# Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: 2.206 Petition – Mr. Salsman September 19, 2008

Teleconference on October 16, 2008

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: (telephone conference)

Date: Thursday, October 16, 2008

Work Order No.: NRC-2504 Pages 1-17

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. Court Reporters and Transcribers 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 234-4433

	1
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	PETITION REVIEW BOARD (PRB)
5	CONFERENCE CALL
6	+ + + +
7	THURSDAY
8	OCTOBER 16, 2008
9	+ + + +
10	The conference call was held, Jeffery A.
11	Clark, Chairman of the Petition Review Board,
12	presiding.
13	
14	PETITIONER: JAMES SALSMAN
15	
16	PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS
17	JEFFERY A. CLARK, Chairman
18	MAHENDRA J. SHAH, Petition Manager
19	BRETT MICHAEL KLUKAN
20	EUGENE M. PETERS
21	CHRISTOPHER M. STAAB
22	NRC STAFF
23	NORMA GARCIA-SANTOS, NMSS Petition Coordinator
24	This transcript done from an audio CD provided
25	by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	1:00 p.m.
3	BRIDGE OPERATOR: Good afternoon. Is
4	anybody on the line?
5	MR. SALSMAN: Hello. This is James
6	Salsman. I'm the petitioner.
7	MR. SHAH: Hi, Mr. Salsman. How are you?
8	MR. SALSMAN: Very well, Dr. Shah. How
9	are you?
10	MR. SHAH: All right. I guess you have
11	all the people you were planning to have or?
12	MR. SALSMAN: I don't know. They probably
13	will call in. I was hoping they would, but who knows?
14	MR. SHAH: Do you want to wait or?
15	MR. SALSMAN: No, no, that's okay.
16	MR. SHAH: You understand this is a
17	recorded line, right?
18	MR. SALSMAN: That's right.
19	MR. SHAH: Okay.
20	BRIDGE OPERATOR: This is the NRC
21	Operations Officer. Are you expecting a number of
22	additional callers?
23	MR. SALSMAN: Well, maybe.
24	BRIDGE OPERATOR: Maybe?
25	MR. SALSMAN: I don't know. It's

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

3 unlikely, very unlikely. 2 BRIDGE OPERATOR: Okay. If there are, I can do an automated roll call. 3 If there's not, obviously you all know who's on the line right now. If you want me to, just ask for me and I'll do an automated roll call. 6 MR. SALSMAN: Thank you. Mr. Salsman, do you want to 8 MR. SHAH: 9 start the teleconference? 10 MR. SALSMAN: Thank you, yes. I've read 11 the response to the petition and I've tried to 12 understand requirements the and have not been successful in understanding the requirements 13 14 submitting a petition of this kind. I was --MR. SHAH: -- Go ahead. 15 MR. SALSMAN: I was surprised by the 16 request for specific examples of problems with the 17 18 casks or problems with the weather events which is not really predictable on a local level over time. 19 Mr. Salsman, can we -- I sent 20 MR. SHAH: 21 you an agenda. Can we follow the agenda? 22 MR. SALSMAN: Yes, I mentioned I read your The --23 response. 24 MR. SHAH: No, I was talking about the

agenda for this teleconference. You have the first

item there was summary of this process, 2.206 process 2 and the petition. MR. SALSMAN: Right. I'm sorry. Go 4 ahead. MR. CLARK: Mr. Salsman, this is --MR. SHAH: How about if we introduce? let's go ahead MR. CLARK: Yes, 8 introduce everybody that's here. 9 First of all, Mr. Salsman, this is Jeff 10 I'm the Acting Deputy Director Clark. 11 Licensing and Inspection Directorate in the Office of 12 Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. I'm the Chairman of the 2.206 Petition process. 13 14 Next. MS. GARCIA-SANTOS: Yes, I'm Norma Garcia 15 and the Petition Coordinator. They keep me informed 16 about what the process is and the process that they're 17 following and just being informed for the petition. 18 19 MR. PETERS: My name is Gene Peters. a technical member of the PRB. 20 21 MR. KLUKAN: My name is Brett Klukan. I'm 22 an attorney in the Office of General Counsel. 23 My name is Mahendra Shah. I'm MR. SHAH: 24 the Petition Manager for this petition you have

submitted.

MR. STAAB: My name is Chris Staab. 2 a technical member of the PRB. MR. SHAH: Okay. Jeff. MR. CLARK: Okay, Mr. Salsman, what I want 5 to do is just go over a summary of the 2.206 process. This may be beneficial in answering your overall question and also to go over your petition and where 8 we are in the process with that at this time. 9 MR. SALSMAN: A question about the roster. MR. CLARK: Okay. 10 11 MR. SALSMAN: Are there any members from 12 the Enforcement or Inspections division the on Petition Review Board? 13 14 MR. SHAH: No, we do not. MR. CLARK: Well, I am the Deputy Director 15 of the Licensing and the Inspection Directorate for 16 Yucca Mountain. 17 MR. SALSMAN: I see. Okay. And what 18 about enforcement? 19 20 MR. CLARK: No, we do not. 21 MR. SALSMAN: I see. Proceed. 22 MR. CLARK: Okay. First of all, regards to, we have a Management Directive 8.11 that 23 covers the 2.206 petition process and it's the policy 24 25 Nuclear Regulatory Commission to provide the

members of the public with a means to request that the Commission take enforcement related action, either to modify, suspend or revoke a license or for other appropriate enforcement-related action and this is distinguished from actions such as licensing or rulemaking.

We received several correspondences regarding your request, but if I may, I would like to consolidate into the two points that you have made in several correspondences with us. The first one --

MR. SALSMAN: First, may I ask that you explain why modifying the existing license is not considered an enforcement-related action?

MR. CLARK: Modifying an existing license is an enforcement-related action.

MR. SALSMAN: That's my understanding as well. So why is there nobody from enforcement on the Petition Review Board?

MR. CLARK: We can understand from our position basically mine from the Licensing and Inspection Directorate that this is not an enforceable action. Actually, part of the position that you're making goes towards a potential for rulemaking or for other related actions which we'll cover in a little bit more detail when we get to that point.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. SALSMAN: And I've already been told 2 to file a petition for rulemarking as an alternative to petitions for modifications of licenses and I feel 3 4 like I'm getting the runaround. MR. SHAH: We never talked about that, did Did we say that -- This is Mahendra Shah. 6 Dr. Shah, let me tell you MR. SALSMAN: 8 about that. There's a petition for rulemaking pending in the 9th Circuit currently under review and I have a 9 10 series of questions and including questions that might 11 involve ethical concerns. Now are there any questions which you consider off-limits? 12 MR. SHAH: Questions related to? 13 14 MR. KLUKAN: This is Brett Klukan, Mr. Could you give an example of such a 15 Salsman. question? 16 MR. SALSMAN: Well, I sent in a list of I 17 think it was 17 or 18 questions about why I don't 18 for specific 19 understand the request meteorologic 20 predictions and I know you've received those. Dr. 21 Shah told me that you received those by email. 22 MR. SHAH: Yes. MR. SALSMAN: Okay. There is also this --23 24 It strikes me as extremely suspicious that a decision 25 about whether or not the request was an enforcement-

related action took place without the involvement of 2 the enforcement staff. That's clearly irregular. 3 CLARK: We are evaluating 4 technical merits of the action you proposed. 5 MR. SALSMAN: Well, technically your procedure as the management directive states that 6 you're supposed to involve the enforcement department 8 personnel. 9 Could you just -- This is MR. KLUKAN: 10 Brett Klukan, Mr. Salsman. Could you point out to 11 where, I recognize you may not have it in front of 12 you, in the management directive you're pointing to? Yes, I most certainly will 13 MR. SALSMAN: 14 at a later time. I'll follow up by email with that. You know, I was hoping that you would be familiar with 15 it. 16 Anyway, let's --17 MR. CLARK: Mr. Salsman, again this is 18 Let's go back in one -- Just so that 19 Jeff Clark. we're all on common ground here. 20 State the two 21 requests that we believe we have from you before us. 22 The first is that you asked for immediate NRC approval on a tentative basis of the licensee 23 24 application filed by the U.S. Department of Energy on

June 3, 2008.

MR. SALSMAN: Excuse me. I think you have 2 the date wrong. I requested the application that has been docketed and obviously approved. 3 MR. CLARK: Okay. MR. SALSMAN: Thank you. MR. CLARK: So you're requesting immediate 6 authorization to NRC approval for construct 8 geological repository at Yucca Mountain. And maybe even more than 9 MR. SALSMAN: 10 It depends on how many you need to -- How many 11 cores you need to store? So, you know, I feel very 12 strongly about this and now I've found out that you didn't actually follow your own procedures. 13 14 MR. CLARK: Well, Mr. Salsman, let me tell 15 you this. MR. SALSMAN: It's the same pattern and 16 practice of negligence and irresponsibility on the 17 part of the Commission and I think those responsible 18 should be held responsible. 19 Mr. Salsman, on the first 20 MR. CLARK: 21 aspect, the first item, immediate NRC approval of the 22 license application, I'm going to state to you that 23 clearly it's not within the realm of enforceable 24 action.

MR. SALSMAN: Oh, really.

1	MR. CLARK: Because there is no license
2	approval at this time and we cannot from a request
3	from the public circumvent a lengthy technical review
4	and safety review to immediately license this
5	facility.
6	MR. SALSMAN: Not even in the case of an
7	emergency.
8	MR. CLARK: You would have to provide the
9	benefit to the American public of circumventing like I
10	said basically a year long technical review to
11	determine the safety of Yucca Mountain.
12	MR. SALSMAN: Seven hundred thousand jobs
13	if we construct 35 plants by 2030.
14	MR. CLARK: I think, Mr. Salsman, that's
15	immaterial to what we're stating.
16	MR. SALSMAN: Is it immaterial or are we
17	talking about what it costs to insure not just the
18	facilities that are covered by the Price Anderson Act
19	but the related facilities supporting the plants and
20	the neighborhoods around the plants and storage
21	facilities.
22	MR. CLARK: I understand what you're
23	saying, Mr. Salsman. But again, that's not an
24	enforceable action.

MR. SALSMAN: Why not?

Т	MR. CLARK: Because there is not a tenable
2	license application until we do the technical review.
3	MR. PETERS: Maybe I can say it another
4	way. This is Gene Peters. We can only take an
5	enforcement action against a licensee and we do not
6	have a licensee at this point for the proposed Yucca
7	Mountain geologic repository because that application
8	has only recently been docketed. It is undergoing a
9	mandatory safety review which is directed by the
10	Congress under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the
11	NRC.
12	MR. SALSMAN: Are you trying to tell me
13	that you don't license any Department of Energy
14	facilities at all?
15	MR. PETERS: Actually, I don't think we
16	do. Only those that have been privatized like USEC
17	(phonetic). We do not regulate Hanford or Savannah
18	River (phonetic).
19	MR. SALSMAN: What about the facilities
20	surrounding the Department of Energy facilities and
21	supporting them and adjacent to them? You know, it's
22	clear that whether you have a licensee or not, you
23	definitely have licenses which require immediate
24	enforcement action.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}\xspace$  . PETERS: The Department of Energy does

1	not hold a license for Yucca Mountain at this time.
2	So it cannot be an enforcement action.
3	MR. SALSMAN: Well, you know, if I had a
4	trash can full of burning paper and you had a closet,
5	would you tell me that I couldn't apply to open the
6	closet and put the trash can in the closet and close
7	without a technical review?
8	MR. CLARK: Well, I hate to go through
9	analogies, Mr. Salsman.
10	MR. SALSMAN: I know.
11	MR. CLARK: This is Jeff Clark. You know,
12	because analogies are subject to interpretation.
13	MR. SALSMAN: Yes, let's say we had
14	control of the atmosphere in the closet and whatever -
15	_
16	MR. CLARK: The problem is we don't know
17	what the closet is right now. The technical
18	application has just come in for Yucca Mountain from
19	the Department of Energy.
20	MR. SALSMAN: And you're not willing to
21	give them the benefit of the doubt.
22	MR. PETERS: We cannot.
23	MR. SALSMAN: Even though they have been
24	apparently keeping up with OSHA standards for uranium
25	toxicity and you have not.

MR. PETERS: The Congress of the United specifically 2 has directed the Nuclear States 3 Regulatory Commission to evaluate the license 4 application for Yucca Mountain. MR. SALSMAN: Specifically. That is the Congressional 6 MR. PETERS: 7 mandate that we cannot circumvent. MR. SALSMAN: There is a specific law for 8 Yucca Mountain. 9 10 MR. PETERS: The Nuclear Waste Yes. 11 Policy Act of 1982 as amended in 1987, the Nuclear 12 Waste Policy Act amendment, the Energy Policy Act of 1992, the President's Site Recommendation in 2002. 13 14 assure you. This has received national priority. MR. SALSMAN: So what you're telling me is 15 that Congress has specifically told you to follow your 16 procedures which in this case are most prudently 17 modifying any licenses the Department of Energy or any 18 related facility has 19 in order to expedite construction of the facilities that they've applied to 20 21 create. 22 MR. But, Mr. Salsman, this SHAH: Mahendra Shah. Before you conclude that there is an 23 24 emergency, we have to talk about the case. You 25 haven't provided sufficient facts as far as the

storage facility. That's the second issue you had. So you're talking about taking action I, but action II is where you're pointing out an issue or emergency and that's what I think Jeff was about to summarize.

So if you can let Jeff complete his part, we would appreciate that.

MR. CLARK: Let me state the second request that you made to us. The second one was to modify the licenses of dry cask storage facilities to transport their spent nuclear fuel to Yucca Mountain once built if the application was still being reviewed or, as you stated, the application as docketed is now being reviewed.

Our action, the 2.206 Petition Review Board as I stated is to see if your requests meet the criteria of a 2.206 petition, that being that it can invoke the actions that I spoke of before to modify, suspend or revoke a license or that they provide a specific safety concern and safety nexus to describing an action that we would take for an already existing licensee to put something into a safe condition.

MR. SALSMAN: I think the circular reasoning is internally inconsistent.

MR. KLUKAN: In what manner, this is Brett Klukan, Mr. Salsman, is it circular?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MR. SALSMAN: You say that you can't grant
2	the tentative approval because you don't have a
3	licensee. But you can't modify the license the
4	conditions to the emergency which were stated quite
5	clearly in the request for tentative approval, can't
6	be granted because you don't have sufficient
7	emergency.
8	Well, you know, it's going to take a
9	tornado hit on one of your storage facilities or a
10	truck or whatever it is and really bad contamination
11	and then you'll have to get up in the morning, turn on
12	the news and then you'll have to go look at yourself
13	in the mirror and I wonder how many of you are going
14	to be able to do that.
15	MR. CLARK: Mr. Salsman, I understand that
16	you do have concerns and we would like to address your
17	concerns.
18	MR. SALSMAN: Thank you.
19	MR. CLARK: But you also have to
20	understand the function of our board. Our board
21	MR. SALSMAN: I understand quite well the
22	function of your board.
23	MR. CLARK: Our board is for
24	MR. SALSMAN: But I wish it was following
25	the documented function instead of the continued

pattern and practice of negligence which is so evident.

MR. PETERS: I just wanted to separate the two issues. We have the ability to take action on the dry cask storage facilities if the threat is sufficient independent of Yucca Mountain.

MR. SALSMAN: I'm not interested in discussing the circular reading any further. You have my questions. I think that you completely failed to consider several important aspects, not just uranium toxicity to the reproduction system and to the immune system and to the neurons, behavioral effects, but you've also failed to even keep up with the basic ICRP-derived formula for eliminating exposure to acceptable amounts.

The Department of Energy has published documents in 2000 and 2004 which clearly state that you're way out of date and you don't know what you're talking about. You're trying to -- you think you're trying to encourage production, but what you're doing is you're keeping the insurance rates high. So those 700,000 jobs you can just say forget it if that's the way you're going to treat this problem.

MR. SHAH: Mr. Salsman, can we focus on the purpose of this teleconference which is for you to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	provide additional information
2	MR. SALSMAN: I think we should start
3	focusing on the purpose of the Atomic Energy Act.
4	MR. SHAH: Well, the purpose of
5	MR. SALSMAN: Which is to provide economic
6	and effectiveness as well as health and safety.
7	MR. KLUKAN: Mr. Salsman, this is Brett
8	Klukan. That is not the purpose of this that we have
9	afforded you. It is not to discuss generally AEA.
10	It's to give you an additional opportunity to support
11	your claims made in the 2.206
12	MR. SALSMAN: I've been supporting my
13	claims and I think I have made a solid case and you
14	have not offered a single point of evidence opposing
15	my support. What do you have?
16	MR. SHAH: So do you have any additional
17	information that you wanted to tell us about?
18	MR. SALSMAN: No.
19	MR. SHAH: Okay. I think then the purpose
20	of this teleconference I think is served and completed
21	today.
22	(Telephone click.)
23	Thank you.
24	(End of tape.)
25	