nuclear waste in their own backyard, endangering not only their own children but also generations beyond.

Deb Allard

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-ESFST~~

DOCKETED  
USNRC

**From:** erica hartman <gypsybum@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 8, 2002 7:34 PM  
**Subject:** skull valley

2002 APR -9 AM 7: 58

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

I am a student at Utah Valley State College and having recently learned about the preparations to store high level nuclear waste in Skull Valley I would like to voice my opinion. As a resident of this state, I am opposed to having toxic waste so near to my home. If we all refuse to support PFS, then they will be forced to procure other means whereby electricity can be generated. Let us not be a state that supports companies who hold such little regard for the health of our people. Sincerely, Erica Hartman

---

Do You Yahoo!?  
Yahoo! Tax Center - online filing with TurboTax  
<http://taxes.yahoo.com/>

DOCKETED  
USNRCDOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-ES651~~

2002 APR -9 AM 7: 58

**From:** Devan Thorne <dstdevan@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 8, 2002 3:50 PM  
**Subject:** I have a voice!

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

I am a citizen living in the Provo/Orem are and I am very concerned with the Nuclear Waste that might be allowed to be stored on the Goshute Indian Reservation. Utah has been used so many times for the Governments projects while many citizens are getting sick and not being able to get better because of life alteirng chemicals or tailings. Many people/workers are sick in the Tooele/Grantsville area because of the Nerve Gas disposal and bombm testing done by the Federal Government and their lack of education on that matter. Many people have Cancer and hundreds of soliders died at a young age because of expulsion to Radiation. Many people alowed it to happen because they needed jobs. The Goshute Tribe will receive up to \$200 million for their agreement and it is not right. Terrorosm is a big threat right now and I am not guranteed the safety if I go anywhere. What about Terriosm ti a Nucear Waste Site. If the Terrorost get control of some of and a suicide bomber gets Nuclear Wast!  
e they could destroy our precious State or poison us. I think we should find another place like Upper Canada or middle Rural Canada. We could sent ot to space but don't put it in my state! HAs anybody thought about Mexico or Alaska. It would be better than making the west a Nuclear Waste playground.

I would appreciate you find another location because the majority of citizens do not want it here and We should have the coice on this matter.

Thank You

Devan Thorne

-----  
Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Tax Center - online filing with TurboTax

## DOCKET NUMBER

PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-15FSI~~DOCKETED  
USNRC

**From:** "MARTIN GROVER" <1grovema@uvsc.edu>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 8, 2002 2:42 PM  
**Subject:** Opposed to storage of nuclear waste.

2002 APR -9 AM 7: 58

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

## NRC

I am vehemently opposed to storing low or high level nuclear waste in Skull valley or Utah. Nuclear waste needs to be disposed of in different means than storage. Nuclear engineers know that spent fuel rods can be recharged and reused many more times than currently are being allowed by regulators. Waste far exceeds what it should. I am opposed to storing waste in a desert ecosystem that you do not understand also. Utah is not a place to stuff all your used junk. Thank you for allowing me to voice my opinion.

Martin Grover, Orem Utah

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-10651~~

**From:** <Lou\_Krens@adp.com>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 8, 2002 2:38 PM  
**Subject:** Public forum on Skull Valley repository

DOCKETED  
USNRC

2002 APR -9 AM 7: 57

There is a public forum on the possibility of a nuclear waste repository in Skull Valley at the Salt Lake Convention Center in Salt Lake City today. Are there two meetings, one at 2-5 PM and one at 7-9:30 PM? Or, is there just one? If there's only one, what is the correct time? Am I correct in assuming that the meeting is open to everyone and you only need to sign-up if you want to speak?

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Thank you,  
Lou Krens  
801-956-6412

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-ESFSI~~

**From:** "Richard wagner" <richard8@xmission.com>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 8, 2002 1:30 PM  
**Subject:** Nuclear Waste

DOCKETED  
USNRC

2002 APR -9 AM 7: 57

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Hello, my name is Richard Wagner, and I am Salt Lake City Resident. I live at 1177 So. 800 E. Bsmt, and I am signing up to speak at the 7:30 PM public hearing at the Salt Palace. Thank you for signing me up to the list.

Sincerely,  
Richard Wagner

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-1661~~

DOCKETED  
USNRC

**From:** "J. Jensen" <jjensen@healutah.org>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>, <mrm@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 8, 2002 1:26 PM  
**Subject:** request to speak at public hearing

2002 APR -9 AM 7: 57

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Dear NRC,

I wish to speak at the public hearing tonight (4-8-02) at the Salt Palace Convention Center in Salt Lake City regarding the proposed Private Fuel Storage facility. Please add me to the roster.

Thank you,

Jon Jensen  
Outreach Assistant  
HEAL Utah  
68 S. Main St., Suite 400  
Salt Lake City, UT 84101  
jjensen@healutah.org  
801-355-5055

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-ESFSI~~DOCKETED  
USNRC

**From:** <ams25@utah.edu>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 8, 2002 1:24 PM  
**Subject:** Objections to transport of spent nuclear fuel

2002 APR -9 AM 7:57

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Dear sirs of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

I am writing today to voice my strong objection to the proposal for a temporary storage facility of spent nuclear fuel to be located in skull valley Utah. My main objection is regarding the lack of planning that this proposition is built upon. If this material is stored here it will be only after vigorous litigation. Furthermore, before it could ever depart there would be a lot more litigation. I am not completely opposed to this material finding its final resting place at that facility, but it should be licensed as a permanent repository if there is even the remotest chance that is what it will become. The lack of thorough planning regarding the site is not the biggest problem however. The transportation of the material itself seems to be the part of the plan with the most risk and the least assessment of that risk. In the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the site transportation risks were not addressed. To my knowledge that is how they remain today. Considering that tests of the storage casks omitted the effect of sabotage or use of weapons such as tank killing shape charges, moving this material now would create an uncertain level of risk to thousands of miles of open space and dozens of cities. With transportation corridors stretching virtually from one side of the nation to the other, the opportunity for a ready made radiological weapon would become an all to real threat to many metropolitan areas and waterways across our country.

I understand that there are risks associated with leaving spent fuel where it is in the densest population centers of America. It is further understood that onsite storage is rapidly running out. Left unaddressed this could result in the premature decommissioning of several power plants. But there is an alternative. If more money were invested in fast breeder reactor technology then we could develop a path towards truly eliminating this high level waste. And at the time that technology reaches fruition this material, which would then again be fuel, would need to be exactly where it is now, at the power plants where it can effectively be safe guarded. Not spread across the country in rail yards, not in the Utah desert and not underneath Yucca Mountain in Nevada.

In closing I would urge you to avoid creating such a blatant target for terrorism. Our enemies have proved themselves adept at exploiting resources to make weapons of mass destruction. Lets not hand them the means to permanently poison the cities of their choice. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Adam Silver

Student Father and Resident,  
Salt Lake City, Utah.

**CC:** <mrm@nrc.gov>

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-15651~~

DOCKETED  
USNRC

2002 APR -9 AM 7: 57

**From:** Terri Peacock <terripeacock@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 8, 2002 12:44 PM  
**Subject:** public speaking

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

I would like to schedule a time to speak at the April 26, 2002 NRC meeting in Tooele, Utah at the High School Auditorium between 3:30 - 5:30 P.M. In the event that time slot is full I request to be scheduled between 7:00 - 9:30 P.M.

Thank you, Terri Peacock

-----  
Do You Yahoo!?  
Yahoo! Tax Center - online filing with TurboTax

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-15651~~

DOCKETED  
USNRC

**From:** mike mckay <mikemckay2000@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 8, 2002 10:13 AM  
**Subject:** public hearing

2002 APR -9 AM 7: 57

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

to whom it may concern:

i would like to take a moment at your  
public hearing today to express my views on storing  
high level nuclear waste at the skull valley goshute  
indian reservation.

i plan to be at the 2pm to 5pm session at the salt  
palace convention center in salt lake city.

please email me to confirm your receiving this email.

thank you...

kevin stanfield

mikemckay2000@yahoo.com

---

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Tax Center - online filing with TurboTax

<http://taxes.yahoo.com/>

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. ~~72-22-ISFSI~~

DOCKETED  
USNRC

**From:** George Holling <hollinge@uvsc.edu>  
**To:** <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 8, 2002 11:03 PM  
**Subject:** Storage of Nuclear Waste in Utah

2002 APR -9 AM 7: 58

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

To Whom It May Concern,

I strongly object to the storage of nuclear waste in the State of Utah for the following reasons:

1. while it currently appears that this could be accomplished safely, history has shown that unanticipated, serious problems may show up in the future. Since the waste may be active and dangerous for several thousand years the cost of a future cleanup may be prohibitively expensive and could easily ruin the economy of the State of Utah and its neighbors.
2. since the true cost of storing and maintaining a storage site for nuclear waste is not well known nor understood it is impossible to determine a fair compensation to the owners of the proposed site and the residents of the State of Utah. The future costs to the State resulting from storing this nuclear waste could be significantly higher than any revenue generated directly or indirectly from this transaction. It is the responsibility of the government to protect its citizens from any unfair exploitation and thus the government should not allow the storage of such materials in the State of Utah unless it also agrees to hold Utah and its residents harmless (directly and indirectly) for any future costs associated with the storage of such nuclear waste.
3. for the reasons outlined above the government should not allow the generation and disposal of any such nuclear waste unless the party responsible can be held accountable and can demonstrate its ability to pay for all future costs associated with maintaining a suitable storage site for such waste.
4. the preferred method of disposing of waste already generated is to pay foreign countries to dispose of such waste, where no liability will be incurred by the US and its citizens. Further, no future activities that generate such waste should be allowed unless the party generating such waste has an approved plan and financing in place to dispose of such waste.

I ask that the above be considered in opposition to any plans to move and storage nuclear waste in the State of Utah.

George H. Holling

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of )  
 )  
PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE, L.L.C. )  
 )  
(Independent Spent Fuel Storage )  
Installation) )

Docket No. 72-22-ISFSI

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENTS have been served upon the following persons by deposit in the U.S. mail, first class, or through NRC internal distribution.

Office of Commission Appellate  
Adjudication  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Administrative Judge  
G. Paul Bollwerk, III, Chairman  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
Mail Stop - T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Administrative Judge  
Jerry R. Kline  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
Mail Stop - T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Administrative Judge  
Peter S. Lam  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
Mail Stop - T-3 F23  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Sherwin E. Turk, Esquire  
Catherine L. Marco, Esquire  
Office of the General Counsel  
Mail Stop - 0-15 D21  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Diane Curran, Esquire  
Harmon, Curran, Spielberg  
& Eisenberg, L.L.P.  
1726 M Street, NW, Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20036

Joro Walker, Esquire  
Director, Utah Office  
Land and Water Fund of the Rockies  
1473 South 1100 East, Suite F  
Salt Lake City, UT 84105

Martin S. Kaufman, Esquire  
Atlantic Legal Foundation  
205 E. 42<sup>nd</sup> St.  
New York, NY 10017

Docket No. 72-22-ISFSI  
LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENTS

Denise Chancellor, Esquire  
Assistant Attorney General  
Utah Attorney General's Office  
160 East 300 South, 5th Floor  
P.O. Box 140873  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Jay E. Silberg, Esquire  
D. Sean Barnett, Esquire  
Shaw Pittman  
2300 N Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037-1128


John Paul Kennedy, Sr., Esquire  
David W. Tufts, Esquire  
Confederated Tribes of the Goshute  
Reservation and David Pete  
Durham Jones & Pinegar  
111 East Broadway, Suite 900  
Salt Lake City, UT 84105

Richard Wilson  
Department of Physics  
Harvard University  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Tim Vollmann, Esquire  
3301-R Coors Road N.W., #302  
Albuquerque, NM 87120

Paul C. EchoHawk, Esquire  
ECHOHAWK LAW OFFICES  
151 North 4th Avenue, Suite A  
P.O. Box 6119  
Pocatello, ID 83205-6119

Marlinda Moon, Chairman  
Sammy Blackbear, Sr., Vice-Chairman  
Miranda Wash, Secretary  
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians  
P.O. Box 511132  
Salt Lake City, UT 84151-1132

  
Office of the Secretary of the Commission

Dated at Rockville, Maryland,  
this 10<sup>th</sup> day of April 2002