

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Meeting Between the
Nuclear Regulatory Commission and
the Snake River Alliance

Docket Number: (70-7015)

Location: Boise, Idaho

Date: Monday, August 9, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-379

Pages 1-177

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND
 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT DIRECTORATE (EPPAD)
 DIVISION OF WASTE MANAGEMENT AND
 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (DWMEP)
 OFFICE OF FEDERAL AND STATEMENT MATERIALS AND
 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS (FSME)

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING BETWEEN U.S. NUCLEAR
 REGULATORY COMMISSION AND THE SNAKE RIVER
 ALLIANCE REGARDING THE AREVA DRAFT EIS

+ + + + +

MONDAY, AUGUST 9, 2010

+ + + + +

BOISE, IDAHO

The Public Meeting convened at the Oxford Suites, Boise, 1426 S. Entertainment Avenue at 7:00 p.m., Richard Barkley, Facilitator, presiding.

NRC STAFF PRESENT:

STEPHEN LEMONT, Senior Project Manager, Environmental Review Branch A

DAVID L. SKEEN, Deputy Director, Division of Waste Management and Environmental Protection

THOMAS G. HILTZ, Branch Chief, Advanced Fuel Cycle, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards

RICHARD S. BARKLEY, PE, Nuclear & Environmental Engineer, Office of the Regional Administrator, Region I

DIANA DIAZ-TORO, Branch Chief, Environmental Review Branch A

ASHLEY RIFFLE, Project Manager, Environmental Review Branch A

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

SPEAKER

Richard S. Barkley.....	4
David L. Skeen.....	8
Thomas G. Hiltz.....	16
Stephen Lemont.....	20

Presentations

Andrea Shipley, Snake River Alliance.....	38
Liz Woodruff, Snake River Alliance.....	38

Public Comment

Reham Aarti.....	55
John Revier, for Rep. Simpson.....	56
Sue Chew, state rep.....	58
Jared Fuhriman, Idaho Falls mayor.....	60
Mike Hart.....	63
Paul Kjellander, Gov. Otter's rep.....	66
Lane Allgood, Partnership for Science and Technology.....	69
Timothy Solomon, Regional Development Alliance....	71
Erik Simpson, State Rep.....	73
R.N. Maynard.....	77
Kerry Cook.....	78
Sarah Cohn, Idaho Conservation League.....	80
Robert Simison, City of Meridian.....	83
Lane Packwood, Idaho Department of Commerce.....	85
Lee Staker, Bonneville County commissioner.....	88
Virginia Hemingway.....	89
Diane Jones.....	92
Manley Briggs, M.D.....	94
John Weber.....	97
Trevor Grigg.....	99
Holly Paquette.....	101
Bob Neilson.....	103
Lisa Young.....	105
Joe Schueler.....	108
Bryan Martin.....	112
Bob Poyser, Regional Affairs, AREVA.....	113
Wendy Matson.....	119
Carol Bachelder.....	120
Don Howard.....	123
Stephen Crowley.....	124
Anne Hausrath.....	127
Eric Schuler.....	128
Kreg Davis, Electrical Wholesale Supply.....	131

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S (Cont'd)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Sally Briggs..... 136

Mark Dunham, Idaho AGC..... 137

Brianna Ursenbach..... 140

Robb Chiles, Idaho Chamber Alliance..... 142

Victoria Everett..... 144

Robert Meikle..... 146

Collin Day..... 149

Ted McConaughey..... 151

Josh Weil..... 155

Doug Sayer..... 155

David Coney..... 156

Linda Martin, Eastern Idaho Economic Development
Partners..... 160

Steve Serr, Bonneville County Planning and Zoning
Administrator..... 165

Katie SeEVERS..... 170

Larry Hyatt..... 173

Adjourn

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

[7:05 p.m.]

1
2
3 MR. BARKLEY: Good evening. If you can
4 take a seat, please. It's great to see such a great
5 turnout. The staff puts a lot of effort into
6 arranging a public meeting such as this, and I really
7 appreciate seeing such an extensive turnout, and
8 hopefully my ground rules get presented up there for a
9 second.

10 My name is Richard Barkley. I'm a meeting
11 facilitator for this meeting. I work for the Nuclear
12 Regulatory Commission. I work for a different office
13 than, actually, the people at the front table.

14 And I'm going to go over a little bit
15 about the ground rules for the conduct of this
16 meeting. It will ensure that this meeting goes
17 smoothly, that we are able to get through as many
18 opinions here and as many expressions and comments
19 regarding this draft Environmental Impact Statement as
20 possible. I have almost 40 sign-up cards tonight, so
21 I have to follow some fairly rigid rules on the order
22 in which they're called and the time limit you're held
23 to, so that everybody gets a fair chance to express
24 their opinions this evening.

25 One of the first things I like to do is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 please turn these things off, if you could, including
2 myself, because I've had these go off on me, in
3 meetings, and embarrass myself. To sign up, if you'd
4 like to sign up, please fill out one of the yellow
5 speaker cards at the table in the back. Again, I have
6 a grouping of them.

7 To be fair, the amount of time allotted
8 will be limited and based on the number of speakers
9 who sign up. I would like to hold the time that you
10 speak to no more than five minutes, I think you can
11 express your view in that period of time, and to get
12 through 40 people in this period of time this evening,
13 you can see going over five minutes is going to be
14 very, very difficult.

15 I will call three, possibly four speakers
16 at a time, such that people know that they are "up on
17 deck," to come up. I only want one person to come up
18 to the microphone to speak. I'd like you to speak
19 from this microphone out here on the stage, although
20 if there is a desire to speak from this microphone
21 here, we can do that as well.

22 I will alternate between elected
23 officials, so that we hear from all elected officials,
24 but also I will be calling members of the public, too,
25 as well, so we alternate through. See, that makes for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a much more balanced discussion throughout the
2 evening.

3 I'd ask that you do not interrupt the
4 speaker, or speak when not at the microphone. This
5 meeting is being recorded by a meeting transcriber,
6 and so I need you to speak very clearly into the
7 microphone, if that's possible.

8 The next slide, if we could. Sorry, I
9 didn't take this with me. We've gone through most of
10 these. Again, speaking clearly into the microphone.
11 If there is a need, when we have a short question-and-
12 answer session, I'll come out with a microphone to
13 speak with you.

14 I hope there'll be no disruptive behaviors
15 this evening. So far, this audience, in the course of
16 their interactions with me, has been extremely polite,
17 one of the most polite audiences that I've ever met so
18 far.

19 So hopefully, we'll be very respectful of
20 people's opinions as the evening goes through.

21 Yes, sir?

22 PARTICIPANT: I'm sorry, sir. Would it be
23 possible to speak from the lectern because some of us
24 are appearing and disappearing in a very magical way--

25 [Laughter]

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 PARTICIPANT: It would be nice to be able
2 to see what's being said as well as hear it.

3 MR. BARKLEY: You can do it from either
4 location. Depending on the individual, you may prefer
5 to face the NRC, or to be facing the audience. Okay?

6 PARTICIPANT: And I'm saying you. You
7 speak from the lectern.

8 MR. BARKLEY: Me speak from the lectern.
9 All right. I intend to speak from the lectern the
10 rest of the evening. I was moving around a little bit,
11 so I could actually read my slides.

12 PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

13 MR. BARKLEY: All right. Written comments
14 are always welcome on the Draft EIS, and the staff
15 will talk to you about how you can submit written
16 comments at this meeting tonight. You can submit them
17 during the meeting, at the end of the meeting. It's
18 up to you.

19 Finally, if there's any questions, you
20 have a concern because you need to leave and you want
21 to speak, you need to move up in the order, I can work
22 through that. If there's an issue with how I'm calling
23 people, please come see me. I'll be glad to work
24 through any issues. I want to make this meeting go
25 smoothly and fairly, and be a clear expression of all

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the views regarding this project.

2 At this point in time, I would like to
3 recognize several elected officials we have in the
4 audience.

5 We have Paul Kjellander from the
6 governor's office. He's going to be arriving here,
7 just shortly. I have Leslie Huddleson from Senator
8 Crapo's office. Leslie. Welcome, Leslie. And I have
9 John Revier of Congressman Simpson's office. John, in
10 the back there. They'll be making statements, later
11 on, on behalf of their bosses.

12 Lastly, there are feedback forms that you
13 can turn in regarding the conduct of this meeting. So
14 if you could fill one of those out and mail it in,
15 they are the meeting table. I know I saw a number of
16 you have them. Please fill them out, and they're
17 self-addressed, and we'll have them sent in.

18 So I appreciate it.

19 At this point in time, I'd like to turn it
20 over to the staff to make their presentation and do
21 introductions.

22 MR. SKEEN: Did we lose it again? While
23 Steve's getting the slides back up there, let me tell
24 you a little bit about who I am. My name's Dave
25 Skeen. I'm the deputy director of the Division of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Waste Management and Environmental Protection at the
2 Nuclear Regulatory Commission in Washington, D.C.

3 So I led this little group here, tonight,
4 of NRC folks, and I've got to tell you, I'm really
5 pleased to see this many people at a public meeting.
6 You wouldn't believe how many meetings we have, that
7 we show up and nobody comes. So to have this much
8 interest, you know, I'm glad to see that. That really
9 makes us feel good.

10 So let's see. Yes. There's who I am.

11 So I want to make a few opening remarks,
12 and then I'll walk through, just briefly, kind a what
13 the NRC's roles and responsibilities are, and then
14 some other folks here will talk about our licensing
15 process and then how we do our environmental reviews
16 for the Environmental Impact Statements that we do.

17 So again, good evening and welcome to the
18 meeting. We have traveled here, to Boise this
19 evening, to hear comments associated with our draft
20 Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Eagle
21 Rock uranium enrichment facility that is to be built
22 near Idaho Falls.

23 We want to hear from people in the Boise
24 area, so that we can ensure we hear from as many
25 potentially affected stakeholders as we can, before we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 complete our final Environmental Impact Statement.

2 This meeting is a departure from our usual
3 practice of a single meeting, in our public meeting on
4 our draft Environmental Impact Statement in the
5 vicinity of the proposed facility. However, we
6 decided to hold an additional meeting, here, in Boise,
7 due to the number of stakeholders in this area who
8 believe that the environmental impacts of the proposed
9 facility in Idaho Falls may have implications beyond
10 the Idaho Falls area of the state.

11 We welcome your comments on our draft EIS,
12 and I can assure you that we take each and every
13 comment from stakeholders very seriously.

14 The NRC's job is to protect the public
15 health and safety, and the environment, by thoroughly
16 reviewing each license application that we receive,
17 and that includes the proposed Eagle Rock facility,
18 before we decide whether or not to issue a license.

19 Now I understand that there are
20 stakeholders here, tonight, who may oppose the
21 building of this facility as well as those who may
22 support it. So I want to assure you that we want to
23 hear from both sides this evening. I also want to
24 remind you that the purpose of the meeting is to
25 gather comments on our draft Environmental Impact

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Statement.

2 So we are here to learn if there's any
3 additional environmental information that we may not
4 have considered, and we hope to hear from you tonight.

5 And now we are aware that there may be
6 other issues that both sides on the issue want to
7 discuss with us, but this meeting is not the time or
8 place for those matters. We want to hear from as many
9 of you, as possible, about any environmental issues,
10 in the time that we have allotted in this room this
11 evening.

12 So I would appreciate it if you could
13 focus your comments on the draft EIS. Otherwise, we
14 may be here all night and not get to hear everybody
15 that wants to speak on the issue. So in addition, I
16 would also like to remind you that if someone else
17 gets up to the mike and makes your comment before you
18 get there, we don't need to hear it again. We treat
19 every comment the same, whether one person gives it to
20 us or a 100 people gives us the same comment.

21 We will look at each comment,
22 individually, and we give it careful consideration
23 before we complete our final Environmental Impact
24 Statement.

25 So the NRC will consider both the oral and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 written comments that we receive here tonight, as well
2 as those that we are going to receive in Idaho Falls
3 on Thursday evening, and any other comments we receive
4 via e-mail, fax, or letter, by September 13th of this
5 year, and we will use that information as we prepare
6 our final Environmental Impact Statement.

7 The final Environmental Impact Statement,
8 combined with the NRC's safety review of the facility,
9 will result in a licensing decision to either approve
10 or disapprove the license application, and we hope to
11 have that decision issued by January of 2012.

12 So with that, let me click over to the
13 objectives. I want to touch on the objectives, just
14 briefly. I'm going to discuss our roles and
15 responsibilities. Tom will then go over the licensing
16 process, and Steve Lemont, here, will provide a
17 summary of our draft EIS.

18 We hope to do all this in about 30
19 minutes, or so, because we really want to hear from
20 you folks. We want to try to explain our process to
21 you, but we really want to hear comments from you on
22 any environmental impacts that you think this facility
23 may have.

24 So the NRC's mission. The NRC was created
25 in 1974 by the Energy Reorganization Act. That came

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about because Congress decided that, when they created
2 the Atomic Energy Commission in 1954, that over the
3 years, they learned that maybe it wasn't such a good
4 idea to have the regulator and the promoter of nuclear
5 energy and weapons in the same organization.

6 So with the Energy Reorganization Act,
7 they created the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to
8 become an independent regulatory authority, an
9 independent federal agency to oversee the civilian use
10 of nuclear materials, and they created the Department
11 of Energy to oversee the military use of nuclear
12 materials and the weapons side of the house, and also
13 to promote nuclear energy. So that was the big split
14 in 1974.

15 And then you see our mission statement is-
16 -you know, we regulate the civilian use of nuclear
17 material and our job is, again, to protect the public
18 health and safety, the environment, and promote the
19 common defense and security of the United States.

20 Our commission is a five member
21 commission. They are appointed by the President of
22 the United States and they serve five year terms.
23 It's a rolling five year term for each commissioner.
24 So basically a new commissioner comes up for, either
25 to be reappointed, or to select a new commissioner,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 every June 30th of every year.

2 Our responsibility. We oversee 104
3 commercial nuclear reactors that are operating in this
4 country today as well as 35 test and research reactors
5 at various facilities, and currently, we're looking at
6 licensing new designs of reactors in this country for
7 the first time in many years.

8 We also oversee the use of, civilian use
9 of materials. That includes reactor fuel, or
10 radioactive materials that are used in the medical,
11 industrial or research arenas.

12 We also oversee the waste, from the
13 decommissioning of a utilization facility, once it's
14 completed its work with nuclear materials, including
15 the storage of that material, or the transportation,
16 as far as we approve the casks for which the waste is
17 transported in.

18 And finally, security. Following 9/11, we
19 got a lot more into this business of security at the
20 NRC, to protect against sabotage and terrorist attacks
21 against nuclear facilities or civilian nuclear
22 materials.

23 So you are why we're here. It's the
24 stakeholders that, our interactions with stakeholders
25 is the most important thing that we do when we're

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 trying to make a decision. We base our decisions on
2 science and sound engineering practices, but we also
3 realize that sometimes the local people know more
4 about a certain situation than we do, so we want to
5 hear any comments that you have, that will help us
6 make a good decision.

7 And to do that, communication is the key.

8 We're actively engaged with a vast array of
9 stakeholders who have an interest in our activities at
10 any one point, and we believe that the dialogue that
11 we have with our stakeholders, back and forth, is
12 critical for us to develop a good Environmental Impact
13 Statement.

14 So, again, you are the most important
15 stakeholder that we have, and that's the individuals
16 in this room, or anywhere that--feel they have an
17 interest in any of the NRC's activities.

18 We also deal with the American, Native
19 American tribes as sovereign nations. Also the state
20 agencies, other federal agencies, the Congress. You
21 see the whole list up there.

22 So we try to do our work in as open and
23 transparent a way as we can, and again, we try to get
24 everyone's opinion, whether it be the individual
25 stakeholder or Congress themselves.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So with that, I'm going to turn it over
2 now to Tom Hiltz. Tom is the chief of our Advanced
3 Fuel Cycle, Enrichment and Uranium Conversion Branch
4 in headquarters, and his group does the licensing
5 review, the safety review part of the review that we
6 do to help make a licensing decision.

7 And then after Tom's done, we'll have
8 Steve Lemont come up and talk a little bit about the
9 Environmental Impact Statement review that we've done,
10 and then we want to get to you, as quick as we can, to
11 hear your comments tonight.

12 So with that, again, welcome this evening
13 and we appreciate your comments. Thank you.

14 MR. HILTZ: Well, first of all, let me
15 add my welcome and associate myself with both Dave and
16 Rich's comments, thank you for coming out, and
17 congratulate you for coming out on a beautiful summer
18 evening.

19 We really appreciate it. You are an
20 important part of the process, and we appreciate the
21 fact that you took time from your evening, to come out
22 and participate with us.

23 Just a bit of background on the proposed
24 project. AREVA Enrichment Services, in December of
25 2008, submitted an application to the Nuclear

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Regulatory Commission, proposing to enrich uranium
2 using a gas centrifuge process. The proposed facility
3 will be sited approximately 20 miles from Idaho Falls,
4 in Bonneville County. AREVA must meet all the safety
5 and environmental requirements before NRC will issue a
6 license to operate.

7 The staff uses standard review plans to
8 ensure that the Applicant's application meets safety
9 requirements, and that the proposed activities will
10 not adversely impact the environment.

11 This is a diagram that illustrates the
12 major steps in both our licensing and environmental
13 review.

14 As I said, both reviews are currently
15 underway, are going on, in parallel. The safety
16 review, which my group is responsible for, is
17 progressing, and the results of that review will be
18 presented in an NRC publication, commonly referred to
19 as a safety evaluation report, and we expect to issue
20 that safety evaluation report by the end of this
21 month.

22 The draft Environmental Impact Statement,
23 on the bottom part of the diagram, was issued in July,
24 and we are in the public comment period, one of the
25 reasons that we're here this evening.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The middle portion of that diagram talks
2 about a mandatory hearing, or the hearing process, and
3 a hearing is required, per our regulations, for
4 uranium enrichment plants.

5 Since our December 2008 review has
6 progressed, the scoping meeting for the Environmental
7 Impact Statement was held in June of 2009 in the Idaho
8 Falls area.

9 On July 23rd, 2009, a Notice of
10 Opportunity for Hearing was issued, to notify the
11 public of the mandatory hearing, as well as an
12 opportunity to petition, to intervene, to contest the
13 license application. No petitions to intervene were
14 submitted. Therefore, there is no hearing planned on
15 any contested issues.

16 As part of our review process, the staff
17 prepares requests for additional information. These
18 are part of our review, where we go through the
19 license application and determine areas where we need
20 more information in order to reach a safety
21 conclusion.

22 Those RAIs have been issued and AREVA has
23 responded to those, and those responses will be
24 considered in our final safety evaluation report.

25 The mandatory hearing will be held to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 evaluate the staff's review of the application. In
2 March of this year, the Atomic Safety and Licensing
3 Board was established to preside over the mandatory
4 hearing, and the draft Environmental Impact Statement,
5 as I mentioned, was issued in July.

6 Future activities. The final safety
7 evaluation report, I mentioned, is scheduled to be
8 issued by the end of this month. The final
9 Environmental Impact Statement, that will consider
10 comments received during the public comment period, is
11 scheduled to be completed in February of 2011.

12 Mandatory hearings will be conducted after
13 the safety evaluation report and the final
14 Environmental Impact Statement is issued. Based on
15 information we know now, that hearing will be
16 bifurcated, which means there will be a separate
17 hearing on the safety evaluation report and a separate
18 hearing on the environmental report, Environmental
19 Impact Statement, and the date and details of those
20 hearings will be specified by the board.

21 But we do know that the mandatory hearing
22 will be held in the Idaho Falls area, and we expect to
23 reach a final decision no later than January of 2012.

24 And with that, I'll turn it over to Steve
25 who will talk about the environmental review process.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. LEMONT: Thanks a lot, Tom, and again,
2 I just want to repeat, thank you all for coming here
3 tonight. My purpose here is that I'm the project
4 manager for the Environmental Impact Statement, and as
5 such, I'm going to summarize the contents of that
6 draft Environmental Impact Statement, or, as we call
7 it, an EIS, for short.

8 Okay. This slide shows the main chapters
9 of the draft EIS. This is pretty similar to most
10 other EISs that other federal agencies might prepare,
11 and just to briefly go over these.

12 The introduction discusses a number of
13 items, but primarily, it talks about the proposed
14 action, which is what AREVA proposes to do, or their
15 desired outcome or goal for which an NRC license is
16 required. And I'll talk a little more about that
17 later.

18 It also talks about the purpose and need,
19 that is, why is the proposed action needed in this
20 particular case.

21 In chapter two, we look at alternatives to
22 the proposed action. These would be alternatives that
23 could also accomplish the purpose and need, and we
24 compare the potential environmental impacts of
25 selected alternatives with the impacts of the proposed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 action.

2 And chapter three is the affected
3 environment section, and what that does is describe
4 the baseline environmental conditions. In other
5 words, those are the conditions in the area, or of the
6 environment at the time the license application is
7 submitted, in this case before AREVA has done any type
8 of construction work at the site.

9 Chapter four, Environmental Impacts,
10 discusses the potential impacts of the proposed
11 action.

12 In chapter five, Mitigation, we identify
13 proposed measures that could reduce potential adverse
14 impacts to the environment. For example, things like
15 dust control measures during construction.

16 Chapter six, the Environmental Measurement
17 and Monitoring Program section, describes the major
18 components of AREVA's monitoring programs for releases
19 of constituents to the environment, to ensure that
20 AREVA maintains compliance with applicable
21 environmental laws and regulations.

22 And then in chapter seven, Benefit Cost
23 Analysis, we describe the major benefits and costs of
24 the proposed action.

25 Okay. This slide shows the location of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the facility. As Tom mentioned earlier, its located
2 20 miles west of Idaho Falls. It's on the north side
3 of U.S. Highway 20. You can see the locations of
4 other major roadways and other major features in the
5 area, such as the Idaho National Laboratory to the
6 west, and the Fort Hall Reservation to the south, and
7 the facility is right here in the middle--Proposed
8 EREF. EREF is the acronym for Eagle Rock Enrichment
9 Facility.

10 This next slide summarizes the NRC's
11 environmental review process. This is the process we
12 use for all of our environmental reviews, for many
13 types of project. We initially received a license
14 application from the Applicant, in this case Areva
15 Enrichment Services, and that application also
16 includes an environmental report.

17 We initially received that application in
18 December of 2008, and we then received a revised
19 application from AREVA in April 2009.

20 The NRC performs an acceptance review of
21 the application, to ensure that it meets all of our
22 requirements that it provides all the information that
23 we need to move ahead with both our safety and
24 environmental reviews.

25 If we accept the application and the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental report, which we did in this case, then
2 on the environmental side we issue a Federal Register
3 Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact
4 Statement, and that Notice of Intent was issued in May
5 2009.

6 That Notice of Intent also initiates what
7 we call the EIS scoping period, where we accept
8 comments from the public, similar to what we're doing
9 here now for the draft EIS, although those comments
10 were to help us determine what we were going to look
11 at in the EIS, and we also held a public scoping
12 meeting in Idaho Falls, in June 2009.

13 Another thing we do is to engage
14 consulting agencies. These would be federal, state
15 and local agencies, who we need to consult with, by
16 law and/or can provide us information for the draft
17 EIS, and include agencies such as the U.S. Fish and
18 Wildlife Service, or the Idaho State Historic
19 Preservation Office.

20 After the scoping meeting, we publish a
21 scoping summary report, summarizing all the comments
22 we received. We then proceed with collecting and
23 reviewing data, and then identifying and analyzing the
24 potential environmental impacts of the project.

25 After that, we put it all together and we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 issue the draft Environmental Impact Statement for
2 public comment. The Draft EIS was officially issued
3 on July 23rd of this year by a Notice of Availability
4 that it's published, by the U.S. Environmental
5 Protection Agency.

6 Although on July 21st, NRC also published
7 a Notice of Availability and opened up the public
8 comment period.

9 The public comment period began,
10 officially, on July 23rd. It's going to end on
11 September 13th. I'll talk more about how you can
12 present comments, but certainly one of those venues is
13 at that meeting tonight.

14 When we get all of your comments, either
15 at this meeting, at the meeting we're having at Idaho
16 Falls, or anything we receive by e-mail, mail, fax, or
17 what you might hand us tonight, the NRC staff will
18 consider all of those comments and use those to revise
19 the Draft EIS, as necessary, and ultimately prepare
20 and issue the final EIS, and the final EIS is
21 currently scheduled to be issued in February of 2011.

22 And after that, as Tom mentioned, there'll
23 be a mandatory hearing process, and ultimately, the
24 NRC licensing action.

25 I mentioned earlier the proposed action

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's discussed in chapter one. In the case of this
2 particular project, the proposed action is to
3 construct, operate, and decommission a uranium
4 enrichment facility in Bonneville County, Idaho. It
5 would be located on an approximately 460 acre piece of
6 land that's on a 4200 acre parcel, that AREVA would be
7 purchasing, and that parcel is currently used for
8 native range land, seeded pasture and crop land.

9 The proposed facility would enrich uranium for
10 use in commercial nuclear fuel, which is used for
11 generating electricity at nuclear power plants. The
12 proposed facility would employ a gas centrifuge
13 process to enrich uranium up to 5 percent uranium-235,
14 by weight, and this type of enriched uranium is known
15 as low-enriched uranium.

16 Also in chapter one is the purpose and
17 need of the project.

18 The proposed action is intended to fulfill
19 the need for an additional economic domestic source of
20 enriched uranium. It would supply enriched uranium for
21 nuclear fuel, for commercial nuclear power plants, to
22 fulfill the nation's electricity requirements, and
23 also it would provide a domestic supply of enriched
24 uranium for national energy security, by eliminating
25 dependence on foreign sources of enriched uranium.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In chapter two of the EIS, we analyzed
2 alternatives to the proposed action, and the NRC
3 considered a reasonable range of alternative to the
4 proposed action in the draft EIS.

5 There were many alternatives that were
6 looked at, that were considered but eliminated from
7 further analysis, for various reasons. Those included
8 alternative sites, that is, sites for the project
9 other than the Bonneville County site, alternate
10 sources of low-enriched uranium, and also alternative
11 uranium enrichment technologies.

12 Now as I mentioned earlier, the
13 alternatives that are considered in the draft EIS are
14 those that can fulfill the purpose and need. But
15 there's one exception to that and that is the "no
16 action alternative," which is the last one listed on
17 this slide.

18 The Council on Environmental Quality is a
19 group that provides regulations that implement the
20 National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, under
21 which this Draft EIS was prepared, and those
22 regulations require that the "no action alternative"
23 also be considered, whether or not it meets the
24 purpose and need.

25 Under the "no action alternative," the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 proposed action would simply not take place, and
2 therefore, this serves as a baseline for comparing
3 alternatives.

4 So in chapter two of the draft EIS, we
5 compared the potential environmental impacts of the
6 proposed action with those of the "no action
7 alternative."

8 In chapter 4, Environmental Impacts, the
9 NRC defines three impact levels. If an impact is
10 minor, or perhaps doesn't exist at all, then we would
11 categorize it as small. If there is a noticeable
12 effect that alters important attributes of a resource,
13 then we consider that impact to be moderate.

14 And if an impact destabilizes important
15 attributes of a resource, then we categorize that
16 impact as large.

17 So in the draft EIS, for each of the
18 environmental resource areas, which would include
19 things like water resources, ecology, and many others,
20 the NRC staff analyzed the potential environmental
21 impacts and assigned a level of significant of small,
22 moderate or large.

23 And I mentioned resource areas, and these
24 are the areas we looked at in the draft EIS. This
25 pretty much covers all of the environmental areas that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 one might examine in an Environmental Impact
2 Statement, and for each of these, we looked at the
3 impacts of the project as a result of construction,
4 operation and decommissioning of the facility.

5 What I'd like to do here is to summarize
6 the draft environmental impacts. The NRC staff
7 preliminarily determined that the environmental
8 impacts of the proposed project would be mostly small,
9 but there are a few exceptions to that.

10 There would be small to moderate impacts
11 related to increased localized traffic density,
12 primarily from commuting workers on U.S. Highway 20,
13 which, as I mentioned earlier, the facility is just
14 north of U.S. Highway 20.

15 There would be a moderate impact on an on-
16 site historic resource known as the John Leopard
17 Homestead, which would be associated with ground
18 disturbance. But that impact would be mitigated by
19 professional excavation, and therefore the impact is
20 considered to be moderate.

21 Moving on to the next slide, there would
22 be moderate impacts on visual and scenic resources in
23 the area of the project due to the contrast of the
24 facility structures, that is, the buildings, with the
25 surrounding visual environment.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 There would be moderate impacts on on-site
2 vegetation and wildlife, due primarily to removal of
3 sagebrush steppe and pasture vegetation.

4 And finally, there would be short term,
5 but very intermittent moderate-to-large impacts in the
6 vicinity of the project site associated with fugitive
7 dust that would be released to the air during ground
8 disturbing activities.

9 Okay. So the NRC staff, based on all its
10 analysis, reached some preliminary conclusions, and
11 they concluded, in general, that the overall benefits
12 of the proposed action outweigh the environmental
13 disadvantages and costs, and that was based on a need
14 for an additional economic domestic source of uranium
15 enrichment services, and also on the consideration
16 that the environmental impacts are mostly small,
17 except for the moderate, or moderate-to-large impacts
18 that I discussed on the previous two slides.

19 So therefore, the NRC environmental staff
20 preliminarily recommends--it's an odd word--that
21 unless safety issues mandate otherwise, the proposed
22 license be issued to AREVA. In this regard, the NRC
23 staff has concluded that environmental impacts are
24 mostly small and taken in combination with AREVA's
25 proposed environmental monitoring programs and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 mitigation measures, would eliminate or substantially
2 lessen any potential adverse environmental impacts
3 associated with the proposed action.

4 And many of you perhaps have already seen
5 and read through the draft EIS, but for those of you
6 who haven't, and would like to look at it and review
7 it, and present comments after this meeting, there are
8 a number of ways that you can access that.

9 If you happen to be visiting NRC
10 headquarters in Rockville, Maryland, we have our
11 public document reading room at NRC headquarters. My
12 guess is that most of you won't be coming, so you can
13 access the document, electronically, in two ways.

14 In the second bullet, we show that there
15 is NRC's Agency-wide Document Access and Management
16 System, which is called ADAMS, for short, and there's
17 a Web link to that, and when you go into that Web
18 link, you have to enter what's known as an accession
19 number, which is noted here, it's the number that
20 starts with ML101, and that's the number of the draft
21 EIS in the ADAMS system.

22 In the third bullet, you can also another
23 Web link, and that would bring you directly to a PDF
24 of the draft EIS, that would open right up on your
25 computer screen.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And finally, copies of the draft EIS are
2 available in the Idaho Falls Public Library in Idaho
3 Falls, Idaho.

4 There's also additional information on the
5 project, if you'd like to look at that. The NRC
6 maintains a Web site for the AREVA Eagle Rock project,
7 and the Web link for that is shown here, and there
8 are--there's lots of other information in that about
9 the project, besides the draft EIS itself.

10 PARTICIPANT: Excuse me.

11 Yes?

12 PARTICIPANT: I'm sorry to interrupt.
13 Could you go back to that previous slide.

14 MR. LEMONT: Okay. I'll put those up
15 again, if you'd like to after this because--okay. So
16 let me move on, and then I'll go back for everyone.

17 So there's also a federal rulemaking Web
18 site, and if you go into that, there's also
19 information on the project, and you would have to
20 enter a document ID number which is shown here, NRC
21 2009-0187.

22 And finally, you can contact us directly.
23 You can call me at my direct phone number, or send me
24 an e-mail, Stephen Lemont, or you can contact the
25 project manager for our Licensing and Safety Review,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Breeda Reilly, and her phone number and e-mail address
2 is shown here as well.

3 Okay. And my last slide deals with what
4 our real purpose of the meeting is, and that is
5 commenting on the draft EIS and how you can present
6 comments to us.

7 First of all, you can do that at the
8 meeting, and lots of folks have signed up to speak.
9 We're anxious to hear your comments on the draft EIS,
10 and we look forward to hearing them, so that we can
11 consider them in preparing the final EIS.

12 There are also three other ways that you
13 could submit comments. You can e-mail them to an e-
14 mail address shown here, eaglerock.eis@nrc.gov. Or
15 you could mail them to the Chief, Rules, Announcements
16 and Directives Branch at NRC, at the address shown.
17 Or you could fax it to the Rules, Announcements and
18 Directives Branch at the phone number shown. And the
19 comment period ends on September 13th, 2010.

20 And one thing I did leave out is, in
21 addition to speaking here tonight to present comments,
22 if you want, if you have comments written out, you can
23 hand them to me, or if you want to write something out
24 while you're here, you can hand them to me, that would
25 be another way, or just send it to us, any time up

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 until September 13th.

2 So again, thank you all for coming to the
3 meeting this evening, we look forward to receiving
4 your comments, and I'm now going to turn it back to
5 Richard Barkley, who will continue with the next part
6 of the meeting. And what I'll do is, I'll go back to
7 this one, I'll leave it up for a few minutes, and then
8 I'll move to the next one, and then to the next one.
9 So anybody who wants to copy that information. And if
10 you don't get it, come up to me after the meeting, and
11 I can get you--and I'll just give you that
12 information, or you can call me, whatever the case may
13 be. Thank you very much for coming.

14 MR. BARKLEY: At this point I was going to
15 offer an opportunity for you to ask any questions
16 regarding the NRC's presentations, just very brief,
17 before we move into the presentation by the Snake
18 River Alliance.

19 Are there any questions regarding the
20 NRC's presentation that we can answer? Okay. I think
21 I have time to take two or three. I see two hands up.
22 Let me come out into the audience with a microphone
23 to take those questions.

24 MS. MACK: My name is Cher Mack, and the
25 question that I have related to the, just sort of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 general overview that you gave on the Environmental
2 Impact Assessment, is that from what I saw, it looks
3 to be the result of the evaluation of an Environmental
4 Impact Assessment for facility construction.

5 I do not see any risk analysis, which I
6 thought is a, as I understand, to be a very, very
7 critical part of an Environmental Impact Assessment.

8 And I'd like to know about issues related
9 to operation rather than construction and the
10 environmental impact in the risk analysis.

11 MR. BARKLEY: Okay. The Environmental
12 Impact Statement covers the impacts of four
13 categories--preconstruction--and when I say
14 preconstruction, we're talking about site preparation
15 type activities, things like land clearing and
16 grading.

17 Secondly, it looks at the impact of
18 construction, for which we're primarily talking about
19 building the main structures of the facility. It also
20 looks at the environmental impacts of operations of
21 the facility, and finally, it looks at the impacts of
22 decommissioning of the facility. And so for each
23 resource area in chapter four, there is a sub section.

24 There are three sub sections. The first one,
25 preconstruction and construction, the second,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 operations, and third, decommissioning. So all of
2 those areas are in fact covered in the same level of
3 detail, as necessary, in the EIS.

4 MS. MACK: [Off-mic] risk analysis?

5 MR. BARKLEY: Well, I'm not quite sure
6 what you mean by "risk analysis." Do you mean risk
7 analysis regarding radiation releases of some type, or
8 contamination of something?

9 [Off-mic comment]

10 MR. BARKLEY: Can we get the microphone
11 there because I can't really hear her. Okay. I think
12 this gentleman here has maybe some clarifying
13 questions.

14 PARTICIPANT: Well, certainly you've had
15 to address the fact that we're dealing with depleted
16 uranium, which is not a substance that will just
17 disappear. It's got a half-life of--how long? Who
18 knows that in the room? But it's not in ten years;
19 right?

20 So if you're going to be assessing the
21 risk to our families, I would hope that you'd at least
22 put some emphasis on this decision, because it's going
23 to have lasting impact to our state. Not just
24 sagebrush impacts or dust.

25 MR. BARKLEY: Right. Okay. Well, if I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can understand what you're saying--and please correct
2 me if I'm wrong--but we did look at things like
3 impacts to the public, and to occupational health. In
4 other words, what would the risks be, you know, say
5 health risks, as a result of exposure during normal
6 operations, or exposures during possible accident
7 scenarios.

8 And I think that's what you're referring
9 to, and the EIS does cover that.

10 PARTICIPANT: Well, the conclusions [Off-
11 mic] the slide.

12 MR. BARKLEY: Well, the conclusions, as I
13 mentioned, they're mostly small, and in the case of
14 public and occupational health, the impacts are
15 considered to be small. Okay. We'll take one last
16 question.

17 PARTICIPANT: This is just a simple
18 technical question. When we entered the door, you
19 handed out to us a comment sheet. Can that be
20 utilized as the same, if we put it in e-mail? Because
21 it doesn't go to the same address; it doesn't go to
22 the same individual.

23 MR. BARKLEY: Well, those will go to me,
24 and you know, anything that goes to me is a comment
25 that's also logged in. So if you want to write a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comment on that form too, you know, in addition to
2 just the general feedback, and provide that to me
3 either here, or mail it to me, that would be fine.
4 And I believe my name is on that too.

5 PARTICIPANT: Right.

6 MR. BARKLEY: That would be fine, and that
7 counts as a comment.

8 PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

9 MR. LEMONT: Just one point of
10 clarification. I think if you had--do you have the
11 white form, the white piece of paper? Is that what
12 you're talking about?

13 MR. BARKLEY: He was holding a public
14 feedback form.

15 MR. LEMONT: That's the public feedback
16 form on the meeting. Generally, we issue those out
17 there, so hopefully you'll give comments on what went
18 well with the meeting or what didn't go well with the
19 meeting, cause we take that back and look to see
20 either if we did something right, we want to keep
21 doing that, or if we did something wrong, we want to
22 try to fix that for the next public meeting we have.

23 So that's what those white forms, the
24 white pieces of paper are generally used for.

25 MR. BARKLEY: Okay. At this point in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 time, I'd like to move to the presentation by the
2 Snake River Alliance. Liz, are you all ready to go?

3 MS. SHIPLEY: While my colleague, Liz,
4 gets her PowerPoint prepared, my name is Andrea
5 Shipley. I'm the executive director of the Snake River
6 Alliance, Idaho's nuclear watchdog and advocate for
7 clean energy.

8 We've been around in Idaho for 31 years,
9 and tonight we are embodying our mission by doing
10 research, educating, community organizing, and
11 collaboration with the community around these issues.

12 I want to thank the Nuclear Regulatory
13 Commission for holding this meeting in Boise and for
14 allowing the Alliance this time to talk. The entire
15 staff of the Alliance, some board members, and a lot
16 of members are here tonight, and I thank you for being
17 here.

18 Liz Woodruff, who is our energy policy
19 analyst, will be giving the presentation tonight.
20 Ken Miller, who's our clean energy program director,
21 and Beatrice Brailsford, who is our program director,
22 are here as well, and you can catch us at the end of
23 the meeting, if you have some questions about our
24 presentation.

25 MS. WOODRUFF: Good evening. My name's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Liz Woodruff. I'm an energy policy analyst for the
2 Snake River Alliance, and I think we need the user
3 beam to press. Okay. Do I do that on this, Stephen?

4 I want to thank the NRC for having us here
5 tonight, and I also want to thank the public, our
6 members, the public at large, for coming out to listen
7 to issues related to the AREVA uranium enrichment
8 factory.

9 And it's the proposition of the Snake
10 River Alliance that the NRC should not license the
11 AREVA facility.

12 First, uranium enrichment should not occur
13 in Idaho for use in power reactors, and secondly, the
14 draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate.

15 So first, I'm going to go into some of the
16 waste issues associated with the production of
17 depleted uranium, and talk about our concerns related
18 to that. Then I'm going to address the premise of the
19 EIS, which is that uranium enrichment is needed in the
20 United States, and contest that claim. And then I'll
21 go into the more technical aspects of the impacts
22 evaluated in the EIS.

23 But when we talk about the waste, it's
24 really important that everybody here understand what
25 is being proposed. The proposal is for a uranium

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 enrichment factory, but that's only one part of the
2 nuclear fuel chain. The entire nuclear fuel chain is
3 dirty, dangerous, and promotes the transportation of
4 radioactive materials on interstates, railways, and
5 highways, which presents an enormous risk.

6 First, uranium is mined, which produces a
7 waste stream, then it's transported, and it's milled
8 and refined, which produces a waste stream. Then it's
9 transported and it's converted, which produces a waste
10 stream. And then it is transported to a uranium
11 enrichment factory. That is what is being proposed in
12 Idaho. It's very important that we understand that
13 this is in the middle of the fuel chain. This not a
14 nuclear power reactor. This is not a reprocessing
15 facility. It's an enrichment factory.

16 At an enrichment factory, the U-235, which
17 is a fissionable isotope, is separated from the U-238,
18 which is non-fissionable isotope. It's spun off in a
19 centrifuge, which is kind of a big cylinder, put in
20 rows, and as it spins, the U-238, the heavier isotope,
21 is put to the outside and that's the depleted uranium.

22 Or excuse me. The lighter isotope. And the U-235,
23 the heavier isotope, is concentrated, and that's the
24 enriched uranium.

25 All of this is done when it's mixed with a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 gas, because that's how centrifuge technology works,
2 and so what you end up with is a gas waste called
3 depleted uranium hexafluoride, which is then stored on
4 site.

5 And we believe that the storage of this
6 radioactive waste, on site, in Idaho, poses an
7 insurmountable risk to the licensing of this facility.

8 The enriched uranium then travels to a conversion
9 facility, once again transported, and then it's
10 transported again to a reactor, where high-level
11 radioactive waste in the form of spent fuel is the
12 result.

13 So how much waste is produced in the
14 enrichment of uranium? Well, for one ton of enriched
15 uranium, seven tons of depleted uranium waste are
16 produced, and this is a picture of depleted uranium
17 hexafluoride waste stored in Piketon, Ohio. You can
18 see in the rusty cylinders on concrete slabs. It's
19 been sitting there for decades because the NRC has not
20 established an adequate disposal pathway for depleted
21 uranium.

22 So once again the waste, rusty cylinders.
23 The U.S. already stores nearly 700,000 metric tons of
24 depleted uranium. That's in Paducah, Kentucky,
25 Portsmouth, Ohio, and Oak Ridge, Tennessee. And all

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of that waste has to be disposed of first, before the
2 waste produced by a commercial, new commercial
3 reactor--or excuse me--new commercial enrichment
4 factory, like AREVA, could be disposed of. So we are
5 behind, we're back in line behind these other wastes.

6 So why is that waste just sitting there?
7 Why has it been sitting there for so long? Well,
8 hexafluoride is highly reactive with water. So none
9 of this waste can be disposed of until it's treated in
10 deconversion plants.

11 Those plants are under construction, over
12 budget, and behind schedule. So this waste has
13 nowhere to go, nowhere to be deconverted before it can
14 be disposed of, and it's the concern of the Snake
15 River Alliance, that that means this depleted uranium
16 waste will be stored above the aquifer for 300,000
17 people, the sole source aquifer in Idaho, for decades.

18 So once it is deconverted, after
19 treatment, if they come up with a solution for this,
20 is the problem solved? Well, there is less of it.
21 But the funny thing about depleted uranium is that it
22 becomes more radioactive. Over time, as it
23 decomposes, it exposes radon gas. And it's most
24 radioactive in its millionth year.

25 And the NRC has recently acknowledged this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fact, and started a rule making process around the
2 disposal of depleted uranium meant to reclassify it,
3 essentially, and find an adequate disposal pathway.

4 So what have they decided? The NRC still
5 wants to dispose of depleted uranium in shallow dumps
6 designed for a few hundred years. This is an
7 inadequate disposal pathway. It has not yet been an
8 established rule it's a waste stream that becomes more
9 radioactive, over time. There are no deconversion
10 facilities, and thus, it will be sitting above the
11 Snake River aquifer for decades.

12 AREVA would add 320,000 metric tons of
13 DUF6 to the current amount.

14 So now that I've discussed the waste
15 issue, one that is, I would say inadequately addressed
16 in the EIS, I'd like to go on to the main premise of
17 the EIS, which is that there is a need for this
18 facility. If you read the EIS, the draft EIS, what
19 you will see is the claim, the "leg" that it stands on
20 is that this will provide a reliable domestic source
21 of enriched uranium to meet an impending need.

22 First, the purpose and need for this
23 facility is not proven in the draft Environmental
24 Impact Statement, for either current or new reactors.
25 It's inadequately proven. It remains to be a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 hypothesis.

2 Secondly, the draft EIS clearly states
3 that AREVA's product will be shipped overseas,
4 nullifying the project's effects on domestic uses of
5 enriched uranium.

6 Third, there's currently enough enriched
7 uranium for domestic use, and AREVA is a French
8 company and gets its uranium supply from the
9 international market. So how does this facility give
10 us a more reliable source of domestically-produced
11 uranium, enriched uranium?

12 And finally, the draft EIS claims the need
13 for AREVA's enriched uranium will be spurred by the
14 building of a new fleet of reactors. But economic
15 cost delays and safety issues all indicate the
16 supposed renaissance is unlikely.

17 And I'd just like to pause here, to check
18 in on this theory of theirs, that there is this need
19 for reliability. Have we ever shut down a reactor
20 because the fuel source was unreliable, in this
21 country? It seems like it's been working pretty well
22 so far.

23 And when our country gets crude oil from
24 overseas and refines it here, does that lessen our
25 dependence? So these are questions we need to ask

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about the premise set up in the EIS.

2 And we would argue that this is not in
3 fact a renaissance. That the very premise of the EIS
4 is incorrect. We're actually set up for a collapse of
5 the nuclear power industry.

6 This is from a study by Mark Cooper of
7 Vermont Law School in June of 2009, and he argues that
8 the cost projections for new reactors are four times
9 as high as the initial nuclear renaissance
10 projections. So there's an economic obstacle,
11 significant economic obstacle that has to be overcome
12 for this supposed renaissance to occur.

13 He argues that nuclear reactors are, in
14 fact, the worst option from the point of view of the
15 consumer in society.

16 He talks about the ways in which
17 efficiency, cogeneration, biomass, geothermal, other
18 renewables, are less costly and more viable forms of
19 energy production, leaving us with six cents per
20 kilowatt hour versus 12 to 20 cents per kilowatt hour,
21 to pursue the nuclear option.

22 And I would argue, in fact, that this
23 third point should have been an alternative pursued in
24 the EIS. You heard them say that they looked at the
25 "no alternative," or the "no action alternative." Why

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 didn't they look at the efficiency and renewable
2 energy alternative?

3 And finally, the additional cost of
4 building a hundred new nuclear reactors could be 1.9
5 to 4.4 trillion dollars. Now I know that "billion"
6 has lost its shock value lately, but we should kind of
7 be shocked by the trillion number, and this economic
8 obstacle is certainly one that calls into question the
9 hypothesis posed by the NRC, that there'll be a need
10 for new enriched uranium.

11 And just to underscore this, this is a
12 chart that was just released in a Duke University
13 study in July of this year, and it shows, with the
14 yellow line, the cost of nuclear going up and the cost
15 of solar coming down.

16 So this economic obstacle presented by the
17 nuclear--you know, before the nuclear industry, is one
18 that renewables are not facing. As a matter of fact,
19 the costs are coming down.

20 And again, this obstacle is one that we
21 believe will stop the supposed nuclear renaissance,
22 and actually lead to a nuclear collapse, therefore
23 nullifying the claim that's the premise of the NRC,
24 that there's a need for new enriched uranium.

25 And this is actually from the EIS itself,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to prove my point. So I'm going to quote the NRC
2 here.

3 Uranium would arrive at the proposed EREF
4 from facilities in Port Hope, Ontario, Canada, and
5 Metropolis, Illinois, or overseas sources. So the
6 uranium, which is what we need the reliable supply of,
7 is coming from international markets. Why does
8 building a facility by a French government-owned
9 company in the U.S. increase the reliability of that
10 supply, if it's coming internationally?

11 Another quote from the NRC. The total
12 enrichment capacity in the United States would exceed
13 the projected demand, approximately 16 million
14 separative work units per year, by about 6 million
15 SWUs per year, if all the enrichment facilities were
16 constructed and operated at their rated capacities.

17 The NRC acknowledges that the licensing of
18 this facility is in excess of the need by 6 million
19 SWUs.

20 And finally, quote: "Potential customers
21 are fuel fabrication facilities in Richmond,
22 Washington, Columbia, South Carolina, Williams, North
23 Carolina, and overseas, through ports in Virginia and
24 Maryland."

25 So this domestic reliable supply of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 enriched uranium that we so desperately need in this
2 country will be shipped overseas by AREVA. The need
3 argument is highly problematic and doesn't stand.

4 So now I'm going to get into the more
5 technical aspects of the EIS. The first point is that
6 there's a bias towards licensing in the EIS.

7 AREVA was given an unwarranted exemption,
8 granted in March of 2010, to start preconstruction
9 activities as early as October of this year, two
10 months away. This preconstruction exemption shows a
11 bias towards licensing, without hearing public comment
12 first.

13 But preconstruction constitutes one part
14 of a major federal action. 40 CFR 1500.1(b) requires
15 that information be available before an agency makes
16 decisions or takes any action.

17 The NRC cannot simply grant an exemption
18 for activities with excessive environmental impacts.

19 If you look at the EIS, all the
20 environmental impacts happen in preconstruction, and
21 then they aren't being taken into consideration, in
22 the EIS, as an area of impact because we granted an
23 exemption for those impacts.

24 And they must either include
25 preconstruction in the EIS, or write an additional EIS

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to evaluate preconstruction impacts. Preconstruction
2 activities cannot occur until the impacts are
3 analyzed, and the record of decision is signed, and
4 your comments getting in on September 13th will
5 certainly not give them adequate time before
6 preconstruction starts to issue a record of decision,
7 and this is unacceptable.

8 My next point is going to be around
9 proliferation. Actually, before I go into this point,
10 I just feel like it would be totally wrong to not
11 acknowledge that this is the 65th anniversary of the
12 bombing of Nagasaki. In any case, proliferation is
13 viewed as outside the scope of the NRC.

14 But the NRC should produce an unclassified
15 nonproliferation assessment for the ERES, because gas
16 centrifuge uranium enrichment is a proliferation
17 technology. A comparable case occurred in Idaho
18 during the environmental evaluation of pyroprocessing.

19 In that instance, no one was arguing that
20 the DOE intended to recover pure plutonium, but
21 because pyroprocessing is a proliferable technology,
22 the DOE produced a nonproliferation assessment as part
23 of the final EIS on the facility. And we are asking
24 that the NRC include a nonproliferation assessment on
25 this facility as well. Why?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This is a demonstration of the rapidity
2 with which you can move from the generation of fuel
3 for power reactors to fuel for weapons, a key
4 ingredient in weapons.

5 Each one of these rows is a cascade. Each
6 one of these bars is a centrifuge, those big things
7 they use to enrich the uranium; right?

8 So you need 24 cascades to enrich uranium
9 to fuel grade, and you can see as we go in a linear
10 fashion forward, you need two cascades to get it to
11 weapons grade.

12 In other words, it's incredibly efficient
13 technology for producing material that's a key
14 ingredient in nuclear weapons, and this underscores
15 the point of why a nonproliferation assessment must be
16 included in the EIS, and is currently lacking.

17 My next point is regarding transmission
18 issues. The routes of some of the proposed new
19 transmission lines, including the MSTI intertie, have
20 not been determined. Those routes have not been
21 concluded yet in our state, and thus should not be
22 considered as certain future transmission
23 infrastructure, as they are currently in the EIS.

24 On another point on transmission, and this
25 is very key, the draft EIS should also analyze the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 benefits of bearing any additional transmission lines,
2 to minimize the known harmful impacts to wildlife in
3 the area. This is especially important, given that
4 impacts of transmission lines will disturb wildlife
5 and cause wildlife mortality.

6 Now this is something that's considered as
7 a preconstruction impact in EIS, so this isn't given
8 the weight and the technical impact review, the small,
9 moderate, and large that you saw.

10 But more specifically, in the EIS, in
11 Appendix B, the Idaho Department of Fish and Game
12 affirms that the threat to transmission lines would be
13 great for wildlife, and they recommend baring
14 transmission lines and suggest AREVA submit to plans
15 to mitigate for the expected wildlife impacts. These
16 concerns must be addressed in the EIS, before any
17 preconstruction activities are allowed.

18 And all of the issues associated with the
19 construction of this facility--accidents, fire, air
20 and water quality degradation, the development of this
21 land will impact several species, including raptors
22 and sagebrush obligate species. This includes the
23 sage grouse. The sage grouse is a candidate species
24 for federal protection, and the only reason it's not
25 listed yet is because of bureaucratic process of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 listing. There's a delay. But the treatment of this
2 issue is inadequate in the draft EIS.

3 The impacts to sage grouse from
4 transmission and preconstruction warrant integration
5 into this EIS, or separate EISs, specifically around
6 preconstruction and transmission issues.

7 My next point is that this Environmental
8 Impact Statement and the proposed licensing is
9 potentially in violation of the Farmland Protection
10 Act. The EIS claims that this facility is exempt from
11 the Farmland Protection Act since the site is on
12 private property.

13 So a red flag went off for me when I read
14 this in the EIS, and so I called the relevant
15 agencies, federally, and in the state, and I was told
16 that because AREVA accepted a \$2 billion federal loan
17 guarantee from the Department of Energy, the Farmland
18 Protection Act applies, because it's a federally-
19 funded project.

20 The NRC must go back, review this section
21 of the EIS, talk to the relevant agencies, discuss the
22 issues around this huge Department of Energy loan, and
23 go through the process and procedures necessary to
24 determine that you're in compliance with the Farmland
25 Protection Act.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This is on Prime A age farmland that they're proposing
2 this facility.

3 And my final point before I reach my
4 conclusions are around fire. Fire poses an
5 unacceptable risk to this facility. This radioactive
6 waste, and the facility, as a whole, will be
7 threatened by wildfires at the proposed site, yet it
8 is never addressed as an impact relevant to that
9 specific geography in the EIS. The draft EIS does not
10 provide a detailed analysis of the threats posed by
11 fire, and some of you might recall that just about,
12 oh, three weeks ago, there was a huge fire over at the
13 lab. The draft EIS specifically says fires often
14 don't occur east of the lab. Well, whoops--let's go
15 back.

16 Here's the lab and this is east, and
17 that's the fire. So I'm pretty sure that fires occur
18 east of the lab. 150,000 acres just burned there over
19 Superfund sites. This is the proposed facility.
20 Actually, if you looked at their map, it might even be
21 a little closer. But this is about 10 miles. The EIS
22 evaluates earthquake risk specific to this geography.
23 It evaluates flood risk specific to this geography.
24 It evaluates weather risks specific to this geography.
25 It does not evaluate wildfires specific to this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 geography. And it absolutely must.

2 So in conclusion, radioactive waste poses
3 an unacceptable risk to our state. You heard that the
4 NRC has a cost-benefit analysis. Well, based on our
5 read and the reading of our members, and other
6 Idahoans, it's very clear that the costs of this
7 facility are far greater than the benefits, to our
8 public safety, to our water, to our air, to our land,
9 to wildlife habitat. And this definitely outweighs
10 the hypothetical and very risk assertion by the NRC,
11 that we need uranium enrichment.

12 AREVA's proposed Eagle Rock enrichment
13 facility will store radioactive waste at the sole
14 source aquifer for 300,000 people. It will impact
15 sensitive species, require the transport of
16 radioactive materials, impair a national monument in
17 Idaho, support destruction of a historic site, devour
18 billions of dollars in state and federal largesse to
19 meet a hypothetical need that does not yet exist, and
20 obliterate farmland that is potentially protected by
21 the Federal Government.

22 We are here to say this is simply not
23 worth the risks, and new evaluations on the draft EIS
24 are needed, specifically around preconstruction and
25 transmission issues, and until that time, this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 facility should not be licensed. Thank you.

2 MR. SKEEN: Thanks for those comments,
3 Liz. We appreciate that.

4 MR. BARKLEY: All right. Thank you, Liz.
5 And I appreciate you holding to the time allotment.

6 At this point I did have one speaker here
7 that indicated she had to leave early. Do you still
8 have to leave?

9 MS. AARTI: Yes.

10 MR. BARKLEY: Okay. I'm going to call her
11 first because of the time limitation she has, and then
12 I'll move to three of our elected officials to speak.

13 Reham Aarti. Is that how you say it?

14 MS. AARTI: Yes.

15 MR. BARKLEY: From there or here. Either
16 way.

17 MS. AARTI: Is this one working?

18 MR. BARKLEY: Yes.

19 MS. AARTI: I'm just here to say that I
20 agree completely with what Liz was saying. I think
21 the risks are absolutely ridiculous, considering what
22 the benefits are going to be. I know people are
23 worried about jobs, and they want more jobs in Idaho,
24 and everything. But I'm sorry, it's not worth it,
25 it's not worth, you know, our children being in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 danger. I mean, accidents happen all the time. Fires
2 happen all the time. It's not worth it, in the least
3 bit, and I know you guys do your job and everything's
4 supposed to be really safe, but that doesn't mitigate,
5 you know, human error and everything else.

6 And I just don't think there's any need
7 for it. There's no need for that uranium, especially
8 when it's going somewhere else. It's not even helping
9 us. It's not doing anything here but creating trash.
10 We're a big giant trash can for France, and I don't
11 think it's acceptable. So that's all I have to say.
12 Thank you.

13 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

14 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you. The first three
15 people I'd like to call are John Revier, speaking on
16 behalf of Representative Michael Simpson. Then
17 Representative Sue Chew of the Idaho legislature. And
18 the finally Mayor Jared Fuhriman of the City of Idaho
19 Falls. Go ahead.

20 MR. REVIER: Hi. My name is John Revier.
21 I'm here on behalf of Congressman Mike Simpson, and
22 I'm going to read a letter from Congress Simpson.

23 "Dear Commissioner Jaczko, and fellow NRC
24 commissioners. I'm writing today to express my strong
25 support for AREVA's license application to construct

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and operate the Eagle Rock facility. I'm sorry I
2 cannot join you at the public hearings in Idaho Falls
3 and Boise, but I'd like to welcome the NRC to Idaho,
4 and express my appreciation for the NRC's work on this
5 important matter.

6 "It is more important than ever, that our
7 nation take the steps needed to end our dependence on
8 foreign sources of energy and become energy-
9 independent. Currently, the United States imports
10 nearly 90 percent of the uranium enrichment services
11 it uses. The Eagle Rock facility will provide a
12 stable domestic supply of enriched uranium for
13 existing and planned commercial nuclear reactors, and
14 it will serve an important part of an overall domestic
15 energy strategy.

16 "AREVA has a strong record of corporate
17 safety and achievement, and the technology that Eagle
18 Rock will use has been well-proven in the United
19 Kingdom, mainland Europe, and now in the United
20 States.

21 "I have the utmost confidence in the
22 quality, safety, and security of their facilities. I
23 would like to recognize the people of Idaho, and
24 especially Southeast Idaho, for all the time and hard
25 work they put into working with AREVA to make this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 facility a reality.

2 "Thank you for being here today and taking
3 the time to listen to the citizens of Idaho regarding
4 their thoughts on the Eagle Rock enrichment facility.

5 I urge you to act expeditiously in consideration and
6 approval process of the application, and I look
7 forward to continue to work with you on issues related
8 to the Eagle Rock facility, and to advancing the
9 future of nuclear energy in our nation. Thank you."

10 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

11 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you, John.

12 Sue, are you in attendance? Very good.
13 Sue. Thank you.

14 MS. CHEW: I guess this is the mike, huh?

15 MR. BARKLEY: If you want to stand up
16 here, it's fine.

17 MS. CHEW: Stand up here?

18 MR. BARKLEY: It's your choice.

19 MS. CHEW: Well, thank you, everyone, for
20 coming, and thank you for scheduling this extra
21 meeting to hear us. You know, my background is a
22 pharmacist, and, you know, for us, safety comes first
23 and foremost. And that's also what I'm charged with
24 on health and welfare in the House, for the state
25 legislature as well. You know, I'm looking at this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and I'm, you know, reflecting on the troubles we've
2 been hearing on the news with regard to the Gulf and
3 the situation there.

4 So, you know, I'm looking at the issues
5 that we're looking at in terms of your EIS, and I do
6 want to make sure that we aren't fast-tracking
7 anything, that there aren't any corners being cut, and
8 that things aren't moving along too fast, because,
9 really, just like in the practice of medicine, when
10 you make a mistake like this, you can't undo it. This
11 is about life.

12 So, you know, when I look at the fact that
13 we have an aquifer, and we have potential waste that
14 would be created upstream, I want to make sure that we
15 have a good plan there when we look at transportation
16 into Idaho and out, that those things are considered.

17 And, you know, that overall, the kind of
18 points that were brought up in the previous
19 presentation, the review. You know, when we look at
20 our energy needs, you know, I really am the "big
21 picture" person. And not only should we look at
22 nuclear as a source of energy, but, you know, we've
23 got a lot of other things that we really should be
24 looking at in the state and in this nation.

25 And I would like as much effort being put

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 forth, and as much support, being put forth with our
2 other sources of energy. When we look at solar, we
3 look at geo, when we look at wind, I'd like to see
4 that develop, especially in this state. And, you
5 know, we've heard that the energy that would be
6 developed through this particular mechanism doesn't
7 benefit our state. I'd like for us to reflect on
8 that.

9 And I'd like for, you know, the ingenuity
10 of Idahoans here, our researchers are regular people
11 that have good ideas, really, to be supported in our
12 state with regard to these other sources.
13 Conservation goes a long way, and I think that all
14 these things need to be at the table, not just
15 nuclear, and, you know, I really have a caveat with
16 regard to this, because of potential dangers. Thank
17 you.

18 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

19 MR. BARKLEY: Okay. Thank you. Jared.
20 Mayor.

21 MAYOR FUHRIMAN: Richard, before I begin,
22 I have one of our constituents that is really on a
23 tight deadline. Is there any way, after my remarks,
24 if she could come forward?

25 MR. BARKLEY: That's fine.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MAYOR FUHRIMAN: Good evening. My name is
2 Jared Fuhriman. As has been stated, we're about 20
3 miles, just west of Idaho Falls. First of all, I
4 appreciate the City of Boise for hosting this hearing
5 tonight. It gives us a greater opportunity, that we
6 can come before not only the NRC, to address you, but
7 also the folks here in the City of Boise, and what a
8 great opportunity, the impact this could have on the
9 State of Idaho itself.

10 I also want to congratulate, and thank the
11 NRC for a very thorough draft EIS, and safety analysis
12 report. It's obvious that a great deal of work has
13 gone into this production. I understand, acutely
14 understand better, the great work and the effort that
15 it takes, and as mayor, I appreciate the detail in
16 your research, and the potential impacts that it has
17 on this project and our communities.

18 Please be assured that before we decided
19 to support this project, we did a great deal of
20 research ourselves, to ensure that this type of
21 facility was appropriate for our community.

22 While I'm not a nuclear expert, many Idaho
23 Falls residents are, and we have the luxury to receive
24 counsel from them when we have questions involving
25 nuclear and environmental issues.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I also agree, recognize the expertise of
2 the NRC team that is working on this licensing
3 application, and I thank you for the time that you've
4 given to us as we've traveled back to Washington, D.C.
5 and have met with you. We truly appreciate that.
6 Your courtesy and frankness has helped our community
7 better understand the licensing process.

8 You know, it was just a year ago, March,
9 that I had the opportunity, along with two high school
10 teachers and 20 high school students, to travel back
11 to Tricastin, France, and there we were able to go
12 through the George Besse Plant, which the Eagle Rock
13 facility is modeled after. And I've got to tell you,
14 it was very impressive as we were on the site, be able
15 to witness the production of that.

16 I had a chance to talk to elected
17 officials there, as well as citizens of Tricastin, and
18 they're very proud of the George Besse plant, and
19 they're with AREVA, that they're their neighbor, and
20 also the partnership in energy.

21 One of the things that I noted when I was
22 back there. All the plants were built right next to
23 cities. And we had the opportunity to talk to many of
24 the citizens, and there was absolutely no residual
25 problems, that they could ever detect. I had the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 opportunity to meet with many AREVA executives and
2 staff, both in France and the United States, and I
3 have total confidence that the Eagle Rock enrichment
4 facility will be operated safely and efficiently.

5 So, once again, we want to thank you for
6 giving us this opportunity to speak tonight, and we'll
7 be looking forward to welcome you back to our city
8 this Thursday evening. Thank you.

9 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

10 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you. Your name is?

11 MR. HART: My name's Mike Hart and I'm
12 from Idaho Falls. That's why I appreciate Jared--I
13 asked him, to see if I could also get pushed to the
14 front, just so I can get back home before it's way too
15 late.

16 MR. BARKLEY: Okay; very good.

17 MR. HART: I'd like to just state first,
18 my appreciation again, that you did have public
19 hearings. I'm a member of the Coffee Party, not the
20 Tea Party, where we believe in civic and civil
21 engagement with people who we don't always agree with,
22 and I think tonight's hearing is an example of,
23 obviously the folks in this room are going to have a
24 different view than the constituents in Idaho Falls.

25 But it's all part of a democratic process,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and it will work itself out, and hopefully we can
2 trust our government to follow what is in the public's
3 best interest.

4 With respect to what I view as the
5 public's best interest, first, I thank you for the
6 analysis. Looking through the EIS, Section 4.2.3, you
7 analyze visual impacts which include light pollution.
8 As an astronomer, we use the area, Hell's Half Acre,
9 for astronomy parties. We use that because it's a good
10 dark sky location that's relatively convenient.

11 The EIS doesn't specifically mention that,
12 but in mitigation, it does identify that there will be
13 low--or the lights will be pointed downwards, and I
14 would appreciate further mitigations to acknowledge
15 that the sky should be kept as dark as possible.

16 Possibly for security, if you could use
17 infrared technology or something that doesn't require
18 high light levels that would very much be appreciated.

19 In terms of ecological impacts of the
20 site, one thing I noticed was again the analysis of
21 the fact that you'll not--you'll be ceasing grazing on
22 that area, which for sage grouse, the reality is what
23 really causes threatened and endangered species
24 listing of sage grouse is not spoken--but it's cows.

25 So, actually, getting cows off that range,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and reseeding it with natural native plants, will
2 actually probably improve sage grouse habitat
3 significantly, and I think you list it as a light
4 impact. Actually, I would go so far as to say it
5 might actually be a benefit, of having an area. But
6 when you do reseed, do go with natives rather than
7 reseeding with crested wheat grass or other non-native
8 species that are invasive.

9 With respect to the need, I, looking at
10 global warming, I know there are obviously impacts of
11 nuclear energy, but the reality is, seven generations
12 from now I think they won't be worrying as much about
13 depleted uranium as they will be about depleted
14 glaciers, depleted ice caps, and nuclear energy has a
15 significant benefit. It's not without its warts, it's
16 not without its impacts, but there is "no free lunch"
17 when it comes to energy.

18 You can conserve, but we do use energy.
19 It is used globally, whether this is a French company,
20 whether it's used locally, or nationally, the reality
21 is its carbon-free, and that carbon-free resource is
22 something that is very precious, and until we have
23 alternative technologies that can produce significant
24 usable quantities of electricity, nuclear is a very
25 positive step in between now and a carbon-free future.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So those are my comments.

2 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

3 MR. BARKLEY: Okay. Thank you. The next
4 three speakers I'd like to call up are Lane Allgood,
5 Tim Solomon, and Erik Simpson.

6 MR. ALLGOOD: Mr. Barkley, Mr. Kjellander,
7 representing Governor Otter has now arrived, so I
8 think it would be appropriate for us to step aside and
9 let Mr. Kjellander speak for the governor.

10 MR. BARKLEY: I'm fine with him moving up.
11 Thank you. Welcome, sir.

12 MR. KJELLANDER: Good evening. My name is
13 Paul Kjellander. I'm the administrator for the Office
14 of Energy Resources, and I'm here this evening on
15 behalf of Governor C.L. "Butch" Otter, to provide his
16 comments as governor and as a citizen of this great
17 state.

18 As such, the governor wants to state his
19 support for the proposed AREVA enrichment facility,
20 Eagle Rock, which will be built and operated outside
21 of Idaho Falls. AREVA is proposing to build a state-
22 of-the-art, technologically-proven modern facility to
23 enrich uranium needed to operate the existing U.S.
24 fleet of 104 power reactors.

25 AREVA's plant will be incorporated many

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 unique features which have been developed over three
2 decades of experience with centrifuge enrichment
3 technology.

4 AREVA's vast experience in use of the
5 technology will result in minimizing, and, where
6 possible, eliminating any impacts on the surrounding
7 environment and regional communities. There will
8 remain, however, many significant beneficial impacts.

9 First, the Eagle Rock project will provide
10 a much-needed stabilizing economic force in Idaho
11 Falls and the Southeastern Idaho region.

12 Second, this facility will create much-
13 needed high-quality jobs for the dedicated workforce
14 in the area. Eagle Rock will create thousands of
15 construction and contractor jobs, and during 30 years
16 of operation, hundreds of long term, high-end
17 positions.

18 Third, Eagle Rock will help rebuild the
19 nation's nuclear infrastructure and enhance energy
20 security for all those who depend on nuclear power for
21 their health and welfare, right here, from Idaho.

22 Safety, integrity, professionalism, and
23 sustainability are demonstrated attributes that Areva
24 embraces in all of its projects and operations, and
25 the governor believes it will bring no less to Idaho

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Falls.

2 AREVA has been easy to work with, and they are
3 excited about coming to Idaho as we are excited to
4 have them locate their facility within our state.

5 As we look across the country today, there
6 are not many, if any, states or regions that can claim
7 proposed major energy infrastructure projects or
8 facilities like the Eagle Rock enrichment facility.

9 While large projects are usually
10 accompanied by some environmental impacts, Governor
11 Otter believes the end result of this facility will be
12 very positive for Idaho and the country. Eagle Rock
13 will provide much-needed domestic production of
14 enriched uranium for our existing U.S. nuclear power
15 fleet, which will help enable U.S. utilities to move
16 away from importing nearly 90 percent of this
17 important fuel product.

18 So we welcome the NRC here to Boise this
19 evening. The governor is sure you'll hear a cross-
20 section of comments, but he suspects, based on his
21 travels around this great state, the majority of
22 Idahoans will tell you that they want and embrace
23 Eagle Rock, and look forward to continuing to work
24 with AREVA in bringing this important project one step
25 closer to reality.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In conclusion, the governor would strongly
2 encourage the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to move
3 forward expeditiously in their review and granting of
4 a license to AREVA, so that this important facility
5 can begin construction next year.

6 Thank you. I also have to say that I
7 turned fifty just last week. It's a little dark here
8 and I do need some readers.

9 MR. SKEEN: Thank you for those comments.

10 MR. BARKLEY: All right. Very good.
11 Thank you.

12 MR. ALLGOOD: Thank you, Mr. Barkley, and
13 members of the team that are here. My name is Lane
14 Allgood. I'm the executive director of an
15 organization based in Idaho Falls called the
16 Partnership for Science and Technology. Our
17 organization is a nonprofit organization formed to
18 advocate for energy and environmental technologies,
19 and decisions that we feel are in the public interest.

20 Our organization, along with several
21 others that are represented here tonight, have been
22 following the licensing process from the time AREVA
23 submitted it in December of 2008. I want to be
24 sensitive on the time issue tonight, and so myself and
25 my colleagues will only make very brief comments, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we obviously will be prepared for more detailed
2 comments Thursday, in Idaho Falls. We'd like to
3 commend the NRC for the very open and transparent
4 process, and thank you for the time you spent with us,
5 both in Washington, D.C. and Idaho Falls, to respond
6 to our questions.

7 Last June, at the EIS scoping meeting held
8 in Idaho Falls, we asked you to consider the following
9 impacts. Land use, transportation, geology and soils,
10 water issues, air quality, historic and cultural
11 issues, social, economic, public and occupational
12 health, noise, and waste management. All of those
13 potential impacts were addressed in the EIS and we
14 appreciate that.

15 As citizens of the communities closest to
16 the facility, these potential impacts are very
17 important to us. We want to thank you for the obvious
18 amount of work that went into the research and
19 evaluation of this draft EIS, along with the safety
20 analysis report, and after reviewing this draft, we
21 understand why the licensing process takes so long.

22 We understand and support the NRC's
23 primary role, is to protect public health, safety, and
24 again, as neighbors of the Eagle Rock enrichment
25 facility, we thank you for your dedication. Thank

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you.

2 MR. BARKLEY: Thanks.

3 MR. SOLOMON: Good evening. I'm Timothy
4 Solomon, executive director of the Regional
5 Development Alliance in Idaho Falls, and I appreciate
6 being here tonight to comment on the EIS. Let me say,
7 first of all, that the EIS was very well done, and we
8 appreciate the time the NRC has taken to include all
9 of those very critical characteristics that Lane
10 mentioned a moment ago.

11 The Regional Development Alliance is
12 experienced in doing economic impact analysis, and I
13 want to congratulate you on the socioeconomics portion
14 of the EIS, which I'm going to address throughout my
15 comments.

16 We subsequently ran an additional analysis
17 based upon your numbers in the EIS, to see how those
18 came out, and those job numbers are "right on" in our
19 estimation.

20 The job creation numbers for a region of
21 this size are quite substantial. They are not an
22 insignificant impact on the state and on our region.
23 308 preconstruction jobs and 1,687 construction jobs
24 will impact Idaho, in a very positive way, over the
25 years in which those activities take place. 3,289

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 direct, indirect, and induced jobs are also very, very
2 significant throughout the operational period.

3 The direct output effects of more than 315
4 million in the first full year of operations is not a
5 small impact, and provides a substantial base of
6 potential business for local suppliers, service
7 providers, and sole proprietors, a very important part
8 of our economy.

9 Even if the output remains static over a
10 20 year period, using the numbers in the EIS, the
11 region would have a base of 6.3 billion in total
12 direct East Coast activity from which to draw for
13 those business opportunities over that operational
14 period.

15 We do urge the NRC to take another look at
16 your labor income numbers. We think they may be
17 slightly less than a project of this size, and a
18 region of this size merits. However, if you just take
19 the 92.4 million that is outlined in the EIS, if you
20 take that out over a 20 year operating history,
21 assuming no year-to-year change, we estimate nearly \$2
22 billion of labor income along on that side of it.

23 The economic impact of AREVA's \$2 billion
24 investment in Idaho is driven by capital investment
25 that leads to job creation. The Eagle Rock enrichment

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 facility location in eastern Idaho is absolutely
2 critical to the economic vitality of the region.

3 Real property has improved and begins
4 yielding tax revenues at a much higher level. New
5 investments are made in tangible personal property
6 that keeps our manufacturing and processing
7 capabilities and our job infrastructure on the leading
8 edge.

9 Jobs are created; dollars are spent in the
10 local economy. Business to business and business to
11 consumer transactions increase, real per capita income
12 increase, tax revenues throughout the area of impact,
13 both direct and indirect, to the investment, increase,
14 and the general economy of the entire state is
15 strengthened.

16 And with that, we highly encourage you
17 strongly support the issuance of a license, and I
18 thank you, once again.

19 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

20 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you. Go ahead, Erik.

21 MR. SIMPSON: Oh. Thank you. My name's
22 Representative Erik Simpson. I'm a state
23 representative from District 32 in eastern Idaho, and
24 this plant would be built in my district. First, I'd
25 like to thank the NRC for holding this meeting

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 tonight. I worked at the Idaho National Laboratory
2 for the cleanup program, for about 20 years as a
3 stakeholder involvement lead, and I really appreciate
4 the additional outreach the NRC is doing.

5 I think it's absolutely necessary on a
6 project of this size, and I applaud the NRC for being
7 open to additional public comments.

8 With that, I'd like to clear up some
9 misconceptions that I've heard tonight about the AREVA
10 project, in terms of large volumes of waste that will
11 be left behind, creating a legacy, and that is simply
12 not permitted under the NRC licensing action.

13 Historically, nuclear projects being
14 discussed in eastern Idaho are DOE actions. I just
15 want to remind people, this is not a DOE action. NRC
16 license holders are required to provide financial
17 assurance for decommissioning. They must prove to the
18 NRC that funds will be adequate for decommissioning.
19 They must fund it before operations start. The
20 licensees are required to periodically review and
21 update this funding, and with this license
22 requirement, there is no chance waste will be left
23 behind, or that Idaho will be left with cleanup
24 responsibility for the AREVA facility.

25 Another issue related to the production of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 depleted uranium, that has been overstated, to a great
2 extent, deals with the radioactive level of the
3 material over time. It is true that depleted uranium
4 tails from enrichment become more radioactive. The
5 real question is whether that presents a problem to
6 anyone's future health and safety of the environment.

7 We all know that uranium is a naturally-
8 occurring radioactive element as found in nature.
9 Uranium also contains all of the naturally-occurring
10 decay products of the uranium decay chain.

11 After going through chemical purification
12 and enrichment, the depleted uranium tails are
13 stripped of those other materials that are actually
14 much less radioactive than the form of uranium
15 normally found in nature.

16 So it is the build-up of those normal
17 decay products in the depleted uranium that give
18 reason for the position that it becomes more
19 radioactive, with time. Truth be told, the uranium is
20 actually building back up to its natural balance of
21 uranium and decay products. The ultimate question we
22 need to address was storage and disposal of depleted
23 uranium, is can it be done safely and does this
24 increase in radioactive, back to normal levels, create
25 a future problem for the environment?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The answer to that--uranium can be very--
2 or it can be very safely stored and disposed.

3 Now in the photograph that was showed, you
4 saw the uranium safely stored. I must confess, a
5 little rust on the container is not a problem, and
6 what isn't stated is that that material is regularly
7 monitored and inspected per federal guidelines. That
8 was not stated.

9 Lastly, depleted uranium tails themselves
10 are not considered waste. The tails contain residual
11 value in both the remaining uranium and fluorine that
12 it contains. In fact, the Idaho Company,
13 International Isotopes, is in the process of licensing
14 and building a \$100 million facility in New Mexico
15 specifically designed for the chemical deconversion of
16 depleted uranium from enrichment. The facility will
17 extract the valuable fluoride and sell that on the
18 commercial market place.

19 In conclusion, I want to state that I
20 strongly support the AREVA project, and feel the draft
21 EIS is very adequate, and considers the environmental
22 factors associated with the facility. I believe AREVA
23 will be a positive addition to the State of Idaho, and
24 an integral part of our nation's development of energy
25 independence. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

2 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you. The next three
3 speakers we will have are Mr. Maynard, R.N. Maynard.
4 Then I was requested to have Kerry Cook speak. I
5 think she's running late. She needs to leave. And
6 then finally, Sarah Cohn. So Mr. Maynard.

7 MR. MAYNARD: Thank you. First of all,
8 I'd like to thank the NRC for holding this extra
9 meeting in Boise. I know they didn't have to do that.

10 My name is R.D. Maynard. I'm a resident of Meridian,
11 Idaho. I currently serve as the chairman of the INL
12 Citizens Advisory Board for DOE EM cleanup at the INL.

13 But I'm not here to represent the CAB.
14 But as a member of the CAB, and a native Idahoan of
15 over 50 years, and unlike Paul Kjellander, I'm not
16 going to put my age on record, naturally, I'm
17 interested in any potential impacts to the
18 environment, particularly the Snake River aquifer,
19 that construction and operation of the Eagle Rock
20 enrichment facility might cause.

21 Past waste disposal practices at the INL
22 site, along with land application of fertilizer and
23 pesticides, and excessive irrigation, have already
24 caused some contamination of the aquifer.

25 After reviewing the summary of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental consequences and mitigation section of
2 the draft EIS, I'm confident that any potential
3 negative impact on the air and water resources would
4 be small.

5 I applaud the NRC on your very thorough
6 work on this licensing application and appreciate the
7 detail of research that went into the EIS.

8 I would suggest that anyone with concerns
9 about environmental issues associated with this
10 project spend some time reading the environmental
11 impacts, mitigation, environmental measures, and
12 monitoring programs, and summary of environmental
13 consequences section of the EIS

14 I strongly support this as a citizen of
15 the State of Idaho. Thank you.

16 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you. Kerry.

17 MS. COOK: Hello. Kerry Cook is my name.
18 I want to thank you very much for having this hearing
19 in Boise. It means a tremendous amount, a lot to all
20 of us that you've come here, that we can speak to you
21 tonight, and it restores some of my faith in how these
22 decisions get made. I also want to thank you for
23 slipping me in here. I am a ticket taker at a movie
24 theater and I have to get back to take tickets before
25 the movie starts.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So I am going to be very brief because of
2 all of that, and I'm going to just address two things.

3 The first thing is this preconstruction phase.

4 There is nothing in the EIS to suggest
5 there is any reason for haste. There's no emergency
6 facing this country, or any other country, that this
7 facility must be built as soon as possible.

8 There's--I guess I'm just going to say,
9 that I think that there's--there must be some proof
10 laid out here, that there's any reason to say work
11 needs to start in October, when so many questions are
12 left to be answered, so much is still--we're here
13 talking to you tonight about effects on the
14 environment, many questions we have about the road
15 into it, transmission, and yet, you're going to allow
16 preconstruction.

17 It's totally puzzling to me, and I think
18 really needs much more explanation, and I actually
19 believe shouldn't happen.

20 The second thing I would like to talk to
21 you about is the depleted uranium. Now Idaho has a
22 long history of taking care of the waste that someone
23 else said was going to get solved, taken care of
24 handled, cleaned up, or something like that, within,
25 oh, just a few years or perhaps the next decade.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Depleted uranium is adding to a waste
2 burden that Idaho already suffers with, and I believe
3 that you owe it to the people of the United States to
4 not license any facility that is going to increase,
5 make any more depleted uranium, until this question is
6 thoroughly solved, not proposed, not suggested, not
7 theoretical, but solved. Just needs to stop. Thank
8 you very much.

9 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you. Sarah Cohn.

10 MS. COHN: Good evening. Thank you for
11 the opportunity for the public testimony here, in
12 Boise. I know you've heard that a lot; but I'll say
13 it again. My name is Sarah Cohn. I work for the Idaho
14 Conservation League. Since 1973, the Idaho
15 Conservation League has been Idaho's voice for clean
16 water, clean air, and wilderness, values that are the
17 foundation of Idaho's extraordinary quality of life.

18 The Idaho Conservation League works to
19 protect these values through citizen action, public
20 education and professional advocacy.

21 As Idaho's largest state-based
22 conservation organization, we represent over 9500
23 members in Idaho, many of whom have a deep personal
24 interest in protecting Idaho's natural resources and
25 public health.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In the interest of time, and my fellow
2 concerned citizens, I will keep my comments brief,
3 with the understanding that we will provide detailed
4 written comments before the deadline.

5 We, ICL has provided public comments on
6 the scoping analysis for the proposed AREVA facility,
7 and we have provided comments on the potential
8 rulemaking for the safe disposal of unique waste
9 streams, including significant quantities of depleted
10 uranium.

11 As the Federal Register announcement for
12 this proposed rulemaking suggests, NRC does not
13 currently provide adequate guidance for the type of
14 waste streams that will be created by the proposed
15 Eagle Rock facility and stored on site.

16 Until regulations are in place governing
17 disposal of depleted uranium, and disposal facilities
18 have implemented those regulations, ICL believes it is
19 inappropriate to license any new uranium enrichment
20 facility. NRC should consider the creation of
21 adequate rules to guide the safe disposal of depleted
22 uranium as paramount to permitting individual
23 facilities.

24 Preconstruction has been mentioned by
25 other folks, and I will mention it also. It is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 unclear under what authority NRC can offer the
2 exemption for preconstruction activities when such
3 impacts extend outside of NRC jurisdiction.

4 For example, preconstruction activities
5 will impact species protected under the Endangered
6 Species Act, such as sage grouse, and others, and
7 waters protected under the Safe Drinking Water Act,
8 specifically the sole source aquifer, the eastern
9 Snake River plain.

10 The project must consult with agencies
11 like EPA and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, in
12 order to analyze and release for public comment the
13 environmental and public health impacts of
14 preconstruction activities, including clearing,
15 blasting, and grading, prior to conducting such
16 activities.

17 And finally, we are concerned with the
18 transportation analysis in the draft EIS, that it does
19 not appropriately account for the hazardous and
20 radioactive materials that will be transported to and
21 from the site.

22 Analyzing traffic impacts alone does not
23 adequately encompass the potential impacts to public
24 health, and the environment, associated with such
25 cargo. Perhaps that will be addressed in the safety

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 analysis. I have not yet seen that. I don't believe
2 it's been out for public comment.

3 Similarly, we are concerned that fire is
4 not addressed as a potential threat, when fuels exist
5 on site and fires have recently been burning in the
6 region. Thanks again.

7 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

8 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you very much. I've
9 been very impressed with all the presentations made so
10 far, and particularly how well all of you have held to
11 time. I greatly appreciate that, given I have thirty-
12 seven more people that want to speak this evening.

13 I believe I have two individual who still
14 represent elected representatives, are representing
15 elected entities, one of them being Robert Simison of
16 the City of Meridian, and Lane Packwood, who is the
17 administrator of Economic Development of the Idaho
18 Department of Commerce. To my knowledge, that's the
19 only other elected officials that wanted to speak
20 tonight. Is there one other gentleman? Okay. Lee,
21 you're third.

22 Robert.

23 MR. SIMISON: Thank you for allowing us
24 the opportunity to speak this evening. I again want
25 to express our gratitude to the NRC for coming out

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 here for this hearing tonight. I am speaking tonight
2 on behalf of Mayor Tammy de Weerd of the City of
3 Meridian, which is the third largest city in Idaho,
4 located here in the Treasure Valley, in support of the
5 purpose and need for the proposed Eagle Rock facility,
6 as outlined in the EIS.

7 We believe that the proposed facility will
8 help support our nation's nuclear power industry and
9 emphasize the importance of having a reliable source
10 of enriched uranium for national energy security, as
11 is described in the EIS.

12 We do feel that taking the "no action
13 alternative" is not a viable option for the State of
14 Idaho, and believe, just by looking at the
15 socioeconomic impacts, as others have stated, is valid
16 reasons why we should move this project forward.

17 I just want to specifically point out
18 that, you know, while the draft EIS does list it as a
19 small impact, due to the criteria that was used, in
20 the State of Idaho, that part of the region, the 11
21 counties over there, it is really not a small impact.

22 It has a tremendous impact, here, in the state, and
23 we believe, as a city, that this will also impact this
24 side of the state, here, in the Treasure Valley, as we
25 try to work more and more with the products and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 services that are coming out of INL, and hope that
2 there will be partnerships that will come from the
3 private industry as well as the research that's
4 currently being done at INL, that may answer questions
5 that many people still might have about nuclear energy
6 and depleted uranium in the future.

7 I think this could be a good partnership
8 for the area. With that, I will go ahead and conclude
9 my comments, and say, as a nation, we need a
10 generation of safe nuclear energy power plants and we
11 encourage you to move the EIS for the Eagle Rock
12 facility forward, and know that it will directly and
13 indirectly benefit thousands of Idahoans. Thank you.

14 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

15 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you. Lane.

16 MR. PACKWOOD: Good evening. My name's
17 Lane Packwood. I'm the economic development
18 administrator for the Idaho Department of Commerce,
19 and we thank the NRC for having these extended comment
20 periods.

21 We've also reviewed the EIS, and from a
22 technical point of view, we find it is adequate, and
23 we encourage you to proceed to the next step,
24 licensing. There is one--I'd like to echo the
25 comments of some of the other speakers here tonight.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We are somewhat surprised that the EIS
2 finds that the economic and fiscal benefits associated
3 with the project to be small, and I think I just--we--
4 we disagree that it's small. It is, in fact,
5 enormous. And just to put some perspective on the
6 impact of this project, just taking the numbers from
7 peak facility construction alone, direct employment,
8 590 jobs, that would decrease unemployment in the two
9 county ROI by 10 percent.

10 There's only 5100 unemployed workers in
11 Bonneville and Bingham County. 590 jobs is an
12 enormous impact. In fact, the roll-up of all the jobs
13 of the four phases examined nearly 3300 jobs. Just
14 this project alone would move Idaho unemployment by
15 one-half a percent. So that is non-negligible impact
16 on employment in this state. The same with income
17 generated by the project.

18 I found it somewhat interesting that the
19 EIS does take kind of a "sliced break" approach to
20 income and taxes. They look at one year within
21 preconstruction, one year in construction, one year of
22 operation, and take a look at what those revenues are,
23 when, in fact, we would encourage you to look at the
24 length of--or the lifetime of the facility. That's
25 all a cumulative impact.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, for example, just the income generated
2 by the 11 years leading up to full operation, just the
3 construction phases, is half a billion dollars, and
4 that's almost five and a half times what the estimate
5 here, in Table 4-27, lists. The same with property
6 taxes. Just a tremendous impact on the economy. 2.8
7 million in income taxes generated, 6 million in sales
8 and use taxes, 5.3 million in property taxes.

9 When the facility is operational, it'll be
10 paying something like 3.5 million in property taxes.

11 Now Bonneville County only collects 23.8
12 million now, and just put that in some perspective.
13 What does that mean to a local economy? You know, 3.5
14 million is 58 teachers, each year, year after year,
15 just the average--and that's the average salary,
16 that's not starting salary of teachers in Idaho.
17 Fifty-eight.

18 So I guess our point here tonight is just
19 to encourage the NRC to take a look at the economic
20 impact, and to understand what a--what a--the scale of
21 the project, and we've heard various estimates of the
22 overall cost, the capital expenditures, 2, 3, 4
23 million. Let's just say it's 3.5 billion. Let's just
24 say that's the cap X of the project.

25 Well, the economy of the State of Idaho,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the GDP is only 52 billion. That's 6.6 percent of our
2 state GDP. On a federal level, if we were to compare
3 that to what size federal project would represent 6.6
4 percent of federal GDP, AREVA is to Idaho what a \$947
5 billion project out be to the national economy. And
6 that's bigger than the stimulus. So certainly not
7 small in its impact. Thank you.

8 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

9 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you, Lane.
10 Lee.

11 MR. STAKER: Hi. It's a pleasure to be
12 here. My name's Lee Staker. I'm a Bonneville County
13 commissioner. Bonneville County encompasses Idaho
14 Falls and some other small towns. The Eagle Rock
15 facility falls within the district that I'm elected.
16 I'm elected countywide but I have to reside in a
17 certain district, and it falls within the district
18 that I represent.

19 I won't get into a lot of details, other
20 than to say the tax base of Bonneville County is about
21 \$5.9 billion, and you start looking at this as a tax
22 base. Even though the full taxes won't be from that,
23 it is significant to Bonneville County.

24 I have brought with me today our planning
25 and zoning administrator who will address some of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 technical aspects from the planning and zoning and the
2 building aspect of Bonneville County.

3 I'm grateful for you to come to listen to
4 us. I think it's wise that you came to Boise to get
5 other perspective, other than just from Idaho Falls.
6 I appreciate that very much. And I appreciate the
7 opposition. I think for the most part, they've been
8 very well-behaved, and I appreciate it very much.
9 Thank you.

10 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

11 MR. BARKLEY: Okay. Our next three
12 speakers are Virginia Hemingway. Boy, I'm going to
13 butcher this next name. Gus Esteves? And finally,
14 Diane Jones.

15 Virginia.

16 MS. HEMINGWAY: I'm Virginia Hemingway. I
17 reside in Boise, unlike most of the previous speakers
18 who come from Idaho Falls. I found that--I found it
19 very interesting, that while our state is cutting back
20 in almost every area, especially education, that they
21 have suddenly found it very expedient and prudent to
22 spend \$750,000 on an overpass to a nonexistent plant,
23 and according to the sources that I have read, this
24 overpass was approved without going through the
25 regular Idaho Department of Transportation procedures.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 On to Areva, because I have such a limited
2 amount of time, that company had 6.2 billion euros in
3 net debt at the end of 2009, and as recently as June
4 of 2010, it has been downgraded by Standard & Poor's
5 to a debt rating of BBB plus, due to its weakened
6 profitability.

7 These statistics do not even begin to
8 address the dangerous impact of 350,000 tons of
9 depleted uranium that will be stored in more than
10 three--30,000 cylinders, which will be on cement pads
11 above ground.

12 Idaho is already a dumping ground for
13 nuclear waste, and there is no place for it to go.
14 There will be no place for it to go, because there are
15 no plans for this waste to go anywhere.

16 We will also have approximately 2,000
17 truckloads of incoming waste being transported over
18 our potholed roads which need fixing, more than we
19 need a \$750,000 off-ramp to a spot where there is
20 nothing currently, except sagebrush.

21 As has been mentioned, we just escaped a
22 fire that could have totally decimated the INL, which
23 is just almost right next to your facility, that
24 you're--that the AREVA is planning. And in Russia,
25 they are currently trying to control a fire that is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 coming very close to where Chernobyl melted down, and,
2 in fact, their emergency minister had this to say
3 about it.

4 He said that the heat from the fires in
5 the region, which already has nuclear contamination
6 from the Chernobyl disaster, more than 20 years ago,
7 could release harmful radioactive particles into the
8 atmosphere. In the event of a fire there,
9 radionuclides could rise into the air, together with
10 combustion particles, resulting in a new pollution
11 zone. And he said this on state television in Russia.

12 For these, and many other reasons, I
13 adamantly am opposed to this plant being built and to
14 the Idaho taxpayers' money paying for an off-ramp to
15 nowhere, except sagebrush. These few facts prove that
16 once again, Idaho's leaders, and the NRC, have shown
17 they do not consider the long-term consequences of
18 decisions made in haste, without appropriate research.

19 As a fourth generation Idahoan, I do not
20 need, nor do I want, this kind of danger in my state.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

23 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you.

24 Gus. You're not here. We'll move on.

25 Okay. Diane, are you ready?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. JONES: My name is Diane Jones, and I
2 live in Boise, and I'm representing myself. I do
3 appreciate your time. If I might, I'd like,
4 respectfully, to make a comment on procedure. I'd
5 just like to say, if you're going to have a hearing in
6 Idaho Falls and a hearing in Boise, I think it's
7 appropriate for people from Idaho Falls to testify
8 there and not be able to testify twice in both
9 hearings. There's a lot of us from Boise who really
10 appreciate being able to testify but, you know, they
11 have their hearing. There's one here for us. Thank
12 you.

13 Just some brief points. First, I'd like
14 to talk about the issue of need. I believe that the
15 EIS really needs to address the obvious contradiction
16 between the assertion that enrichment uranium is
17 needed for United States energy independence, and the
18 stated fact that the uranium itself may be imported
19 and the product of enrichment may be exported.

20 It's an obvious contradiction which
21 clearly needs to be looked at.

22 As far as need, I know some speakers have
23 attempted to make a case for need in terms of jobs and
24 tax base, and any project can be justified in terms of
25 jobs and tax base, including cleaning up toxic waste.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That's not really what we want in Idaho.
2 There are plenty of alternatives. I know that's not
3 covered by the EIS, but in the "big picture," jobs
4 could be created with energy systems that might be
5 based on wind and solar, that would have less adverse
6 environmental effects.

7 Assuming that the project goes forward,
8 and the enriched uranium is used in the United States,
9 there's an assertion in the EIS that this would be an
10 economical source of enriched uranium.

11 My question is: Does that economy include
12 the cleanup of the waste that's generated? It seems
13 clear that the NRC has not yet figured out how this
14 waste should be, could be disposed of, and it's the--
15 who bears the cost? How can we expect the company to--
16 whose financial future is uncertain, to be able to
17 guarantee that they will bear the cost of treating all
18 that waste and disposing of all that waste, when the
19 process for disposing of the waste is not even known?

20 This seems highly reckless to me, and not
21 a very sound economical calculation.

22 Finally, I'd just like to say the EIS
23 found only small and moderate impacts from this
24 project, this proposed project. One of the things
25 that was looked at is removal of sagebrush steppe and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that was regarded as a moderate. I would like to say
2 that when sagebrush steppe is removed, it's removed,
3 and it does not come back for a long time.

4 That's not small or moderate. It's a very
5 large impact.

6 And then I think, myself, along with, I
7 think, many members of this audience, wonder how the
8 generation of 350 metric tons of waste, of depleted
9 uranium, for which no known disposal route has been
10 proposed, accepted, whatever, can be regarded as a
11 small impact.

12 Thank you very much.

13 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

14 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you, Diane.

15 Our next three speakers will be Manley
16 Briggs, John Weber, and the finally, Trevor Grigg.

17 MR. BRIGGS: My name's Manley Briggs, and
18 I represent myself, and I'd like to thank the NRC for
19 giving us the opportunity to present some ideas. I'm
20 a physician, been practicing in Boise since 1965, and
21 as such, over the years; I've been concerned about the
22 health effects of radiation. In Idaho, we've been
23 kind of bombarded from different sides about potential
24 health effects. The nuclear bomb test in Nevada, the
25 Hanford downwind effect, and the storage, for many

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 years, of waste over the aquifer, as well as the
2 transportation of waste to Idaho.

3 So I'd like to make certain that the EIS
4 addresses health concerns. Now one of my concerns is
5 with this storage, potentially being stored over the
6 aquifer for X number of years. I think that the
7 seismic activity in the area around the plant needs to
8 be considered. I understand that that was addressed
9 and it was felt to not be significant.

10 But Idaho is very seismically active. It
11 has the fifth largest number of earthquakes in the
12 country. The most recent earthquake was August 1st,
13 2010. It has had the two largest earthquake in the
14 lower United States in the last 50 years. The Hebo
15 Lake earthquake on the Idaho-Montana border was a 7.5
16 magnitude, and the Borah Peak earthquake, in 1983, was
17 a 7.3 magnitude.

18 And if this material is being stored in an
19 area close to those potential earthquakes, I feel that
20 that has to be addressed. There are fault lines that
21 essentially completely surround the INL, comes down
22 from the Lost River, comes down from the north, and I
23 think that certainly needs to be addressed from the
24 health point of view, because an earthquake could
25 certain disrupt storage.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Now the other thing that I'd like to point
2 out, in relation to the nuclear bomb tests, the
3 National Cancer Institute, in 1999, attempted to study
4 the effect of those bomb tests on health throughout
5 the West, and they found that of the five most-
6 affected counties in the country, four of them were in
7 Idaho.

8 And they did a study to look into the
9 effects of the radioactive iodine 131 on thyroid
10 cancer in the state, and although there was a definite
11 rise in thyroid cancer, it could not be demonstrated,
12 statistically, that it was--had made a difference.
13 There's so many variables, that this was difficult to
14 get a statistical value.

15 However, a really interesting thing that I
16 noticed was that Elmore County had a statistically
17 increased rate of thyroid cancer in those born after
18 1958. That means they weren't affected by the nuclear
19 bomb tests. But why do they have it? And it is
20 pertinent, I think, at least needs to be looked into,
21 that Elmore County is the first county down-river from
22 the discharge of the Snake River aquifer at the
23 Thousand Springs into the Snake River. So I think
24 that at least needs to be addressed by the
25 Environmental Impact Statement. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

2 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you. John, welcome.

3 MR. WEBER: Thank you. Thank you for the
4 opportunity to comment on the proposed AREVA uranium
5 enrichment plant in Idaho.

6 After reviewing the safety analysis report
7 and the EIS, I have a few questions and comments to
8 present to NRC at this time. Because no Bobin
9 (phonetic) oil recovery system will be used, where
10 will the PFPE oil waste be stored?

11 What is the kilowatt rating of each of the
12 four standby diesel generators, and how much diesel
13 will be stored on the site? How can AREVA's
14 statement, in section 9.2, about protecting people and
15 the environment from radiation be taken seriously,
16 knowing AREVA's dismal track record in Africa, and
17 other parts of the world, for protecting people and
18 the environment?

19 Why can we expect a different outcome in
20 Idaho? In section 10.0, one difference between the
21 AREVA plant and the National Enrichment Facility is--
22 this is quoted: "AES will utilize a letter of credit
23 to provide reasonable assurance of decommissioning
24 funding, rather than a surety bond."

25 Why is that? We all currently know, after

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the last financial crisis, that a letter of credit is
2 basically a worthless piece of paper. They have many
3 risks a couple of them, including insolvency of the
4 Applicant and insolvency of the bank issuing the
5 letter of credit.

6 In section 10.1, it states that: "DOE is
7 entitled to take title to and dispose of the waste."
8 So the French citizens take the profits and the U.S.
9 citizens get the waste. Also, the U.S. citizens bear
10 most of the risk by giving the French company multiple
11 tax benefits and loan guarantees.

12 Is it true the estimated cost of
13 decommissioning the plant is 3.5 billion U.S. dollars?

14 I recommend the "no action alternative" for the
15 following reasons.

16 With many of the current U.S. reactors
17 nearing the end of their design life expectancy, and
18 very few, if any, new reactors likely to be built due
19 to economics, a case has not been made for a need for
20 this plant.

21 It's much like putting the cart before the
22 horse. A plan owned by a foreign company will do
23 nothing to protect U.S. national security. And I was
24 reading my insurance policy, the other day, at State
25 Farm. A lot of you probably have State Farm

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 insurance.

2 It says: "Exclusions. There is no
3 coverage under this policy for any loss arising out of
4 nuclear radiation, radiation or radioactive
5 contamination from any source."

6 Thank you.

7 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

8 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you, John.

9 Trevor.

10 MR. GRIGG: Thank you for the opportunity
11 to speak this evening, and my name is Trevor Grigg.
12 I'm just a citizen of Boise here, and just came out
13 this evening to comment. I actually spent the last
14 couple years as student body president of Boise State
15 University, and so I had the opportunity--I don't
16 represent Boise State University tonight, I'll make
17 that clear--but I just had the opportunity to
18 represent a lot of students, and a lot of individuals
19 in construction management and engineering, and in the
20 business colleague, like I am, and, you know, just
21 kind a echoing the gentleman over here, to my right,
22 who talked about understating the economic benefits
23 from this project.

24 But literally--I'm not understating this--
25 but literally, the hundreds of people that I know,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that go to Boise State University, and the tens of
2 them--lots of them that are unemployed right now, that
3 have very high-skill degrees, they're engineers,
4 they're ready to go, they're looking for a job, and
5 the unemployment rate in our country is highest
6 amongst teenagers and those in their twenties.

7 And, you know, I want the same opportunity
8 of prosperity that my parents have had, and I know
9 that these acquaintances and these friends, they want
10 the same opportunity of prosperity, and I think that
11 this economic benefit that comes to our state through
12 this project is huge, and it gives us that
13 opportunity.

14 I want to live in Idaho. I don't want to
15 have to take my degree that the taxpayers of Idaho
16 have subsidized for me, and move to another state, and
17 make money and pay taxes there. I want to keep it
18 right here, in Idaho. So thank you very much, and we
19 appreciate you coming here.

20 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

21 MR. BARKLEY: Yes. Thank you, Trevor.

22 The next three people I'd like to call are
23 Holly Paquette, Bob Nielson and Lisa Young.

24 Holly.

25 MS. PAQUETTE: Hi. I'm Holly Paquette and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'd like to thank you for coming and letting us say
2 what we want to say here, in Boise. I want to start
3 with kind of a little bit of background about myself.

4 I'm a fourth generation Idahoan. I moved away when I
5 went to college and graduate school. I have two
6 children that were born in Idaho and therefore are
7 fifth generation Idahoans, and I expect they'll stay
8 too.

9 I also want to talk a little bit about my
10 educational background. I left Boise and I went to
11 undergraduate in biology, human anatomy and
12 physiology. I have a master's degree in biochemistry
13 and microbiology. So I feel like I'm coming here to
14 speak with a little bit of a background that maybe
15 some other people don't have.

16 There have been a lot of people who have
17 spoken before me, who I think have made most of the
18 points that I would have liked to have made. I don't
19 want to go over those again. I also want to say, too,
20 that I'm a small business owner, so I do see the
21 economic impact of the hard times that we're in right
22 now.

23 Having all that been said, I think the
24 perfect picture for me, that described what my worries
25 are about this, with the storage of the uranium that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we saw up there. Now Representative Simpson from
2 Idaho Falls came up and said--which actually did not
3 make me feel better. I think he hoped that that
4 would--that those rusted containers are actually
5 highly regulated, checked, and meet all of the
6 standards that are needed to be keeping the people
7 around it safe.

8 For me, that was a shock, that that's
9 considered perfectly regulated, and I think that that
10 brought to mind what's going on in the Gulf right now.

11 We have a lot of trust in our government,
12 that they are regulating things, and that things are
13 perfectly okay. If that means that depleted uranium
14 is being stored in rusted metal containers, that we
15 have no way of getting rid of, that frightens me.

16 And so the main thing that I want to tell
17 you is that most of the people who have come in here
18 today, and have supported AREVA, and said that Idaho
19 needs AREVA, have been talking about money, and that
20 seems to be the underlying basis for why they're
21 supporting AREVA.

22 And having introduced myself and my
23 background, I want to tell you--sorry, I'm a little
24 emotional about this--no amount of money is worth
25 risking the environment or the safety of the people of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Idaho, and that includes the next generation of
2 Idahoans. Thank you. MR. BARKLEY: Thank you,
3 Holly.

4 Bob.

5 MR. NIELSON: Thank you for the opportunity
6 to speak briefly. My name is Bob Nielson. I'm a
7 resident of Meridian and I'm speaking for myself.

8 One of the things that's very important in
9 this country to be looking at in these days and ages
10 is carbon management, and because of carbon management
11 and the issues associated with it, I'm a strong
12 supporter of renewable energy, including biomass,
13 geothermal, hydropower, solar and wind.

14 However, for the same reason, I'm also a
15 supporter of nuclear energy. And because I'm a
16 supporter of nuclear energy, if you're going to have
17 nuclear energy you have to have enrichment plants.
18 There's no way around that.

19 Now we've all talked about environmental
20 impacts. It's an interesting, a little fact, that if
21 you talk about life cycle analysis for a variety of
22 energy sources, and I'm talking about from the time
23 that you're talking about mining, through
24 transportation, through conversion, through
25 manufacturing, through operation, through

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 decommissioning. That if you look at nuclear energy
2 in terms of carbon management, it produces the same,
3 or less, carbon dioxide on a life cycle basis than
4 wind energy does.

5 Now that doesn't say that nuclear is
6 better or worse, or wind is better or worse. What it
7 does say, though, is that no matter what kind of
8 energy generation technology you're talking about,
9 there are impacts, impacts to all of them, and those
10 impacts need to be carefully considered, so that we,
11 as the citizens of Idaho, can make the decisions that
12 are important to our livelihoods and the state.

13 Now nuclear energy produces about 20
14 percent of the electrical energy in this country
15 today. I would maintain that because nuclear is one
16 of the few sources that's baseload compared to
17 renewable energy for which most renewable energy is
18 not baseload, we need to have nuclear energy, and if
19 we need to have nuclear energy we need to have
20 enrichment, and I'm afraid that, unfortunately, it's
21 an important source among all the others. There's no
22 "silver bullet." We need a mix. Nuclear is a part of
23 that mix. Thank you.

24 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

25 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. YOUNG: Hi. My name is Lisa Young and
2 I'm a 21-year-old Idaho native, and I'm concerned
3 about the uranium enrichment facility that's being
4 proposed here. Thanks for letting me speak. I've
5 lived in Boise, Idaho, my entire life, and I just
6 recently graduated with my bachelor's degree in
7 chemistry, with a minor in environmental studies from
8 Boise State.

9 From my work in academics, research and
10 community involvement, I received a Top 10 Scholar
11 Award from the university when I graduated,
12 recognizing my status as one of ten BSU's top students
13 out of roughly two thousand graduating.

14 As a member of the scientific community,
15 and as a member of many organizations on campus, and
16 in the community, I can say that this proposal is
17 irrational, unnecessary, and a threat to the health,
18 safety, environment, and tax dollars of all Idahoans.

19 I'm concerned about many different issues
20 surrounding this facility's Environmental Impact
21 Statement, but today I'll focus on the storage of
22 depleted uranium hexafluoride waste on site, and the
23 future transportation and storage off site.

24 While the proposal commits to removing all
25 of the depleted uranium waste from the site, after

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 decommissioning, the question still lingers. What if
2 they receive a license extension? It's important to
3 analyze the environmental impact that the storage of
4 this waste on site, beyond the timeline currently
5 implicated by the proposal, as this is a very real
6 possibility and could result in very different
7 analyses of the storage of the waste on site.

8 Also, it is not likely that the waste will
9 be deconverted in a timely manner, as the U.S. has no
10 operational deconversion facilities, and even with
11 those that are up and coming, the current stockpile of
12 around 704,000 tons of depleted uranium waste will
13 take several decades, at least, to fully deconvert
14 with our current capabilities.

15 This facility is estimated to produce an
16 additional 320,000 tons of depleted uranium waste over
17 the course of its lifetime. When it comes to
18 decommission this facility, all of this waste will
19 need to be relocated, and as the deconversion process
20 looks limited, it will likely be transported elsewhere
21 for further storage.

22 The storage of depleted uranium
23 hexafluoride, which reacts with water, water vapor, to
24 produce two dangerous corrosive and soluble compounds,
25 UO₂F₂ and HF, is extremely unstable. The production

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of these compounds presents huge risks in the storage
2 timeline as the corrosion of storage cylinders and the
3 possibility for leaks is a very real reality.

4 Idaho will not allow for this kind of
5 risk, especially over its precious aquifer, which
6 could easily be contaminated after an accidental spill
7 of depleted uranium hexafluoride waste.

8 With a spill of this material, the
9 radioactive material has a potential to enter the
10 aquifer and poison our sole source of water.

11 Perhaps if this facility was necessary and
12 urgent, these risks could be ignored. But it's clear
13 that we do not need this facility. The current system
14 and sources for enriched uranium have provided
15 adequate fuel for reactors for decades, and with a
16 total of three enrichment facilities expected in the
17 U.S. in the near future, one already in operation
18 and two that are being constructed right now, the need
19 for more enriched uranium is nonexistent.

20 This enriched uranium will be shipped
21 overseas, leaving the dangerous waste in Idaho for at
22 least 30 years and potentially much longer. There's
23 no need to take these risks at this time and the EIS
24 unfairly represents these risks.

25 Producing this waste is irresponsible and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 my sense is this facility is irresponsible. Thanks.

2 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

3 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you, Lisa.

4 The next three speakers I'd like to call
5 are Joe Shueler, Brian Martin, and finally, Bob
6 Poyser.

7 Joe.

8 MR. SHUELER: Yes. Thank you for letting
9 me speak. What was your name again?

10 MR. BARKLEY: Richard.

11 MR. SHUELER: Richard. So Richard, you
12 mentioned--I sat down. I'm a Boise resident; okay.
13 I'm just going to approach you real here. I heard the
14 first thing you said, that you wanted this to be a
15 really smooth meeting tonight, and that really
16 resonated to me, because I'm not so sure that this
17 should go smoothly.

18 This is a very serious decision that we've
19 entrusted to a very few people, and I'm not convinced
20 from this meeting--cause you're convincing us as much
21 as we're trying to convince you tonight, right? I'm
22 not very convinced that this is unbiased.

23 I'm extremely concerned about that, and
24 the implications just are dire to me. And I have to
25 ask: What is the risk? Not the impact. What is the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 risk?

2 I've heard a lot of statements about what
3 the impact is. And the economic impact is, yes, I'm
4 sure tremendous, and I think she put it well, that
5 there's a dollar sign to this. But I'm not here to
6 hear about impact, whether it be pro or against. I
7 want to know what the risk is to me and my family,
8 because that's what this is about. It's an
9 environmental impact survey. I know there's many
10 environmental factors, but I think if there's one
11 thing we should be concerned about in Idaho, is our
12 safety.

13 And so I want you to address that, and
14 look at that more seriously, because I hear your
15 statements and they didn't really speak to me about
16 nuclear waste. And you all know that's why we're here.

17 It's not--and the sagebrush is important, and the
18 dust is important, and economy is important.

19 But we wouldn't be having public meetings
20 if it weren't for the fact that you're going to put
21 something that's highly toxic into our state, and
22 there is no real solution. You've not given me one
23 that I feel merits that choice.

24 So my real--what seems like the follow-up
25 question, ends up being after we talk about risk, is:

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 What is your price? And I don't think there's a price
2 for putting my family at risk. And I want you to
3 recognize that. And I want you--can you--I know this
4 is public comment. Can you answer me? Do you--can
5 you tell me there is no risk to placing depleted
6 uranium in Idaho?

7 Can any of you answer that in the
8 affirmative or negative? Is there no risk? Or maybe
9 are you not at liberty to answer?

10 MR. SKEEN: The purpose of being here
11 tonight was to get comments on the draft Environmental
12 Impact Statement. So if you have comments on the
13 statement, that's what we're after.

14 MR. SHUELER: Yes. And based on your
15 statement, I'm not convinced that you can answer to me
16 that there's no risk. And if that is the answer that
17 I'm to take away from this meeting, then the meeting
18 should not be about a process. To me, it should
19 involve some element of outrage, to me, at the
20 audacity of non-Idahoans, whether they be French, or
21 otherwise--and in fact, now that I've this testimony,
22 Idahoans themselves, putting me, my family, my little
23 nephews who are two and five, at risk, cause you
24 haven't--you haven't really proven to me that isn't
25 risk.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So I'm going to have to go with that,
2 because that's a safety issue to me. So tell me the
3 pros of putting my family at risk, and why in Idaho,
4 if there is risk, because I think we all know there
5 is? Is it because there's low population here? Is it
6 a lesser target for terrorism, which is an issue,
7 hasn't been discussed? These mitigations,
8 which I keep hearing, we're mitigating things, left
9 and right here, do they make my family less safe, and
10 all of these people's families more or less safe?
11 Yeah. So your environmental requirements. You know,
12 high--we've had--we've always mitigated environmental
13 consequences since the dawn of this country, and, you
14 know, like we see it in high obesity rates and things.

15 The FDA can write off whatever they want;
16 it doesn't make it right, or okay. And so we're not
17 talking about impact. We're talking about what's
18 right. We're not talking about what's in our best
19 interest, financially. We're talking about what's
20 right.

21 So I hope you make a decision with that
22 element in mind, knowing that people in Idaho are
23 aware of that, and are watching that. Thank you very
24 much.

25 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you, Joe.

2 Brian, you still here?

3 MR. MARTIN: Good evening. Thanks, again,
4 for having, hosting a meeting in Boise as well. I do
5 appreciate it, being on a college budget. Although I
6 was under the impression that, initially, it was going
7 to alternate between commissioned and public people,
8 so I was confused there. But I've heard a lot of good
9 things and some of it has covered what I wanted to
10 talk about, and so I'll focus in on one thing that I
11 was initially worried about, and I don't know if it
12 has been considered.

13 Currently, based on the transportation
14 numbers that were proposed in the EIS, there was to be
15 approximately 1200 containers of depleted uranium
16 produced, or shipped per year, and based on that, and
17 the packaging of those containers, over the 30 years
18 lifespan, I calculated approximately 284,000 tons of
19 depleted uranium created.

20 Now that was to be sent off to two
21 facilities in the Midwest that are not completed yet.

22 And so those facilities were initially created to
23 take care of the waste, the over 700,000 tons of waste
24 that is already present there from nuclear weapons
25 production.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So based on the capacities of those
2 facilities, and what's going to be produced here--
3 well, just based on what's presently in existence, it
4 would take over 22 years to deconvert all of the
5 existing nuclear waste, leaving at least 22 years of
6 depleted uranium, on site at Eagle Rock, before
7 anything can be started.

8 And so that's a concern, because then you
9 have 22 years of waste that's sitting on sites, that
10 can then be shipped off, you know, as time progresses,
11 but with that type of lag, it suggests that there will
12 be waste present on site past the scheduled lifespan
13 of the facility, that 30 years. And so that kind of
14 begs the question of, well, are you expecting this to
15 be a license extension?

16 And so if that is the case, if that's kind
17 of implied, that should be something that should be
18 addressed and discussed within the EIS before it's
19 finalized.

20 And that's all I had.

21 MR. SKEEN: Okay. Thank you very much.

22 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you, Brian.

23 Bob, do you want to speak from here?

24 MR. POYSER: Okay. Good evening, ladies
25 and gentlemen, and members of the NRC. My name is Bob

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Poyser and I'm vice president of Regional Affairs for
2 AREVA Enrichment Services. I'm also a resident of
3 Idaho, and I live in Idaho Falls. On behalf of AREVA,
4 I am pleased to welcome the Nuclear Regulatory
5 Commission for the start of the public comment meeting
6 on the draft EIS for AREVA's Eagle Rock enrichment
7 facility. I will be brief and try to avoid being
8 redundant; but nevertheless, we believe it's important
9 that certain statements be made directly to you by
10 AREVA.

11 Eagle Rock will be a state-of-the-art
12 uranium enrichment facility utilizing proven, reliable
13 and safe technology to produce fuel material for
14 commercial nuclear power reactors. The Eagle Rock
15 facility will be located over 200 miles east of Boise,
16 and about 20 miles west of Idaho Falls in Bonneville
17 County.

18 We welcome this opportunity to provide
19 factual information about our project to Boise and the
20 surrounding communities. Assuming we are granted a
21 license next year, those in Boise, who make the trip
22 to Idaho Falls by way of Highway 20, will see the
23 beginning of an important step towards our nation's
24 energy independence, the development of a significant
25 investment in Idaho, and construction of an American

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 facility which will provide jobs to American workers,
2 and strength to the local economy.

3 In addition, the Eagle Rock enrichment
4 facility will provide safe and secure domestic
5 enrichment services that American utilities need to
6 generate carbon-free energy.

7 This is a project that AREVA's American
8 utility customers have embraced, as demonstrated by
9 their willingness to already contract, in advance, for
10 more than half of the production capacity of this
11 facility.

12 All of the natural uranium that will
13 arrive at the Eagle Rock facility under these
14 contracts belong to American utilities, and is
15 destined for use in American reactors.

16 I would quickly like to address just a few
17 of key aspects of the EIS, and the Eagle Rock
18 facility.

19 Let me start by saying that a clear and
20 definite need, today, in the United States, for
21 enrichment services exists. Today, more than half of
22 the enriched material for America's current nuclear
23 plant plants is imported from Russia. Another one-
24 third is imported from other nations, and Eagle Rock
25 and Idaho will help significantly reduce America's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 dependence on these foreign sources of supply.

2 Nevertheless, when Eagle Rock comes
3 online, America will need to import enrichment
4 services just to fulfill the need for the current
5 existing fleet of 104 reactors.

6 Second, during the design of this
7 facility, AREVA has applied standards for
8 environmental practices and protection above and
9 beyond acceptable industry practices, wherever
10 possible. At the Eagle Rock facility, even rainwater
11 runoff from the site will be directed to a storm water
12 retention basin. Similarly treated liquid waste from
13 the domestic sanitary sewer treatment plant will be
14 directed to a fully lined retention basin with no
15 outlet.

16 The lined retention basins will use
17 evaporation, thus precluding any interaction with the
18 water in the aquifer.

19 These additional features are a part of
20 Areva's commitment to sustainable development, and the
21 deployment of our best know-how to protect the
22 environment.

23 Third. AREVA has, and will continue to
24 incorporate sustainability features, including the use
25 of lead-certified building standards as a part of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 overall effort to ensure that we deploy our best
2 efforts in creating a facility that is environmentally
3 benign and respects the site conditions.

4 Fourth. AREVA has a safe plan to
5 temporarily store depleted uranium material during the
6 life of the facility and safely transport that
7 material, as stipulated by law, to a facility for
8 deconversion.

9 While shipments of depleted uranium to a
10 deconversion facility may occur throughout the life of
11 the project to reduce the total inventory, there will
12 be no--I say again--no depleted uranium left at the
13 site when enrichment activities are completed and the
14 NRC license is terminated.

15 Eagle Rock will have a significant impact
16 on the local and regional economy. This facility will
17 create much-needed jobs for Idaho workers. During
18 construction, we'll create about a thousand jobs
19 locally, and support thousands more regionally. This
20 is a construction effort that will run for nearly
21 seven years. Within two years from today, AREVA will
22 begin to hire and train a workforce that will
23 eventually exceed 400 people, to operate and maintain
24 the Eagle Rock facility over the next 30 years of
25 operating life.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We believe this is a positive, is positive
2 news to the many hard-working people in Idaho who are
3 struggling with difficult economic conditions.

4 Finally, let it be made clear. The Eagle
5 Rock enrichment facility is being fully funded through
6 direct investment by AREVA, and like any major capital
7 project, the balance will be financed through a loan
8 accompanied by interest charges, repayment schedules,
9 and certain protections for the lender.

10 AREVA will bear the full cost of
11 construction and operation of the Eagle Rock
12 enrichment facility. Even the removal of depleted
13 uranium from the site is accompanied by a payment to
14 the deconversion facility for its services.

15 In the final analysis, AREVA will bear the
16 full cost of construction and operation.

17 AREVA is really excited to be a part of
18 Idaho's business community, and we look forward to
19 continuing our work with the state, and the people of
20 Southeastern Idaho. We plan to build and operate a
21 safe environmentally sustainable world class facility
22 that is important to America's energy security,
23 important to our American utility customers, and
24 important to the advancement of Idaho's continued
25 leadership in nuclear programs. Thank you very much.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

2 MR. BARKLEY: The next three speakers I'd
3 like to call are Wendy Matson followed by Carol
4 Bachelder, and then finally, Don Howard.

5 Wendy.

6 MS. MATSON: Thanks. I'm a little short.

7 Thank you. Thank you so much for holding
8 this meeting here. I couldn't make it to Idaho Falls.

9 I'm Wendy Matson. I'm a long-time resident of Boise,
10 Idaho.

11 I'm very, very concerned about this
12 proposed project because I breathe air, I drink water,
13 and I live on the Earth with other living beings. So
14 I'm speaking for them as well as for myself. I'm not
15 a technical person, but I'm very, very concerned about
16 the air quality issue.

17 Are the filtration systems set up to
18 decontaminate water prior to evaporation adequate, to
19 ensure that containments will not be released in the
20 air?

21 The amount of radioactive material that
22 will be present on the proposed site represent an
23 implicit, severe threat to air quality in the event of
24 an accidental release of radioactive toxins.

25 Also, the earth. Due to the indefinite

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 storage of depleted uranium hexafluoride on site,
2 seismic activity in the area of the proposed facility
3 poses a major safety hazard that could lead to a
4 critical level accident. And I wish that the NRC
5 could clarify why a complete analysis of this risk is
6 delayed until the safety evaluation report.

7 Three. Water. The facility will store
8 radioactive waste above the sole-source aquifer for
9 nearly 300,000 people. This scares me. This threat
10 to a vital and unique resource outweighs any perceived
11 benefit of the facility. So therefore, I feel, very
12 strongly, that since the only justification for the
13 facility is an asserted but unsupported need for
14 domestically-produced enriched uranium, which EREF
15 does not, in any case provide, I vote for a "no action
16 alternative." Thank you very much for hearing me.

17 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

18 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you, Wendy.

19 Carol. Is that you? Okay. That's all
20 right, Carol.

21 MS. BACHELDER: Thank you for the
22 opportunity this evening to speak, and for me to be
23 heard. I know that this was an attempt to limit the
24 discussion to the environmental impact, but we have
25 strayed, haven't we? Into jobs and economic

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 projection. I just wanted to say that all the
2 glorious economic projections that we have heard this
3 evening would really fall by the wayside in the event
4 of a catastrophic event like--I mean, I'm sure British
5 Petroleum did not plan on the accident that occurred
6 there. Chernobyl still isn't operational, is it?
7 It's been 30 years.

8 And it's interesting to me, that we're
9 already talking about decommission, and this isn't
10 even "off the ground" yet. I mean, the plant is set
11 for 30 years, that's all a nuclear plant can operate,
12 is 30 years, and then you have to take it down, and it
13 sits there, being radioactive, for how many
14 generations? I don't even know.

15 But the decommission process and the
16 construction process, and the transportation, and on
17 and on and on--how can we possibly expect any sort of
18 economic feasibility for the price of this energy that
19 we're paying for with all these extensive expenses?
20 It boggles the mind.

21 I don't see how we could possibly get, you
22 know, the amount out of--the amount of energy out of
23 this thing that we're going to put into it, you know,
24 in the terms of money. Energy is really kind of
25 behind the whole argument here, and I'm interested in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 alternative forms of energy, so naturally, I would
2 have to support the "no action alternative" for the
3 nuclear plant.

4 But solar has great potential because of
5 economic warming. A month ago, the entire United
6 States, on the weather map, was red. If we could only
7 figure out storage for this energy from the sun, we
8 could get through the whole winter.

9 My neighbor has a big solar panel, and she
10 put drapes over it because, I mean, you don't want to
11 warm your house in the summertime, do you? But if you
12 could store the energy from the heat of the sun during
13 the summer, you could get through the winter, and I
14 don't think that the cost could possibly compare to
15 the amount of money that you're proposing to spend on
16 this thing.

17 And they say, oh, well, AREVA will be, you
18 know, totally responsible for the expenses. But this
19 is based on projected earnings, like so many
20 businesses do. You know, you plan to pay your loans
21 out of how much money you make. There aren't any
22 guarantees for this, are there? The economic times,
23 and being what they are. I just don't see that even
24 the promise of jobs is enough to sell me on the
25 feasibility of this plant.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I appreciate the fact that AREVA put in an
2 application in 2008, and that was two years ago, and
3 the Environmental Impact Statement was released two
4 weeks ago, and here we're having a hearing on it. It
5 does seem like it's on the fast track, and we'd like
6 to put it on the slow track. I would like to derail
7 it completely. Thank you for your time.

8 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

9 MR. BARKLEY: Don.

10 MR. HOWARD: I'm Don Howard, a native
11 Idahoan, mostly raised in Boise. I've been on the
12 focus group at INEL forever, under Mark Marinet
13 (phonetic). We'd go out and we'd look at the site and
14 the projects, and when you say a leach to, on the
15 water, well, they have a deal out there called Pit 9,
16 that they dump this raw nuclear waste in, and it's
17 down, I think, about 139 feet in the aquifer. Under
18 it is down about 459 feet. And if we have leach, the
19 gentleman said that they was putting a leach to
20 rejuvenate the waters, and what concerns me most is
21 two things. One is economic impact that Idaho does
22 need. But the waste from the uranium we don't need.

23 And I would say that the economic--we need
24 the economic boost that this will bring to the State
25 of Idaho. But I say at what cost to Idaho? Thank

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you.

2 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

3 MR. BARKLEY: The next three speakers I'd
4 like to call up are Stephen Crowley, Anne Hausrath,
5 and Eric Shuler.

6 Stephen, you here? Very good.

7 MR. CROWLEY: Yeah. I guess I'm tall. It
8 happens very rarely. I guess I'd like to add my
9 thanks to your being here tonight and to giving us a
10 chance to speak.

11 I guess my concern is a certain kind of
12 inconsistency in how you're evaluating the cost and
13 benefits. And it might just be a misunderstanding.
14 But it seems to me that the primary positive reason
15 for constructing an enrichment facility is one having
16 to do with provision of safe energy resources for the
17 nation.

18 If that's correct, then what you've given
19 me is an argument for building an enrichment plant
20 somewhere. Okay. Now I'm not--I don't want to bore
21 into the issue of whether or not that's correct.

22 But what I'm going to say is what you're
23 talking about is whether or not we should have a plant
24 at all.

25 PARTICIPANT: Sir, I'm so sorry. Please

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 speak into the microphone.

2 MR. CROWLEY: Is this better? Wow. I'm
3 echoing inside here. Right.

4 [Off-mic comment]

5 MR. CROWLEY: That's what I got. They
6 call that dancing, where I'm from. Right. So the--
7 yes. So putting aside any issues about the
8 correctness or incorrectness of this judgment--right--
9 this is an argument for building a plant somewhere.
10 Right.

11 Now what we haven't heard--so what that
12 makes me worry about, then is the process that the EIS
13 went through in ruling out a certain kind of
14 alternative sources for this product; right? Because,
15 really, in conducting that process, what you thought
16 about was whether or not to build the Eagle Rock
17 facility. Right?

18 So it's a question of should the Eagle
19 Rock facility be built or not, and then you looked at
20 alternative locations and ruled those out.

21 But that's not the same question; right.
22 That's a question about a particular facility at a
23 particular place, and we've been--we've identified
24 positives and negatives of building that particular
25 facility; right. And whatever you think of those,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 those would be equally true if you built that facility
2 anywhere at all; right. There would be waste
3 concerns. There would be economic benefits.

4 So there's a certain kind of mismatch
5 between the primary motivation for the existence of
6 this facility, right, which is a national motivation,
7 and the terms of the debate, which is a particular
8 debate about an individual facility; right. So
9 whether I agree with the proponents, or whether I
10 agree with the people who aren't impressed, I'm like--
11 I'm saying that seems to be inconsistent with your
12 primary motivation. That seems to me, that given that
13 this is an EIS for a particular facility, that
14 general--or that national level motivation has to come
15 off the table; right. It should be the issues about
16 the particular facility under consideration, and if
17 what you're doing is identifying features of this
18 facility that could equally well be provided by any
19 other facility, then those are not relevant to
20 identifying whether or not to build this facility.

21 I'm going to stop now. I'll try to write
22 that down and hopefully make it a little bit clearer.

23 Thank you very much.

24 MR. SKEEN: Thank you very much.

25 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you, Steve.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Anne.

2 MS. HAUSRATH: Hi. My name is Anne
3 Hausrath. I live in Boise, and I thank you very much
4 for the opportunity to speak here tonight.

5 I am opposed to the proposed facility.
6 Other people have spoken eloquently about my concerns,
7 so I will be brief. I do not believe that we have
8 been provided with sufficient evidence of a need for
9 domestically-produced uranium, enriched uranium.

10 I am very much opposed to the storage of
11 radioactive above an important aquifer. This is a
12 huge risk that I do not believe has been adequately
13 addressed.

14 I am opposed to the transport of
15 radioactive materials. I believe this risk has also
16 not been addressed. My husband and I raised our
17 children in Idaho. We are very much concerned about
18 the current economic climate for their generation, and
19 we believe there's a responsibility of all of us to
20 provide for that. I don't believe that this plant is
21 adequate--that the economic is adequate justification
22 for that.

23 We believe the proposed facility is a bad
24 idea. It is not necessary to meet Idaho's needs. It
25 would pose a potential threat to the safety of our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 children, grandchildren, and future generations, and
2 we strongly recommend you to adopt the "no action
3 alternative." Thank you.

4 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

5 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you.

6 Erik.

7 MR. SHULER: Hello. My name is Erik
8 Shuler and I'm a concerned resident of Boise, Idaho.
9 If EREF is built, we all know it's going to have a
10 significant impact on all of us, our environment and
11 our economy, and that's why I'm very grateful for you
12 guys coming here to listen to our testimony in Boise.

13 Taken as a whole, the EIS suggests that
14 this facility will have a relatively low impact on the
15 environment. Of course several aspects of this, of
16 the--have been overlooked in making this conclusion.

17 For instance, as others have already
18 noted, it does not consider the impact of the exempted
19 preconstruction activities, the high risk of wildfires
20 in the area, or the lack of an appropriate disposal
21 pathway for depleted uranium. Accordingly, the true
22 impact of this facility is certainly larger than the
23 draft EIS suggests.

24 But there's a bigger issue here. Before
25 we ask whether the impact will be small or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 devastating, we need to ask why we're making an impact
2 at all. This question is paramount, but the draft EIS
3 failed to provide a convincing answer.

4 The EIS claims that the EREF needs to be
5 built to improve national energy security. For this
6 to be a legitimate need, however, the U.S.'s supply of
7 enriched uranium would have to be unreliable
8 currently. This is not the case.

9 The U.S.'s enriched uranium sources are
10 reliable partners and the U.S even seems to tacitly
11 acknowledge this fact, when it states that some of the
12 enriched uranium will be exported to foreign
13 countries. Even so, it is useful to evaluate the
14 sources more fully, just to understand just how
15 unnecessary this facility is.

16 Now we've heard earlier that 90 percent of
17 our enriched uranium is imported, and about half of
18 that is from Russia, and we've also heard that uranium
19 enrichment is a necessary technology because we need
20 nuclear power to deal with global warming.

21 However, strictly speaking, that's not
22 true, and a great example of that is the megatons to
23 megawatts program that we operate with Russia. This
24 is an agreement between Russia and the U.S. where by
25 Russian nuclear warheads are downblended to make fuel

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 grade uranium, and thus, since we have an abundant
2 supply of warheads, is a very bountiful source of this
3 enrichment--or of enriched uranium. Moreover, this
4 program diminishes the threat of proliferation and
5 prevents the environmental degradation associated with
6 continued mining.

7 In other words, it's beneficial in many
8 ways, and it's been existing for several years and
9 there no reason to expect that it would not be renewed
10 in the future.

11 The other enriched uranium sources are
12 also reliable. Although much of the enriched uranium
13 is, indeed, imported, this fact alone does not
14 indicate instability. We live in an age of
15 globalization and there is no an international market
16 for enriched uranium. Credit counseling with a
17 comparative advantage in the production of enriched
18 uranium, whether because they have highly-accessible
19 reserves, low-cost labor in Africa, or other factors,
20 will specialize in producing enriched uranium while
21 the U.S. focuses its resources in other areas, like
22 agriculture.

23 Our reliance on this market is not a sign
24 of weakness or vulnerability, but a sign of
25 efficiency. Energy independence is an outdated idea,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is one that is not based on security or patriotism;
2 but of ignorance.

3 The current system works, and has worked
4 for several years.

5 The entire project that we are discussing
6 here tonight is predicated on the assertion that it
7 will provide national energy security with respect to
8 enriched uranium.

9 The fact of the matter is that this
10 security already exists and the EREF facility is not
11 necessary, and if the benefits stated in this proposal
12 do not exist, no amount of environmental impact is
13 tolerable, and this facility cannot be licensed.
14 Thank you.

15 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

16 MR. BARKLEY: The next three people I'd
17 like to call are Liz Paul, Mr. Kreg Davis, and Sally
18 Briggs. Is Liz here, by chance? She's not. Let's
19 move on to Kreg Davis, and then after Sally, I will
20 have Evelyn McConauhay speak.

21 Craig.

22 MR. DAVIS: Sorry, that was a piece of
23 paper hitting the microphone; apologize for that.

24 My name is Kreg Davis. I represent
25 Electrical Wholesale Supply. We have 18 locations in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Wyoming, Montana and Idaho. Four of those locations
2 are here, in Treasure Valley--Caldwell, Nampa,
3 Meridian and Boise.

4 Much has been said about how small money
5 is compared to safety, and we certainly would all
6 agree with that. However, I would object to the
7 minimization of the importance of jobs, and jobs in
8 the State of Idaho as it's been characterized.

9 In the last several, couple of years, 18
10 months, particularly, there's been a major economic
11 downturn that has hit this state. No one knows more,
12 how more important it is, a job is, than somebody who
13 is losing it. I've been a first-hand witness of what
14 it's like for people to lose their job, and I would
15 hope that no one in this room would minimize that in
16 comparison to those people. Certainly still agree
17 with the safety issue. I would like to thank everyone
18 here for the opportunity to speak in support of the
19 AREVA-proposed uranium enrichment plant.

20 I'm also grateful for those who have
21 spoken in opposition to my opinion. There have been
22 many people who have said things that I have
23 important, and valued, and helped me to understand
24 their perspective better. I still believe this
25 project is good, for two reasons.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 First. The project is environmentally
2 responsible. It is tested. It is proven technology.

3 I think most people agree that we need safe, clean,
4 secure, and abundant base power, baseload power. This
5 baseload power argument has not been discussed as much
6 as I think it should be tonight.

7 My business is very grateful for the
8 business we get from wind and solar, and would
9 continue to hope those sectors expand, and at a rapid
10 rate.

11 However, neither one of those provide
12 baseload power. Nuclear can. In my opinion, AREvA's
13 project complements these important energy goals. I
14 also believe that serious thinkers on this issue
15 agree--nuclear power is the only technology able to
16 deliver on all of these dimensions. I acknowledge
17 that there are reasonable people who have safety
18 concerns, but most of those I have spoken with, that
19 oppose nuclear power, believe nuclear safety is
20 possible.

21 However, there are those that let
22 anxieties rule. Their doubts lead to fight against
23 any implementation of nuclear power. I personally
24 believe that we are better to focus on growing a safe,
25 clean, secure, and abundant nuclear industry.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Second. The AREVA project is good for the
2 economy, both in the short and long run. In the short
3 run, it will create many jobs, both in Idaho Falls and
4 Boise. A modest estimate of jobs created will number
5 in the thousands. In addition, many more jobs will be
6 saved.

7 In my industry, my company, my
8 competitors, my customers, my suppliers, even the
9 State of Idaho's own Department of Building Safety, I
10 am aware of many Treasure Valley jobs that depend on
11 AREVA's success.

12 I ask every Treasure Valley elected
13 official to speak directly with your business
14 community and especially with anyone in the
15 construction business. We have been among the hardest
16 hit during these difficult economic times. Ask these
17 businesses, and their employees, your constituents, if
18 AREVA's project will save and create Boise jobs,
19 Treasure Valley jobs. If you have doubts, call me. I
20 can introduce you to many Treasure Valley-based
21 businesses, and employees, who hope this AREVA project
22 is a success.

23 In the long run, this project will augment
24 our baseload electrical needs. Nuclear energy is a
25 significant part of the answer to our energy needs.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I worked for Phillips Semiconductors
2 during the years when the semiconductor industry
3 started moving jobs from the United States overseas.
4 Countries with empty fields, cheap and abundant power,
5 clean and plentiful water, and an education program
6 fully developed, complete with a steady stream of
7 graduates and low taxes.

8 These countries provided all this, and an
9 invitation to come. I saw this with my own eyes. You
10 go to the field that I saw 10, 15 years ago, and it is
11 now completely filled with industry, jobs, thousands,
12 tens of thousands of good-paying jobs, making many of
13 the electronics we buy today.

14 If America and Idaho are going to compete
15 in this world, we, too, need to provide clean water,
16 quality education, and reasonable taxes. But we also
17 need to provide energy, abundant power, predictable
18 baseload energy. I personally believe that nuclear
19 energy should be a significant part of that base. The
20 AREVA project helps us to achieve success. This
21 project is good for our planet and it is good for our
22 economy. Thank you for giving me this time.

23 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

24 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you, Kreg.

25 Sally.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. BRIGGS: Hi. Thanks for coming to
2 hear us. It sounds like AREVA plans to build a
3 Walmart. I am Sally Briggs, an air-breathing bladder
4 and milk-drinking native of Idaho, raised during a
5 time when nuclear fallout drills consisted of
6 sheltering under our desks at school.

7 Some time later, grown, with my young
8 children, I received this postcard addressed to Dear
9 Neighbor, and asking, Where were you between 1944--I
10 was three years old, in Boise--and 1972? I was still
11 here, raising my family. This postcard informed me
12 that I may have been exposed to radioactive material
13 released into the air, water, and soil by the Hanford
14 nuclear facility.

15 Much later, I learned of secret
16 experiments. I have since become aware, that in its
17 45 year history, one million curies of Iodine-131 have
18 been released. Such hubris. Do we think the
19 scientists employed by AREVA are smarter, or have a
20 greater moral sense than those at Hanford? Less
21 hubris? At stake is the very air we breathe and the
22 water we receive from our amazing and priceless
23 aquifer. I urge you, as regulators, to apply a
24 healthy dose of skepticism to these plans. Do we
25 really need domestic production? Have all the risks

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 been addressed? Really? Please demonstrate courage
2 in protecting our children, grandchildren, and all
3 those who follow. Thank you.

4 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

5 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you, Sally.

6 Evelyn?

7 PARTICIPANT: She's not here.

8 MR. BARKLEY: She had to leave. Okay.

9 The next three people. Mark Dunham, Diana
10 Ursenbach and Robb Chiles.

11 MR. DUNHAM: Good evening. I'm Mark
12 Dunham, executive director of the Idaho Associated
13 General Contractors. The Idaho AGC is a trade
14 representative representing Idaho's commercial and
15 transportation construction industry. I, too, would
16 like to thank the NRC for taking time to come to Idaho
17 to hear from citizens about the AREVA uranium
18 enrichment plant.

19 I would also like to thank the elected
20 officials and citizens who came here from Idaho Falls
21 to present testimony here, tonight. I have the
22 opportunity to travel the State of Idaho. I was
23 actually in Idaho Falls last week, talking to my own
24 members, many of whom are unemployed, and I think too
25 often in the Treasure Valley, we don't understand, nor

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pay attention to the needs and desires of the rest of
2 the state.

3 I think it's important for the people here
4 to have that opportunity.

5 I'm excited about the positive impact of
6 the AREVA project. We believe this will be a major
7 boost to Idaho's employment base, and my members are
8 ready to be a part of this project, and to assist in
9 any way that we can.

10 I have 840 member companies in Idaho, with
11 close to 200 in Eastern Idaho alone. Idaho's
12 contractors are ready to help with the construction of
13 necessary infrastructure and facilities for this
14 important project.

15 On Saturday, Ken Simonson, who's the chief
16 economist of the Associated General Contractors of
17 America, was in Idaho speaking to my members about the
18 dismal state of the economy.

19 He told my members that Idaho's
20 construction employment rate is at the same level as
21 it was in December of 1994. In my industry, it is
22 about jobs, and it is about money, because that
23 translates into helping your families stay in Idaho,
24 raise their future generations in Idaho. So we think
25 this will be helpful.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 As a result, the importance of projects
2 like the AREVA Eagle Rock enrichment plant cannot be
3 underestimated. Not only will the plant help with our
4 nation's energy situation; it will have a significant
5 impact on Idaho's economy in terms of jobs.

6 Analysis of this project shows that the
7 project will have economic benefits such as creating
8 almost 5000 direct, and indirect, jobs through the
9 life of the project. It will also result in billions
10 of dollars in additional investment into Idaho's
11 economy, and families, at a time the state would
12 benefit from increased economic development.

13 A George Mason University study
14 commissioned by the AGC of America about
15 infrastructure investment, in general, says, indicates
16 the construction jobs created would have significant
17 other impacts on the economy.

18 There would be indirect jobs from
19 supplying construction materials and services. Most
20 jobs would be in the State of Idaho. There would also
21 be additional jobs created when the construction and
22 supplier workers, and owners, spend their additional
23 incomes throughout the state's economy. Again, I
24 appreciate the opportunity to make these brief
25 comments, and will also be providing written comments

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in support of the AREVA project. Thank you very much.

2 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

3 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you, Mark.

4 MS. URSENBACH: Hi. I'm Brianna
5 Ursenbach, and I'm a concerned resident from Boise,
6 Idaho. Before I would begin, I would just like to
7 thank the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for composing
8 this EIS, and taking the time to listen to public
9 feedback. As previous speakers have pointed out, the
10 EIS has several important omissions that prevent it
11 from giving an accurate analysis of the impact.

12 Even if AREVA tries to--tries its best to
13 mitigate the environmental impacts, it's obvious that
14 the best way to avoid environmental degradation is to
15 not build the facility, at all. Accordingly, I would
16 like to focus on the supposed need for the facility.

17 The EIS states the facility is necessary
18 for U.S. energy security; however, this argument is
19 based on the unstated and unproven premise that the
20 U.S. must have domestic sources for all of its nuclear
21 fuel needs.

22 For the sake of argument, let us accept
23 this dubious notion, and assume that all parts of the
24 fuel cycle must be available in the U.S., to have a
25 reliable and secure supply. From there, it follows

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that we would need to source all of our raw uranium
2 domestically as well.

3 Yet the EIS acknowledges that the U.S.
4 will continue to import yellow cake from foreign
5 countries. If we cannot get all the raw material,
6 then we cannot convert it to UF6 and domestic
7 enrichment facilities become irrelevant.

8 In many ways, this energy security
9 argument is analogous to saying that we would be
10 insulated from OPEC, and oil supply fluctuations, if
11 only we were to find all of our oil in the U.S.
12 Clearly, both of these ideas are absurd.

13 Now one may argue that we simply need to
14 resume uranium mining at home to solve this conundrum.

15 But while it is true that the U.S. does have
16 extensive uranium reserves, the legacy of destruction
17 and contamination left by past mining efforts make a
18 resurgence very improbable.

19 Indeed, as one example, the Navaho Nation,
20 whose land contains nearly one-quarter of all U.S.
21 reserves, has specifically banned uranium mining. If
22 mining is not going to be resumed in the U.S. in any
23 significant way, then additional enrichment facilities
24 cannot ensure a reliable fuel supply, and the Eagle
25 Rock facility is once again shown to be unnecessary.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Assuming that the U.S. uranium fuel supply
2 is insecure, it is clear that the EREF will not fix
3 it, and although it is not specifically related to the
4 EIS, it is worth noting that the federal and state tax
5 dollars are being used to subsidize this project.
6 Thus EREF provides no tangible security improvements
7 to the American people, but it does lay a financial
8 burden on them.

9 On balance, it is readily apparent, then,
10 that this facility will not be beneficial, so no
11 amount of negative environmental impact, degradation,
12 is acceptable.

13 In conclusion, this facility is not
14 needed, not wanted, and cannot be licensed. Thank
15 you.

16 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

17 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you, Brianna.

18 Robb, want to speak from here?

19 MR. CHILES: Sure. First off, I'd like to
20 just say, I think it was very well put by Mr. Davis,
21 and I think what he stated is really what a lot of
22 businesses across Idaho truly feel.

23 My name is Robb Chiles, and I'm here as
24 the chairman of the Idaho Chamber Alliance and the
25 Coalition of Eastern Idaho Chambers of Commerce.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Together, we represent over 26 Chambers of Commerce
2 that make up over 18,000 Idaho businesses. The
3 Chamber of Commerce understands that while Boise is
4 considered outside the immediate impact area of this
5 project, we commend the NRC for its due diligence in
6 including as many stakeholders as possible to comment
7 on this potential asset to the state.

8 As a designated representative of the 11
9 county Coalition of Eastern Idaho Chambers of
10 Commerce, I'm satisfied with the great work the NRC
11 has done in evaluating the overall impact this project
12 will have on the State of Idaho.

13 It's important to let our friends in Boise
14 know, and the NRC know, the significance of this
15 project for not only Eastern Idaho but the entire
16 state.

17 After careful review with a number of
18 scientific, environmental, and socioeconomic experts,
19 we strongly feel the draft EIS has covered all of our
20 concerns. We are convinced the NRC has done a
21 thorough job in analyzing all the aspects of this
22 project, and agree the results are complete and
23 accurate.

24 Over the last few years, the business
25 community, and members of the Chamber of Commerce,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have shown tremendous support for this important
2 economic development project. The positive impacts
3 are obvious. With so many America manufacturing jobs
4 going out of the country, we welcome AREVA's
5 investment and the creation of jobs for U.S. workers.

6 I appreciate your time and the opportunity
7 to speak to you on this truly important project. We
8 support your recommendation to grant a license for
9 this project.

10 As Mr. Packwood so eloquently put in his--
11 regarding economic benefits, it just makes good
12 business sense. Thank you.

13 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

14 MR. BARKLEY: The next three speakers I'd
15 like to call are Victoria Everett, Robert Meikle, and
16 Collin Day.

17 MS. EVERETT: Hi. My name is Victoria
18 Everett, and I'm going to make this brief. I have a
19 10-year-old I have to get to bed, and we're bicycling,
20 so it's going to be a wet ride home, and, anyway, I'd
21 just like to say that I like to live what I preach,
22 basically, and three years ago, I decided I couldn't
23 support foreign oil, and I got rid of my truck, and
24 I've been bicycle only, in Boise, year around, summer
25 and winter, for three years.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And also, I didn't feel that power was
2 very environmentally friendly, since we're half coal
3 and half hydro, which both have significant
4 environmental impacts. So last month, I used 38
5 kilowatt hours, the whole month, which most people use
6 that in a day, so--and that was with me, my daughter,
7 and my roommate, John, three people.

8 But I'm concerned about the workers. It
9 says you're providing jobs. How safe are these jobs?

10 You know, coal mines provide jobs, but they're not
11 very safe jobs, and, you know, it wasn't addressed, on
12 the safety of the workers. If there is an accident,
13 how safe are these workers? Who pays for, you know,
14 the damage done to them, and taking care of their
15 families?

16 And also, in the case of an accident, who
17 plays for the cleanup? Who's responsible for that?
18 The State of Idaho? Or is it AREVA? You know, that
19 wasn't clarified. And in transportation, a truck gets
20 in a wreck, it spills all over the ground. You know,
21 such cases as that. Say there is a fire, and there's
22 a major disaster at the plant. Who pays for that?
23 And who pays the doctor bills of the families that
24 have cancer? And just along those lines. And that's
25 all I wanted to say.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

2 MR. BARKLEY: Robert.

3 MR. MEIKLE: My name is Robert Meikle.
4 I'm a resident of Star Valley, Wyoming, but I've spent
5 most of my career in Eastern Idaho, and I want to
6 address a couple things, briefly. I think you can see
7 by my receding hairline, and the color my hair, that
8 I've been around for a while. And I was around
9 Eastern Idaho when all of the dams were built. My
10 father was one of the first people that--we got in the
11 construction business when we bought all of the used
12 equipment from the Palisades Dam. So I've been very
13 much involved, in my entire life, watching the
14 development of hydro. We've had a very abundant hydro
15 in the early years of our state, and we've been really
16 blessed by that.

17 But we are in a different era now, and we
18 have pretty much "tapped out" the hydro resources in
19 Idaho, and so I'm excited about what's going on out of
20 Idaho Falls with the wind energy.

21 I mean, if you drive up on the east side
22 of Idaho Falls, you know, there are like 80 wind
23 towers there, and there are another eighty proposed.

24 I have a good friend that is very involved
25 in trying to bring a solar plant here to the Boise

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 area. I'm all in favor of that. But I think there's
2 one guy that has not been mentioned here, that we need
3 to pay some attention to, and his name is Boone
4 Pickens. He's been on Larry King Live, many times.
5 He's a very wise man and he's been in the oil business
6 for years and years.

7 And I remember an interview in which Boone
8 Pickens had had a conversation, just before the
9 election of our new president, and the new president
10 said, you know, it's my goal to have a million cars on
11 electricity at the end of my administration.

12 And Boone Pickens says, yes, Mr. Obama,
13 but a million cars, with 150 million cars in America,
14 is a "drop in the bucket."

15 Now I'm not trying to get political here,
16 but I think Boone Pickens brought out a very real
17 fact, and the real fact is that we are faced with
18 global warming. There's no denying it. And so
19 here's, really, the issue, and I don't the issue has
20 been totally addressed here tonight.

21 The issue of risk is the risk of what we
22 don't do if we don't adopt nuclear. What are our
23 options if we don't adopt nuclear? And so if we don't
24 do nuclear, ten years from now we'll still be doing
25 coal. And what are the risks of coal, if we're doing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 coal ten years--as opposed to doing nuclear?

2 And so I think you have to weigh the
3 risks. You have to weigh them, carefully, and you
4 have to look at all of the science, and you have to
5 look at all of the economics. But I don't think
6 economics should be the driver here.

7 Boone Pickens made one other really great
8 point, and I've lived in Wyoming the last few years.
9 I understand Wyoming's economy, with coal and natural
10 gas. But we need to go to natural gas, and if we
11 don't go to natural gas, we're going to be in trouble.

12 It's going to take all of these things.
13 But Mr. Davis brought out what I think is the most
14 important point that's been made in this entire
15 hearing, and that is we have to have a baseload. We
16 have to have a baseload that's reliable.

17 I was in the ski business in 1976-77, and
18 in that year, we did not see one storm come through
19 from September clear through till January, and in that
20 year wind wasn't going to do it, solar wasn't going to
21 do it for Idaho, nor was hydro. And so we've got--
22 we've got to look at the "big picture" with our energy
23 policy, and I think you're doing the right thing,
24 although I totally agree, there are risks. But the
25 risks, when you look at the risks and weigh them

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 against the rewards, and our other alternatives, then
2 we've got to move in this direction.

3 And Idaho Falls is one of the places that
4 has 40 years of experience doing this sort of thing.
5 And I've been there for 40 years. My first
6 construction company put the seven big tanks in at
7 CPP, at the Idaho Nuclear Engineering Laboratory, and
8 I was still in business 40 years later, and we took
9 those same tanks out.

10 And I can tell you that when we see these
11 slides of this nuclear waste being stored, the way it
12 was stored, there's no question--that's going to scare
13 "the heck" out of people. But that's not the way we
14 do it now, folks. It's much better technology for the
15 storage of nuclear waste, and it's been proven for
16 many, many years.

17 So these scare tactics that I'm seeing
18 used here, to some degree tonight, are just not valid.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

21 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you, Robert. Is
22 Collin Day here? There's Collin.

23 MR. DAY: The "angry guy."

24 MR. BARKLEY: Well, you voiced concerns
25 about how I was calling people. I reflected that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. DAY: Anyway, I think my biggest point
2 here is, you know, is the safety. I mean, why--you
3 know, I had this all worked out and now I'm frozen.
4 But are we really willing to risk storing all this
5 stuff right on top of an aquifer? It makes no sense
6 to me. I mean, not only--I mean, can you guarantee
7 that 30 years from now, there will be no accidents,
8 and none of that's going to leak into an aquifer?

9 MR. BARKLEY: No. I can't--

10 MR. DAY: Exactly. You can't. You can't
11 guarantee it. Nobody can. We don't need this
12 facility. It's already been proven--or it's been
13 shown that all this is going to be exported out. It's
14 not going to help our energy independence. We need to
15 look at things like--I've been reading about the
16 "smart grid." I think we have got plenty of energy in
17 this country. We just need to use it smarter, or we
18 need to be smarter about how we use it. But there's
19 just no need to take risks and gamble with things like
20 the aquifer that, you know, supplies drinking water to
21 some 300,000 people, because 500 people need jobs. I
22 just--I don't see the point in that.

23 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

24 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you.

25 You have been great in holding your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 remarks to time. We are down to nine people. I have
2 covered this many people in such a short period of
3 time. So it's a very great testament to the people of
4 Idaho.

5 Ted McConaughey is the next person I'd
6 like to call, followed by Josh Weil, and then Doug
7 Sayer.

8 Is Ted here?

9 MR. McCONAUGHEY: Hi. I'm Ted
10 McConaughey. I thank you NRC people for coming here,
11 and just to put things in perspective, I have worked
12 in the radioactive waste disposal issues. I worked at
13 Yucca Mountain, and, as you know, Yucca Mountain is
14 now in limbo, and we have no permanent waste disposal
15 facility. I've worked at the nuclear fuel
16 reprocessing plant at West Valley, New York. As you
17 know, West Valley, New York, was the only commercial
18 attempt at reprocessing nuclear fuels, and the plant
19 "went bust," and is in a very protracted cleanup
20 process now.

21 I've also seen many other facilities, like
22 the Fast Flux Test Facility in Hanford, and as you
23 know, our only attempt, our only serious attempt at
24 nuclear breeder reactors, and so forth, has also
25 failed.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I think that the point of all this is
2 that things aren't going very well. Our best-laid
3 plans are "gang aft agley," I guess is the word, and
4 because our record on completing our project, our
5 nuclear projects, is rather poor, and we don't have a
6 very good way of demonstrating that we actually can
7 carry out these projects for the entire lifetime of
8 the project, including the nuclear fuel, the waste
9 reprocessing, or waste disposal, I think that to
10 suggest that a 30 year lifetime of the plant is very
11 optimistic, and that the nuclear fuel cycle itself is-
12 -we make all kinds of optimistic projections here,
13 which are very hard to ensure.

14 So, once again, I don't want to come down,
15 either for or against the facility under consideration
16 here, but I would like to say that the EIS itself
17 ought to address the possibility of failure at all
18 stages, and have backup plans for funding whatever
19 kind of cleanup and disposal might be necessary, and
20 that should be part of the environmental costs.

21 I mean, this is a very big environmental
22 issue, if one of these facilities fail, as many of our
23 nuclear facilities have.

24 Another concern I have here is this idea
25 that government should subsidize these industries, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we have Bob Poyser from AREVA saying, in quotes here:
2 "AREVA will bear full costs." And so far, they have
3 not. So far, the state throws in money for the
4 "interchange for nowhere," and there's other subsidies
5 that come, right and left.

6 And I think that even the Tea Party people
7 ought to be upset about these government facilities
8 for this construction here. We all ought to say no--
9 AREVA should be funding this stuff, not the
10 government.

11 I also think that the--maybe the most
12 interesting issue in favor of this project is the idea
13 that we need a stable baseload, and a carbon-free
14 stable baseload. And I feel like this--that there are
15 alternatives for the baseload. I mean, certainly,
16 hydro is one, and we have other ways of storing
17 energy.

18 For example, for instance, any of these--
19 any electricity generator can produce hydrogen, and we
20 could store hydrogen, and I don't know the economics
21 of these various things, but what I do know is there
22 are many possible ways of storing energy with
23 efficient retrieval possible.

24 And so to think that we require immediate
25 access to baseload power, at all times, I think

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 ignores the possibility that we have other storage
2 options that might be--that might work in conjunction
3 with ephemeral power sources like winder and solar, in
4 order to give us the essential benefits of baseload
5 power.

6 I think--and as for jobs, I feel this is a
7 fallacious argument that should not be entertained in
8 the environmental review process, because this is not
9 a hearing on jobs. As far as jobs goes, I think that
10 any time we dedicate ourselves to building one
11 facility, especially something as massively expensive
12 as this, we deprive ourselves of the opportunities to
13 build alternative facilities. That money is not going
14 into research, and wind, or solar, or biomass, or
15 whatever.

16 It's going into a single source, and we
17 don't have that money back, so--and any one of those
18 sources would produce jobs. So I really would like to
19 take the jobs issue off the table. That's not to say
20 it's unimportant, but it is to say that whatever we
21 do, we will be creating those jobs, and they will not
22 be lost.

23 Thank you very much for coming here to
24 Idaho, and taking our testimony.

25 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you.

2 MR. WEILL: Hi. My name is Josh Weill,
3 and I'm speaking on my behalf. I'll keep my comments
4 brief, but I wanted to respond to some of the economic
5 benefits we've had about tonight, and I also
6 understand that, you know, it's stated to be very
7 state of the art here, with the AREVA, and high
8 technology. But I don't really see the technology in
9 barrels.

10 And I basically just wanted to leave you
11 with one thought. These jobs are temporary and
12 nuclear waste is forever. Thank you.

13 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

14 MR. SAYER: My name is Doug Sayer. I'm
15 the president and CEO of Premier Technology. But
16 tonight, most importantly, I'm the grandfather of a
17 three-year-old. I appreciate the efforts you folks
18 have made, and the NRC, and your diligence on this
19 license application.

20 You know, what happens to my grandson
21 happens to me. We're both Idahoans. But more
22 importantly, we're both Americans. And we have to
23 have that baseload energy. And until we have an
24 alternative, nuclear is the answer. Decisions I made
25 about my grandson's future are important. I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 realize that the decisions that we make, and the
2 projects that we undertake are going to be his legacy
3 to deal with.

4 So I want to point out in your EIS, when
5 it comes to the socioeconomical portion, that there is
6 a piece that I don't think carried enough weight. You
7 know, in the history of nuclear energy in the last few
8 years in the United States, the supply chain has
9 broken down. As we haven't had construction projects,
10 it's deteriorated.

11 I want to assure you, that's not the case
12 in Idaho. That network of suppliers is accredited,
13 that understands the Code of Federal Regulations, that
14 understands safety significance, is alive and well.
15 We encourage you to pursue this license and approve
16 it, so that we can get back to work and build these
17 nuclear projects like our country needs them. Thank
18 you for your time.

19 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

20 MR. BARKLEY: Our next three speakers are
21 David Coney, Linda Martin, and finally, Steven Serr.

22 MR. CONNEY: Well, I had hoped to go third
23 in the line, just so I can get past the butterflies;
24 but here I am.

25 MR. BARKLEY: You'll do fine.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CONNEY: All right. Thank you.

2 Who I am? I've got it dialed down here
3 pretty good, I think. Who am I and who do I
4 represent? Well, my name is David Coney. I'm a
5 citizen and a participant in the process of self-
6 governance, and I have come in the name of both the
7 ancestors that have preceded us, and in the name of
8 the next seven generations, the future people of this
9 planet.

10 First of all, I'd like to say thank you,
11 not because you've come--it's your job.

12 I want to say thank you to all the people
13 that have chosen to stick around, that have chosen to
14 participate. It's been an honor to witness everyone
15 present here; employing what I feel is one of
16 humanity's highest attributes--diplomacy and decorum.

17 It gives me great hope in our ability to create a
18 world where everyone gets their needs met, with peace
19 and good will towards all of life.

20 What about this licensing that makes me
21 want to comment? Well, clarity, crystal clarity,
22 beyond a shadow of a doubt. Transparency of operation
23 that transcends the status quo. Why do I care? Well,
24 I am my brother's keeper, and I have a sincere and
25 deep belief in the untapped energy known as genius,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 innate genius in every one of the people here, and
2 every one of the citizens of the State of Idaho, the
3 U.S., and the whole entire world.

4 What's at stake in my view? Well, more
5 than we can possibly imagine. The costs that we
6 cannot calculate with pen, paper, and a slide rule,
7 are the ones that our elected representatives have the
8 responsibility to prove to us, beyond a shadow of a
9 doubt, are factored into the equation.

10 Now I've gotten a little bit out of the
11 lines. I got an F in conduct in first grade cause I
12 couldn't stay in my seat, and I couldn't draw inside
13 the lines. But I will point out, that even though
14 this is about the EIS, the AREVA spokesperson,
15 himself, addressed the monetary impact.

16 Now the key concern here is, beyond a
17 shadow of a doubt, that'll keep us out of court, for
18 sure if we do that in our own everyday task. And I've
19 seen the genius in this place and I know it's at work.

20 That's what people pay for. They pay for service and
21 that we've done our work.

22 What we don't know can get us killed. The
23 reason I can tell you that is because I'm a member of
24 an elite group. I'm a military veteran from Desert
25 Storm.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 One thing I'd like to emphasize is public
2 comment in each and every community that any
3 transportation of radioactive material goes through.
4 Specifically because today is World Indigenous Day, I
5 would say that the Fort Hall Indian Reservation needs
6 to be a part of this process. That's huge. And I
7 just returned from an encampment down in New Mexico
8 where I witnessed, firsthand, the desecration of
9 community due to the nuclear military-industrial
10 complex.

11 Haste makes waste. Yes, it sounds cliché,
12 although with a dose of humility, I've applied it and
13 it works, what I learned from my dad. Ratio of
14 planning to execution. The fact is that we're
15 responsible for the next seven generations. That
16 means seven times fifty. If you go 50 years per
17 person, that's 350 years; upwards to seven times a
18 hundred. That's 700 years. I would say that the time
19 that we spend in this process should be in equal ratio
20 to that.

21 Now I'm trying to keep it under five
22 minutes, and I'm almost done.

23 Because the risk is so high, I'm going to
24 ask AREVA to front the money, prove it to us that
25 you're sincere. Invest in Idaho. Back your play with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 money. If I go down to the bank, they're going to
2 say, where's your money, buddy? I would ask AREVA to
3 do it, and if I can do it with five bucks to get a
4 loan, they can do it with 5 billion, or 5 trillion, if
5 they're sincere about what they're bringing to the
6 table.

7 Now I would also ask them to prove to us
8 that they can be the best steward, and invest in
9 Idaho, before they ask anything of us.

10 Now the last thing is that I challenge the
11 business people to come together, to drop the
12 rhetoric, and bring forth solutions that remove the
13 risks and build the same level of cash flow. I
14 believe in each one of you, and that you don't need
15 AREVA to realize the prosperity you so desire and you
16 can make it sustainable, to where the rest of the
17 nation and the world will take note.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you. Okay. Linda.

20 MS. MARTIN: I'm Linda Martin and I'm
21 wearing two hats this evening. One, I am part of the
22 board for the Eastern Idaho Economic Development
23 Partners, and I'm going to read a letter from them.

24 "On behalf of the Eastern Idaho Economic
25 Development Partners, we wish to express support for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the AREVA project. The EIEDP represents a 13 county
2 area surrounding the Eagle Rock enrichment plant
3 location, which is in the effective immediate area for
4 the project.

5 "We have issued previous letters of
6 support for the project, and we feel confident that
7 the NRC and AREVA have addressed all necessary safety
8 and environmental concerns in the draft EIS.

9 "We urge the NRC to stay on scope and
10 utilize scientific expertise to guide their decisions
11 for issuance of the license and permit for the EREF
12 plant.

13 "We feel that the NRC procedures for the
14 licensing process have been very satisfactory, and
15 thank you for your thoroughness."

16 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

17 MS. MARTIN: And the second hat I'm
18 wearing this evening. I'm CEO of Grow Idaho Falls,
19 and we are the economic development agency for
20 Bonneville County, the City of Idaho Falls, and the
21 City of Ammon.

22 We are a public/private nonprofit entity
23 representing a cross-section of businesses engaged in
24 promoting and enhancing new and existing businesses in
25 our community.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This would include not only the EREF, but
2 we are also home to the Center For Advanced Energy
3 Studies, and hope to soon be home to the largest wind
4 farm in Idaho.

5 So we wish to comment on this application,
6 and I'll try not to be redundant.

7 We pretty much concern with most of the
8 assessments of the impact for the different topics
9 that have been addressed, with possibly the exception,
10 as specified by Tim Solomon and Lane Packwood for the
11 socioeconomics section.

12 Several comments have been made for the
13 transportation. Due to the potential localized
14 increase in traffic density along Highway 20, we have
15 tried to think ahead, and we have tried to encourage
16 improvements to that highway. These increased road
17 improvements will currently affect and advantageously
18 speed future travelers through INL, Sun Valley, Boise,
19 and other tourist locales. So we think that that's a
20 very important issue, that while it may not appear
21 that anything is there now, there are people that go
22 past those sections, and if you have several hundred
23 people working, moving equipment and going through
24 there, they're going to need increased transportation
25 access.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Under economic impacts, there are no Idaho
2 taxes directly going to support the construction of
3 this facility. As a group which encouraged the
4 grassroots statewide support of the legislation, it
5 should be noted that it not only applies to AREVA, but
6 to any other new capital investment of similar
7 magnitude.

8 These are earned benefits to any company
9 which chooses to invest in Idaho, of similar monetary
10 amounts. The DOE issued a federal loan guarantee, not
11 a federal loan. This was based on the technical
12 ability and the creditworthiness of AREVA, currently a
13 U.S. corporation.

14 The Regional Development Alliance has done
15 several impact studies, which have been noted in
16 previous instances, and the positive local impact of
17 diversifying the tax base in Bonneville County is
18 significant. Whereas the current annual tax rolls may
19 reflect an annual property tax income of a few hundred
20 dollars, the Eagle Rock enrichment facility would
21 bring in approximately \$4 million.

22 We are looking forward to the thousands of
23 jobs during the various phases. While all human jobs
24 and endeavors are subject to risk, this risk
25 outweighs, by far--I mean, this risk is outweighed, by

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 far, by the benefits of this project.

2 As an economic development agency, we are
3 already receiving inquiries from projects interested
4 in this project, seeking to open new offices, and
5 train and hire new employees.

6 This is a great thing for the economic
7 health of our community and the State of Idaho.
8 Quoting testimony from the December 08 hearing in
9 Idaho Falls: "We don't need a bailout. We need
10 AREVA."

11 As far as technical impacts, the
12 centrifuge technology is proven and safe as based on
13 other facilities across the world, and while there
14 conceivably is a significant gap in the supply-demand
15 equation for enriched uranium to provide our current
16 and future green energy needs, we can address that
17 with the EREF.

18 In addition, there is no evidence of any
19 danger or threat of nuclear proliferation from the
20 design, construction, or operation of the proposed
21 facility.

22 And finally, these hearings are to discuss
23 the appropriate scope and content of the economic,
24 environmental, and safety reviews.

25 We appeared to provide public input in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 December 08, in June 09, today, and we will do again
2 so this week. We will appear in whatever venue the
3 NRC asks for public support, and I might add that our
4 hotels welcome visitors.

5 Stakeholders that reside in the immediate
6 vicinity of the facility are the appropriate people to
7 comment on these reviews. As residents, voters, and
8 taxpayers, we locally represent the immediate concerns
9 for the impacts to our community.

10 We appreciate the time and expertise, and
11 patience, at this point, the NRC has devoted to the
12 licensing and permitting process.

13 We hope that your studies and
14 deliberations will continue to rely on scientific fact
15 and technology for a timely and positive outcome.
16 Thank you.

17 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

18 MR. BARKLEY: Our final four speakers this
19 evening. Katy Seevers, Douglas Sayer, Steven Serr,
20 and finally, Larry Hyatt.

21 MR. SAYER: I don't want to talk twice.
22 I'll talk once.

23 MR. BARKLEY: Go ahead.

24 MR. SAYER: I'm Steve Sayer. I am the
25 planning and zoning administrator for Bonneville

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 County. I am also responsible for code compliance
2 conformance for building code, fire code, mechanical
3 code, flood plain rules and regulations. And I have
4 had an opportunity to work with NRC staff. They've
5 been in my office asking questions as to what we
6 figure impacts are, how we plan on addressing issues,
7 if we have concerns on implementation of this project.

8 We've worked extensively with AREVA, and their staff,
9 to make sure everything that they are doing would be
10 in compliance with NRC guidelines, with local rules
11 and regulations, and they've made every attempt to
12 make adjustments to their plan, to make sure that we
13 have a safe facility.

14 I've had an opportunity to read your draft
15 EIS. I agree with most of the issues that you've
16 stated in there as far as compliance, with what we
17 feel are important within the jurisdictions for
18 enforcement.

19 As far as compliance with zoning rules and
20 regulations, that area was designed specifically for
21 this type of facility. It's not designed to have
22 other uses out there that could be impacted by those
23 uses.

24 We have--we've reviewed the issues as far
25 as fire code protection. We expressed concern over

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the safety on site, have they the ability to fight
2 fires? AREVA has opted to petition in to the fire
3 district. We've had planning meetings with the fire
4 district. We have another planning meeting, this
5 week, to work out responses in case of wildland fires
6 coming in. We've addressed safety setback issues to
7 protect the facility.

8 We don't have any real concerns to be able
9 to protect this facility from wildland fires with the
10 implementation measures that they are planning on
11 putting in place, along with the expansion of the fire
12 service facilities, and staff, and buildings and
13 equipment, to be able to provide that fire protection.

14 Issues were brought up, which I don't
15 remember in particular were addressed, as to the
16 viability of the area out there as being a prime
17 agricultural area. It is a desert that we're
18 irrigating and farming. A good portion of this site
19 is not farmed.

20 Some of the facility will be on irrigated
21 acreage. We have farms out on the west side that are
22 shutting down, and reverting back to natural habitat.

23 Issues of suitability for that agricultural use
24 because of high-life pumping and that. So we don't
25 consider it to be an extreme prime agricultural area

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that far out. Closer in, lower depths, it would be
2 more prime.

3 The issues they had, that were addressed,
4 as to seismic protection, life, safety, protection
5 from earthquake damage. This area is in a seismic
6 zone C on the building code map, cause it's not an
7 extreme risk area for seismic activity.

8 The INL is in the same seismic zone
9 designation. We have multiple nuclear facilities that
10 have been constructed, nuclear reactors that have been
11 built there have been safely functional during the
12 seismic events we have experienced in the past, with
13 no negative impacts on it. We have discussed the
14 seismic issues with AREVA, and NRC staff, it was in my
15 office, and felt that with compliance with the
16 building code requirements that we have, that we fully
17 intend to implement, that we don't see that there
18 would be an issue with--issues of seismic,
19 inappropriateness for this site to be built.

20 And one thing that we have been working
21 with. We plan on doing a long term on-site assessment
22 and overview of the project. Given we're also
23 responsible for fire code enforcement and long-term
24 safety maintenance on the site for safety; we plan on
25 doing annual visits on the site for compliance with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 code.

2 One of the issues we were concerned, we
3 talked specifically about, was the storage facilities
4 on site, to make sure that those are contained. We
5 feel that the plan that they have implemented for on-
6 site retention containment, lined ponds, monitoring
7 would adequately protect the community. As far as
8 code enforcement officers, that one of my major
9 charges, is any facility we have come in, that we do
10 see that they are fully code compliant and protect the
11 public health, safety, and welfare of the community.

12 And my planning hat side. We are
13 encouraging development and expansion. As mentioned,
14 we are promoting alternate energy resource facilities.
15 We have 160 megawatts of wind power under
16 construction at this time. For promoting the nuclear
17 side with this, we've been promoting the nuclear
18 research on the INL site, and we're also currently
19 producing, or hope to be producing a cogeneration
20 facility with a four county region, with a
21 cogeneration facility for waste burning that also
22 generates electricity.

23 So we are promoting all sources of energy.
24 we feel this is also a safe one, that meets the needs
25 of the community, meets our rules and regulations.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Thank you.

2 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

3 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you.

4 Katie.

5 MS. SEEVERS: Hello. My name is Katie
6 Seevers and I'm an intern with the Snake River
7 Alliance, and I live in Eagle, Idaho. I want to thank
8 the staff of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for
9 taking the time to hear me speak, particularly this
10 late in the evening.

11 I'm sorry for any repetitiveness, ahead of
12 time, but I fear that it's too late for me to deviate
13 much.

14 I wanted to comment today on the licensing
15 of the AREVA facility, because I feel that this
16 facility, if licensed, will be a drain to our state.
17 I think the health, environment, and economics of many
18 Idahoans is at stake with the proposed factory.

19 I'm a young Idahoan, and as someone who
20 hopes to live, and some day raise children in a
21 healthy, environmentally friendly, and economically
22 viable Idaho, I am extremely concerned about this
23 facility.

24 My concerns about this factory are this.
25 The location of the factory above the Snake River

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 aquifer, the effect of the factory on the natural
2 environment, and the decommissioning of the factory
3 and the subsequent socioeconomic impacts. The
4 potential for a nuclear facility, which will sit over
5 a sole source aquifer for about 300,000 residents, is
6 beyond disconcerting.

7 The location of the facility above the
8 Snake River aquifer causes further alarm when
9 additional environmental effects are considered. The
10 draft EIS assumes that the depleted uranium
11 hexafluoride will not be stored on the site past the
12 license life of the facility.

13 However, it also acknowledges that Areva
14 may apply for a license extension. I find the lack of
15 a fully developed rule on disposal of depleted uranium
16 problematic, especially when coupled with the prospect
17 of seismic activity in the area and the potentiality
18 for a license extension.

19 The NRS--NRC--excuse me--should clarify
20 why a complete analysis of seismic risk is delayed
21 until the safety evaluation report.

22 In addition to these concerns of effects
23 to the environment, the Idaho Department of Fish and
24 Game has reaffirmed threats to the transmission lines
25 would pose to wildlife, which is discussed in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 draft EIS, section B-26.

2 With pronghorn antelope, sage grouse, and
3 excuse me if I pronounce this wrong--ferruginous
4 hawks, all making their habitat on the proposed site,
5 wildlife impact should be more closely examined by the
6 NRC.

7 My final concern I would like to address
8 tonight are the economic implications associated with
9 this facility. The company who is creating this
10 facility is French, and its production of enriched
11 uranium in the United States does not result in
12 domestic control of that product as addressed in the
13 draft EIS, section 2-17.

14 In spite of this, the State of Idaho has
15 "bent over backwards," awarding tax exemptions funded
16 by Idaho taxpayers. Additionally, the Department of
17 Energy has provided a \$2 billion loan guarantee with
18 more of our tax dollars, and then, to top all of this
19 off, Idaho Department of Labor and Commerce granted
20 \$750,000 towards an overpass.

21 Perhaps we could just write everybody in
22 Bonneville County a check. All the same, a
23 substantial portion of our state and federal tax
24 dollars are being allocated towards a facility which
25 will be decommissioned within 30 years. This concerns

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 me, as does the prospect of an artificial local
2 economy supported by an unsustainable factory.

3 In reference to table 2-6 of the draft
4 EIS, I would like to contest the conclusions drawn on
5 the socioeconomic effects of the facility. Once it is
6 decommissioned, this area could very well resemble,
7 economically speaking, so many of Idaho's logging
8 towns once the mill has been closed down. Tax dollars
9 will be long gone, the local area will quite probably
10 be left with waste from the facility, and jobs that
11 supported local residents will be nonexistent.

12 The potentially devastating health,
13 environmental, and economic effects to Idaho, that the
14 licensing of the AREVA facility presents, make me say
15 that the rejection of the licensing of this facility
16 is in the best interest of our state and its citizens.

17 Again, thank you for the time, for listening to my
18 concerns.

19 MR. SKEEN: Thank you.

20 MR. BARKLEY: Is Douglas still here?

21 PARTICIPANT: He already spoke.

22 MR. BARKLEY: Okay. Larry, have at it.
23 Want to speak from here? Have at it.

24 MR. HYATT: Gentlemen, I'd like to speak
25 briefly to the issue of credibility and accuracy of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 information. I've observed, personally, for over 30
2 years, basically the life of the Snake River Alliance,
3 and have been a member of that group for many years,
4 that time and time again, when they have taken
5 positions based on concerns, research, and positions
6 of information to implement, and suggestions and
7 requests, that over and over and over again, they have
8 been correct.

9 And that says a heart full of information
10 for me. Therefore, I sincerely request that you
11 evaluate, to the deepest level you possibly can, all
12 of the accurate, sincere information, that our Snake
13 River Alliance has compiled and presents to you.
14 Thank you.

15 MR. BARKLEY: Okay. Thank you. With
16 that, we have covered more people than I thought we
17 could ever cover in an evening. Hopefully, you felt
18 that you got a fair chance to speak. I did not have
19 to interrupt anyone because they went too long. So I
20 greatly appreciate that.

21 And I know many of you feel very
22 passionately on the issue. I'm glad you came here and
23 expressed your opinions. I'd like to turn it over to
24 Dave Skeen, here, just to make a closing remark. But
25 thank you very much for your behavior in this audience

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and the fact that I really did not have to do much in
2 the way of facilitating this evening. Thank you very
3 much.

4 MR. SKEEN: Thanks, Rich. I would just
5 like to echo, I really appreciate the input that we
6 got here tonight. I think I said in my opening
7 remarks, that I expected there were probably people
8 that supported this facility as well as those that
9 opposed it, and I think we tried to give an equal
10 hearing to both sides this evening, from all that
11 we're hearing, and the fact that we go through every
12 speaker--I don't know--in a large meeting like that,
13 that doesn't happen all the time.

14 A lot of times we have to take people's
15 cards, or written comments, because we don't have time
16 to hear everybody. And I know we ran long, I think
17 the meeting was supposed to be over at 9:30, but I
18 think it was worth it, to get all the comments that we
19 got here tonight from both sides of the fence here.

20 Certainly, I would jot down things as I
21 heard different speakers talk, and I think we pretty
22 much covered all the gambit of the Environmental
23 Impact Statement, of things here--the purpose and
24 need, land use, historical, visual and scenic, air,
25 the water, ecology, transportation, public and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 occupational health, waste streams. So we'll
2 certainly take all the comments that we got here--as I
3 said, we take every comment that we get, whether it's
4 pro or con, and whoever it's from, we do investigate
5 it.

6 We will evaluate everything that we've
7 heard here tonight before we make a final decision,
8 and we've got a great staff. We've got some of the
9 best experts in the world to look at this stuff. So,
10 you know, we've got PhDs in just about any kind of
11 "ology" that you want, that work for us, and they're
12 good at what they do.

13 So I would make you this promise. That we
14 will look at all the issues that were brought up here
15 tonight, that have to do with our Environmental Impact
16 Statement, and having said that, I appreciate
17 everybody, the ones that have "hung in here" this
18 long, I want to thank you for sticking around. And we
19 do value your opinion, no matter which side of the
20 issue that you're on.

21 The other thing I would like to--I would
22 also like to thank our police here tonight, the
23 security that we had here tonight for hanging in here
24 with us. I know it was over your time, too, that we
25 had asked for the security folks here, this evening.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So again, thank you for coming, we
2 appreciate all the comments, and I promise that we
3 will look at them. So thank you very much.

4 [Whereupon, at 11:05 p.m., the Public
5 Meeting was adjourned.]

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701