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MR. CAMERON: Good evening everyone.

AUDIENCE: Good evening.

MR. CAMERON: It's nice to see all of you here tonight and thank you for coming out to tonight's meeting.

My name is Chip Cameron, and I just want to welcome you to the meeting tonight, and the topic tonight is the draft Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Rule that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has developed on the topic of waste confidence. And it's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator tonight, and I'm going to be assisted by Miriam Juckett right here. And Miriam is for the -- from the Center for Nuclear Regulatory Analyses in San Antonio, Texas.

In our role as facilitators, Miriam and I will try to help all of you to have a productive meeting tonight. What I want to do for a few minutes before we get into the substance of tonight's topic is to just go over some meeting process issues with you so that you know what to expect tonight. And I want to tell you about the objective of the meeting, the format for the meeting, and to introduce some of
the NRC staff that are here tonight. And we're not
going to use a lot of acronyms but two that we will
use will be NRC for Nuclear Regulatory Commission and
EIS for Environmental Impact Statement.

The objective of the meeting tonight is
for the NRC to be able to listen to your comments,
your recommendations, on the draft EIS and on the
Proposed Rule. And the staff will then consider the
comments that they hear tonight when they develop the
final Environmental Impact Statement. And the NRC is
also taking written comments on these issues and the
staff will explain how you submit written comments
and what the new deadline is for submitting comments,
but I just want to assure you that anything that you
say tonight will carry the same weight as a written
comment, and you are free to amplify your comments
that you make tonight in a written comment also.

In terms of the format for the meeting	onight, we're going to have two brief NRC
presentations. Then we have time for a couple of
questions, clarifying questions on the process for
finalizing the Environmental Impact Statement, and
then we're going to go on to you for comment.

In terms of ground rules to help us have
a productive meeting tonight, when I call your name,
please come up and speak from the podium. Those of you who either pre-registered or registered tonight by filling out a green card, come up and introduce yourself to us and your affiliation if appropriate. And then the NRC staff will -- and everybody in the room will listen to your comment. I'm going to call three or four names in advance and if you, because of the number of people we have and the seating arrangement, if you want to try to make your way up to the front of the room, we reserved some seats up here for you so that you can get up to the podium quickly.

I would ask that only one person at a time speak tonight for two important reasons. One is so that we can give them our complete attention and the second one is so that we can get what I call a clean transcript. Our stenographer tonight is Michelle Morales and --

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: All right. I guess we got the right person to be the stenographer. Thanks Michelle. But we're taking a transcript and that transcript will be the NRC's record of what transpired tonight and it will also be your record of what was said tonight.
Probably the most important ground rule is I'm going to ask you to be brief in your comments so that we could make sure that we hear from everyone who signed up to speak tonight. And because -- the good news is we have a lot of people who want to talk and that's great. The other side of that is, is I'm going to ask you to follow a three-minute time limit tonight, and I know that's a short period of time, but it will be enough time for you to make your major points to the NRC and it will be enough time for the NRC to start thinking about the recommendations that you make. My colleague, John Stamatakos, here, who is also from the Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses in San Antonio, Texas. He has a sign "One Minute Remaining," okay. And that's not a warning or anything like that. Just to alert you so that you can think about making your major point in that time remaining. And I want to tell you, nothing dramatic is going to happen to you if you go three minutes and one second, okay. You'll be able to finish your thought, but in order to get everybody on before the hotel asks us to leave the room, and that might be after 11:00 o'clock, so don't worry about the 10:00 o'clock time frame necessarily, but we really need to keep you to three minutes tonight, so we'll be trying...
to do that. And I apologize in advance if I have to ask you to stop because I know that you spent a lot of time preparing your comments and we really respect that.

Fortunately, there's other ways to comment. As I mentioned before, you can submit a written comment, as long as you want it to be, okay. You can -- do we have a feedback form?

Okay. There is something called a feedback form and they're on the chairs and those forms -- thank you very much. (Indicating) These forms are to -- is an effort by the NRC to help the NRC improve its public meetings, so it's an evaluation of the meeting. But if you want to make a comment for the record on this form, you can also write it on here and you can leave it with us tonight before you leave or it already has postage on it. It's franked, so you can just put that in the mail and it will get to the NRC.

Finally, the NRC is going to hold two public meetings where you can phone in and make a comment, and the staff will tell you how you get information on the call-in number, but one of those is going to be on November 14, and the other one is going to be on December 9th, and the staff will give
you more information about that.

A final ground rule is I just would ask all of us, everybody, to just extend courtesy to the people who are speaking tonight. There is going to be -- you are going to hear people that may have different opinions than you have on these issues, and I would just ask you, even if you don't agree with the opinion, can you please just respect the person who is giving that opinion.

I mentioned that we would have time for some questions, and the NRC staff is going to be listening to what you say tonight, but they're not going to be commenting back to you on what you say. They're not going to be answering any questions if you ask questions from the podium, but they will carefully consider those questions and comments and that will be reflected in the final Environmental Impact Statement.

In terms of the questions, we know there might be some clarifications that we need to make about the process or the structure and organization of the EIS, and we'll go out to you, Miriam and I will go out to you to take a few questions, but we really need to move into the comments. But if you have questions on a technical issue, we do have NRC
staff that are going to be out in the foyer. They'll have a white name tag on (indicating). If any questions on a technical issue, they'll be there the whole meeting, go out and talk to them about your question. And I should note that anything that you said in the open house out there, any discussions that you had, if you go out during the meeting to ask about a technical subject, none of that is going to be on the record. So if you want your point to be on the record, please make it in the formal comment that you do up here.

And let me introduce a few people from the NRC staff to you, and then we'll get started with the meeting. This is Keith McConnell, and Keith is the Director of the Waste Confidence Directorate at the NRC. And he is going to speak just a short welcome to you in a few minutes.

After that, we have Paul Michalak, who is right here. Now, Paul is the Chief of the Environmental Impact Statement branch in the Waste Confidence Directorate, and he is also going to give you a summary of what is in the draft Environmental Impact Statement and how to make comments.

Our senior NRC official is Scott Moore, and Scott is the Deputy Directory of the Office of
Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards at the NRC, and that's where the Waste Confidence Directorate, Keith's group, is located.

We also have a representative from our Office of General Counsel up here, and that's David Cylkowski. And we also have another representative of the General Counsel's office, Tison Campbell, for anybody who has legal questions for out in the foyer.

Andy Imboden, is Andy here? He's out there. Andy Imboden is the Chief -- here he is back there. He is the Chief of the Communication and Rulemaking Branch in the Waste Confidence Directorate. There are two branches, Paul's branch and Andy's branch.

We also have other experts out there including some of the authors of various chapters in the Environmental Impact Statement, and with that, I'm going to ask Keith to address you and then Paul. Then we'll go out and see if there's any burning questions, and then we'll get to the comment period. So thank you.

MR. McCONNELL: Okay. Thank you, Chip, and good evening everyone. As Chip indicated, I'm Keith McConnell, and I'm the Director of the Waste Confidence Directorate, and on behalf of the
Directorate and the NRC, I want to welcome you here tonight to this meeting on the Proposed Rule called "Waste Confidence."

At the outset I would like to make a few announcements about our public meeting schedule that might be of general interest and there are some recent developments. As you may or may not know, due to the government shutdown, we at the NRC were furloughed. That resulted in us having to postpone five of the public meetings that were scheduled for this Proposed Rule "Waste Confidence." We've now rescheduled those public meetings and a listing is out in the foyer there on the NRC table defining the time and the place and the date for those rescheduled public meetings.

The second announcement relates to the public comment period. Because we wanted to -- or because we had to reschedule these public meetings and we wanted them all to occur within the public comment period, we have announced that we are extending the public comment period. It was originally scheduled to end on November 27th, and it now is going to end on December 20th.

And the third announcement is, and Chip has alluded to this, is that, and again, because we
have extended the public comment period, we have the opportunity to add a 13th public meeting and it is going to be a facilitated telephone call where anyone who still wants to make a comment orally will have the opportunity to call in. We'll have a transcriptionist, and so those public -- so comments will be part of the record and it will start at 1:30 on December the 9th.

So with that, the purpose of today's meeting, or tonight's meeting, is to get public comment on the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Rule on continued storage of spent nuclear fuel after the operating life of a power reactor and until it's disposed of in a geologic repository.

These two documents, the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement and the Proposed Rule represent the culmination of the NRC staff's efforts in the Directorate.

To address the U.S. Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia's decision to vacate the 2010 version of the Waste Confidence Rule or void it and remand it back to the NRC staff to fix certain deficiencies that the court identified. And, as Chip mentioned, given that the purpose of tonight's
meeting is to hear you, we in the NRC staff are going to limit what we say at the front -- at the beginning of this meeting to the very minimum, so that we can maximize the opportunity for you all to provide us with your comments. And also, as Chip has mentioned, we did bring the technical staff that wrote the vast majority of the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement, and I encourage you to take the opportunity to talk to these people. These are the people that will be writing the final document after we've looked at the comments and thought through the process, so I encourage you to take advantage of the opportunity having them here.

I also want to take a few minutes and talk about our rulemaking process. Writing regulations is a very important part of what we do at the NRC. It's the vehicle we use for implementing national policy and standards. It's also the mechanism we use at the NRC to fulfill our goals, which is maintaining health and safety and security and protecting the environment. The meeting we have -- are having tonight is a very important part of that rulemaking process. It's the opportunity for the public and other interested parties to comment on what we the staff have done in draft form.
I would also note that tonight's meeting is just one of several activities we've undertaken within the Directorate and at NRC to make this Waste Confidence rulemaking as open and transparent as possible. In that regard, we want to thank those of you who have participated in the past in our Muskogee meetings that took place in October and November of 2012, and also, those of you that might have followed along with Waste Confidence activities as we've held our monthly public status calls. The last one of which occurred today where we provided some additional information on the rescheduling of the public meetings.

We want your perspectives and your input, and I would note that the NRC commissioners, the five commissioners at the NRC, have specifically asked for public input on certain questions that they've had us include within the Federal Register Notice that supports the rule. By commenting on those specific areas and providing us any other general comments you might have on these two documents, you help us improve the final documents that eventually will go to the five commissioners and it will provide the five commissioners with valuable information as they evaluate what we've done and how
we've responded to the public comments. So we encourage you to actively participate tonight and to provide us with your input.

With that, I'll turn it over to Paul Michalak, and he'll give a brief discussion and background on the two documents.

MR. MICHALAK: Good evening. I would like to add to Keith's welcome and thank you for participating today. My name is Paul Michalak, and I am the Branch Chief of the Environmental Impact Statement Branch in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Waste Confidence Directorate.

At today's meeting I will give a brief history of Waste Confidence, outlining key aspects of the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement and the proposed Waste Confidence Rule and explain how you can comment on these documents. Then, we'll get to the public comment portion which is the heart of the meeting.

Waste Confidence accomplishes two things. It generically addresses the environmental impacts of continued storage and makes a determination about the feasibility of safe storage and the time line for repository availability. The Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement for
Waste Confidence satisfies part of the Commission's National Environmental Policy Act obligations for reactor licensing and re-licensing and the licensing and re-licensing of spent fuel storage facilities.

The draft Environmental Impact Statement also serves as the regulatory basis to support the proposed Waste Confidence Rule. The Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Rule only cover the time frame after the license life for reactor operation. However, it is important to note that the Proposed Rule on Waste Confidence does not license any particular site or facility, nor does it allow for long-term storage of spent nuclear fuel at any site.

The NRC's history with Waste Confidence started when the Commission issued the rule back in 1984. Since then, the rule has been updated -- most recently in 2010. In 2012 the rule was challenged and the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit vacated the 2010 rule. The court identified three deficiencies with the Commission's environmental analysis to support that 2010 Waste Confidence Rule. The court found that the analysis did not evaluate the environmental effects of failing to secure permanent disposal of the spent nuclear fuel. The
court also directed the Commission to provide a forward-looking analysis with respect to spent fuel pool leaks and evaluate the environmental consequences of spent fuel pool fires. The court did conclude that a generic approach either with an environmental assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement would appropriately address the issues associated with Waste Confidence.

Following the court's decision, the Commission directed staff to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement evaluating these issues with the possibility of issuing an updated Waste Confidence Rule.

There are two things that I would like you to remember. The first is that Waste Confidence is just a small part of the overall environmental analysis for reactor or storage facility licensing and re-licensing. Secondly, the Waste Confidence Rule does not license any facility or authorize storage after expiration of a facility's license. The draft statement describes the impacts of continuing to store spent nuclear fuel beyond the license life for operation of a reactor, whether in spent fuel pools or at independent spent fuel storage installations located both at reactor and away from
reactor sites.

The statement -- the draft Environmental Impact Statement describes why we are revisiting Waste Confidence. It discusses alternatives considered. It describes how environmental impacts were evaluated. It describes what facilities are covered in the environmental impacts of continued storage at reactor sites and away from reactor sites. It also contains information on costs of alternatives to the rulemaking. It describes the cumulative impacts -- environmental impacts of continued storage and it contains information on the feasibility of a repository and the feasibility of safe storage of spent nuclear fuel.

The draft statement assessed impacts of continued spent fuel storage for three time frames based on when a repository would become available. There's a short-term time frame which is 60 years beyond the licensed life of the reactor. We evaluated a long-term time frame, 100 years beyond the short term for a total of 160 years. We also evaluated indefinite storage, that being where no repository becomes available.

The draft statement serves as the regulatory basis for the Proposed Rule. The Proposed
Rule would generically address the environmental impacts of continued storage. These impacts would not be revisited in future site-specific licensing proceedings unless the NRC discovers something about the site that would make the application of the conclusions in that draft generic environmental impact statement inappropriate.

The Proposed Rule would revise the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's regulations, specifically the citation is Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations Sections 51.23. The Proposed Rule also states that the analysis supports the Commission's determinations that it is feasible to safely store spent nuclear fuel following licensed life for operation of a reactor. It also states that it is feasible to have a mined geologic repository within 60 years following the licensed life for operation of a reactor.

We are specifically seeking comment on whether the final rule should contain these last two statements. To ensure that your comments are considered they must be received by December 20, 2013. Mailed comments must be postmarked by December 20. All comments, whether submitted in writing or provided orally, are considered equally.
Of course, we are here tonight so you can tell us about your comments on the Generic Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Rule. Tonight's comments are being transcribed and will be part of the record. You can also leave written comments with the NRC staff located at the registration table and we will make sure that those comments are added to the docket. You may also email, fax, or mail your comments to the NRC. You may also provide comments using a Federal E-Rulemaking site which is www.regulations.gov.

That's the end of the presentation, and I'll turn the meeting back over to Chip.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Paul. Thank you, Keith. Before we go to questions, I was somewhat remiss in introducing some key people on the NRC staff. Susan Wittick, who is right here, who is in the Waste Confidence Directorate and TR Rowe, who is out at the desk. Susan and TR do all of the logistical arrangements for all of the Waste Confidence efforts, so thank them for that.

Are there any clarifying questions that we can answer for anybody before we go out to hear from all of you?

Yes.
Let us get you on the --

SPEAKER: If there are two or more people making a presentation, do we get twice as much time?

(Laughter)

MR. CAMERON: No. Okay. But there is a simple way to deal with that. It's just -- oh, yeah, you can do that together. In fact, I think we have a song that is going to be done by maybe six people at one time. But if you want to do duets and come up together, you can do that, and then we can make some allowance on the time, okay, but not twice as much. Thank you.

SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

MR. CAMERON: Pardon me?

SPEAKER: You didn't introduce yourself.

MR. CAMERON: Oh, I'm Chip Cameron. I'm a facilitator who works under contract for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Okay. Yes.

SPEAKER: Do you have a speaker's list prepared so we'll know in what order we will speak individually?

MR. CAMERON: I have a list of cards that I arranged, and I will call three or four in the front and if you are sitting here and you're
wondering where you are in order, just please come up and talk to me, okay. So, I think I'm the only one who has the list. All right.

Miriam, can you -- I'll go down here and then we'll -- Miriam, why don't you see what that question is and while you're doing that, did someone -- here. Yes, sir.

SPEAKER: Only because I just got involved in tracking this, the Proposed Rule, does it only relate to the storage of waste after a plant closes?

MR. CAMERON: Can we -- do you want to add something?

SPEAKER: No.

MR. CAMERON: Can we get a clarification on that from the staff, either David or Paul. And Paul, did you hear the questions?

MR. MICHALAK: I did. And let me repeat the question. Does the rule or at least the environmental assessment apply only after a plant closes? Well, it's not exactly after a plant closes. It's after the licensed life of the plant, so that if a plant had a 40-year license, for instance, and it operated for 35 years of that time, our assessment starts at the 40th year, which was the -- which maps
to the 40-year license that it was originally given. So it's not when it stopped operating. It's when its license would end. The license that the NRC issued, it's when that license would end.

SPEAKER: So then with regard to Indian Point, if the license is now -- if with regard to Indian Point if the license is now about to expire or it's expired --

AUDIENCE: It's expired.

SPEAKER: It's expired so now we're talking about what's going to happen before it's re-licensed, correct?

MR. MICHALAK: Well, it's in --

SPEAKER: This has to be put into place?

MR. MICHALAK: I believe that -- or that Indian Point is in timely renewal and so that --

AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MR. MICHALAK: But nevertheless, it's the -- Waste Confidence begins at the license -- at the end of the licensed life of the reactor. That's the calculus that we use.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And we'll take one more question and in regard to that gentleman's question, I would just ask the staff, the technical
experts in the back if they want to add anything to that? Not now, but sometime during tonight if we could make a clarification, if we need to make a clarification.

And was there someone here?

MS. WITTICK: She was asking for a clarification on a slide.

SPEAKER: On the slides that had the question on it. There were two questions on that slide in particular.

MS. WITTICK: There were two things that you wanted answered. I think it was --

SPEAKER: The next slide.

MS. WITTICK: The next slide.

MR. CAMERON: We're going to put that up.

SPEAKER: No.

MS. WITTICK: No.

SPEAKER: That's it.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And you know, Paul, you should repeat the specific questions that the Commission had in the Federal Register Notice and perhaps tell people what page those are on. We had that question before. Can we do that?

MR. MICHALAK: Well, we have copies of
the FRN out on the tables.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. We'll go back to that. Well, let's go to comment now. And I'm going to call a number of names. Did you want to ask a question, sir?

SPEAKER: Yeah, I did.

MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

SPEAKER: Do I understand correctly that if this is approved over 160 years that the issue cannot be revisited in any license application or any other process? That this closes out this issue entirely for that 160 years?

MR. CAMERON: Okay. That's a good process question and do we have an answer for it, David?

AUDIENCE: What was the question?

MR. CAMERON: Okay. We'll repeat the question. What's that?

AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

MR. CYLKWOSKI: Repeat the question.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Do you want to repeat that for us?

SPEAKER: Sure. Sorry. Do I understand correctly that if this EIS is approved, then it shuts the door on bringing this issue up for the next 160
years. You can't bring it up in any license proceeding or anything else?

MR. CAMERON: Everybody hear that?

AUDIENCE: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. David.

MR. CYLKOWSKI: Sure. Hi. So briefly, I'll say that the NRC has waiver provisions and a Part Two of the Commissions Regulations. This is --

AUDIENCE: Hold the mic closer to your mouth.

MR. CYLKOWSKI: Okay. Thank you. To repeat, briefly, I'll say that the NRC has waiver provisions in Part Two of the Commissions Regulations, which is the procedural regulations for bringing challenges to licensing actions. If you want, I think we can actually discuss that in more detail out in the back of the room or out back.

AUDIENCE: We all want to know the answer.

MR. CYLKOWSKI: I'm sorry.

AUDIENCE: It's a simple questions.

MR. CYLKOWSKI: I understand. It's -- the details of the waiver provision are not -- is not a yes-or-no answer, so if any --

AUDIENCE: Basically, it's no unless the
NRC grants a waiver.

MR. CYLKOWSKI: Yes, that's --

AUDIENCE: Is that basically what you're saying?

MR. CYLKOWSKI: Yes, that's correct.

AUDIENCE: What's correct?

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And we're going to -- we're going to get some clarification on one issue from Andy Imboden. Then we're going to go and start comments and if we need to clarify the answers to these questions, we will come back later in the proceeding right here and do that. But Andy, do you want to talk about the specific questions?

MR. IMBODEN: Yes. This is relating to a previous question. My name is Andy Imboden. I'm the Chief of the Planning Communication and Rulemaking Branch with the NRC. And we have all these documents out back and also, completely available on our website, but the specific citation is Volume 78 of the Federal Register on page 56799, and those are the four questions that the Commission is specifically seeking public input on, including the two questions that are up on that slide. The slide presentation is on our website. We have hard copies of the slide presentation and the Federal
Register Notice in the back room here for anyone to pick up on, so thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Can you please repeat the location of those four questions again?

MR. IMBODEN: Yes, the citation again is in Volume 78 of the Federal Register on page 56799. We have hard copies back here. On the Waste Confidence website you could also find all of these documents. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. We're going to -- we're going to go to comment now. And we're going to go first to Janice Dean, then Phil Musegaas, Joe Peck, and Bill Nulk, and if you could -- if those people could come up here and be ready to speak, then we'll save a little bit of time.

(Pause)

MR. CAMERON: Janice, I'm sorry, come on up.

MS. DEAN: Good evening. My name is Janice Dean. I'm an Assistant Attorney General on the New York State Attorney General's Environmental Protection Bureau. I offer these comments tonight on behalf of Attorney General Eric Schneiderman, who thanks the NRC --
(Applause)

MS. DEAN: -- for the opportunity to comment here this evening on Waste Confidence Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement, which I will refer to as the Draft EIS and the related rulemaking.

As you may know, Attorney General Schneiderman led the coalition of states that brought the successful challenge last year to the temporary storage rule in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. This successful challenge resulted in the NRC embarking on the Draft EIS currently under evaluation. However, the Draft EIS is significantly flawed.

This proposed analysis concerns one of the most dangerous materials on the planet and a long-term storage of that material and spent fuel pools here in Westchester County and at other nuclear power plants around the nation. The Westchester storage site has the highest surrounding population of any site in the nation. More than 17 million people live within 50 miles of Indian Point, and there are critical water resources and infrastructure developments close to the site.

The Draft EIS recognizes that spent fuel pools are susceptible to fires and that a fire would
have severe consequences comparable to those of a severe nuclear reactor accident. However, the Draft EIS is critically flawed because it attempts to analyze those consequences generically for all nuclear facilities based on the modeled consequences of severe accidents at two nuclear power plants located in rural or less populated areas. Accident consequence factors specific to Indian Point, such as surrounding population, building density, critical infrastructure, and proximity to significant surface drinking water supplies have not been taken into consideration in assessing the consequences of a fire or other spent fuel pool accident.

Generic review of accident risk at Indian Point is inappropriate because the consequences of spent fuel pool accidents in the densely populated area surrounding Indian Point are significantly greater than in the rural or less populated areas in which the reference plants are located. Either the NRC must conduct site-specific analysis of environmental impacts of a severe accident at the Indian Point spent fuel pools or use the Indian Point site and not less populated sites as its baseline for spent fuel pool accident risk nationwide.
The NRC also assumed with no factual basis that all nuclear waste would be gone from spent fuel pools by 60 years after the licensed life a nuclear power plant. Currently, there are no available offsite locations to store high-level nuclear waste from those facilities or even an ongoing process to identify such a site. As such, the Draft EIS fails to meet the requirements of the Circuit Court's ruling by making decisions based on an unsubstantiated hope that the waste will be gone by then.

(Appause)

MS. DEAN: Attorney General Schneiderman led the successful challenge to the temporary storage rule because he believes that communities that serve as De Facto long-term nuclear waste repositories deserve a full and detailed accounting of the environmental public health and safety risks. Unfortunately, he believes that the Waste Confidence Draft EIS, as presented, fails to provide such a full and detailed accounting, and therefore, fails our communities.

Attorney General Schneiderman looks forward to the Commission addressing the Draft's deficiencies in this ongoing rulemaking process and
expresses his appreciation to the NRC for the
opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS and looks
forward to submitting additional written comments
during the comment period. Thank you.

   (Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much, Janice. We're going to go to next to Phil Musegaas.

MR. MUSEGAAS: Thank you. My name is Philip Musegaas. I'm here representing RiverKeeper. We're an environmental organization.

   (Applause)

MR. MUSEGAAS: Thank you. We've been working on the Hudson River to protect the Hudson and to protect New York City's drinking water supply for over 40 years. We've been working on Indian Point for most of that time and particularly since 9/11 we've been working closely to prevent the relicensing of Indian Point and to deal with the nuclear waste issue. So I'm going to talk -- give some general comments, and I've got three main points to make about this Generic EIS that you're hearing about tonight.

RiverKeeper will be filing detailed written comments on December 20th, and so we'll
distribute those to the public, and we're going to go into a lot of detail about why and how we think this generic EIS is both legally and factually completely deficient and why the NRC has to go back to the drawing board and do this over.

(Applause)

MR. MUSEGAAS: Our main concern with Indian Point and with the nuclear waste stored at Indian Point, we have currently over 200 metric tons of highly toxic, highly radioactive waste at the site. Our main concern is that the waste stored in the pools is vulnerable to terrorism, is vulnerable to accidents, it's leaked into the Hudson River, and so the overarching need, both immediately and in the long term, is to move the waste out of the spent fuel pools and into dry casks.

(Applause)

MR. MUSEGAAS: In terms of -- thank you. In terms of this particular rulemaking and the regulations we're hearing about tonight, I want to make three main points. And the first one is that this is an environmental review that the court ordered the NRC to do under -- under what's called NEPA. And when you do an environmental review under this Federal Law, you're supposed to look at the
action that's taken, and here the action is how do we
look at the -- look at the storage of nuclear waste
and how do we allow licensing and nuclear reactors
and the re-licensing of reactors like Indian Point to
continue while this waste piles up with no solution
in sight. The most obvious alternative to that, and
they have to look at a whole range of alternatives,
is to stop producing waste.

(Applause)

MR. MUSEGAAS: And they did not do that
in this -- in this EIS and that's one main reason why
this is deficient. The second reason, the NRC relied
on a number of assumptions to write this EIS that
RiverKeeper believes are completely divorced from
reality. And I'll go through these very quickly. I
know I don't have a lot of time. The first one is
that as Ms. Dean said, all the waste will be out of
the spent fuel pools 60 years after the plan is
permanently shut down. I could tell you I've never
heard Entergy commit to removing all the waste from
the pools and there's no sign that they will do so in
those 60 years. And there's also regulation with the
NRC that would allow them to ask for an exemption
from this requirement, so there's a way out of this.

Second, the NRC assumes that its current
regulations are safely managing the waste and that
this set of regulations that they have now --
(interference). I'm sorry. Can you all still hear
me? I don't know what that was. That the current
regulations will stay in force and will make sure
that the waste is safely managed indefinitely, and
that means 60 years, 160 years, and indefinitely
means as long as this waste is radioactive, which is
250,000 years. And do you all think Entergy is going
to be around in 250,000 years or 60 years? And do
you think the NRC is going to be around? So this
idea that things are just going to go on as they do
now for the indefinite future is just unacceptable to
us and --

MR. CAMERON: Phil, could you just wrap
up.

MS. MUSEGAAS: I certainly will wrap up.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

MR. MUSEGAAS: The third point is the
NRC assumes that the risks and the impacts are the
same at all plants. We all know Indian Point is
unique. We know why. I don't need to remind you all
why.

One last point. Indian Point has become
a defacto toxic waste dump on the banks of the Hudson
River 34 miles from mid-town Manhattan. That's the reality. It wasn't -- didn't start out that way, but that's the situation we're dealing with now. And we deserve better than -- what we deserve from the NRC is a thorough and honest assessment of the risks and the impacts and a plan to deal with this waste safely instead of what we got, which was business as usual from the NRC on Indian Point. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Phil. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Next we're going to hear from Joe Peck, and Joe, if you could introduce us and then we're going to hear from Richard Thomas. And if we could get Dominic Marzullo, Susan Shapiro, and Annie Wilson to come up, they will be next.

MR. PECK: Hi everybody. I'm a regular citizen representing my three children. If I sound a little nervous, I am. I'm sorry.

(Applause)

MR. PECK: First, just out of politeness let me say thanks to Entergy and NRC for giving us an opportunity to speak. I appreciate that.

This all started actually two years ago. My kids had a bully on their bus, and I said to my
kids, you know, not doing anything is the same as supporting the bully, so you need to speak up. So sadly that backfired a couple of years later when my daughter said "Dad, you know, you always talk about this nuclear energy stuff and there's something coming up because my aunt told me about it, and what are you going to do?" And I said "Well, I don't know." She said "Well, I think you ought to go talk." So here I am to say just very simply that we've hackled about this for 30 years. We've done nothing and we still have nuclear waste deposit all over the nation and doing nothing is the same as letting the bully have their way. We really need to get our act together and do something. That's it. Thank you very much.

(Applause)


MR. THOMAS: Good evening everybody. My name is Rich Thomas. I'm the Director of New York AREA. It's an acronym for Affordable Reliable Electricity Alliance, and I'm going to read a statement on behalf of one of our members, the Westchester County Association, which is from Bill Mooney, the president.
It reads: "The public has been asked to come here today to comment on the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Proposed Waste Confidence Rule related to the appropriate and safe storage of used fuel from nuclear power reactors. There are those here today, one of which who you have already heard from, who would like to construe the true purpose of this meeting in order to push their own agendas. The fact is -- the fact is that the Waste Confidence Rule has nothing to do with Indian Point. Federal regulators and scientific experts say that it is safe to store spent fuel in pools onsite at Indian Point and New York's five other nuclear power plants. For the record, Entergy has spent more than one billion dollars upgrading and enhancing the facility and preparing the plant for the safe operation during a 20-year period under a renewed operating license. For nine years in a row Indian Point has received the NRC's highest safest rate in its annual safety evaluation. These are the findings of trained experts who spend tens of thousands of hours evaluating the Indian Point's operations and they agree that the plant is unequivocally safe."

(Laughter)

MR. THOMAS: "The waste storage" -- "The
waste storage issue which we are here to discuss tonight is the result of years of gridlock in Washington, D.C. and the Federal Government's failure to follow through on its promise to create a national repository for used nuclear fuel. Although we would like to see a resolution to the fuel storage issue, it likely won't be over for quite some time nor will it affect whether the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission approves the license renewal for Indian Point."

Thank you.

(Applause)


MS. WILSON: Hi, I'm Annie Wilson.

MR. CAMERON: Are you ready?

MS. WILSON: Yes, I'm ready.

MR. CAMERON: And just introduce yourself to us.

MS. WILSON: Good evening. I'm Annie Wilson. I'm speaking on behalf of the New York Environmental Law and Justice Project in New York City. We hope to supply some comments by due time and briefly, I would like to refer to the impacts of climate change on waste. And that in fact, the rules
insufficiently address this matter in 6.4.5.1 as it relates to short-term, long-term and indefinite storage onsite and offsite. The NRC concludes that the relative contribution from indefinite, long-term, short-term onsite storage of spent fuel to greenhouse gas emission levels would be small, quote-unquote.

As it relates to the cumulative impacts, the -- in Section 6.4.5.1 and 2, the conclusion is that the cumulative impacts will be noticeable but not destabilizing with or without the greenhouse gas emissions from continuous storage, so over a period of 240,000 or 250,000 years one has to wonder if they've -- these projections have actually been made in that context. And as it relates to what is the revision of the Waste Confidence GEIS and the rule for possible revision, this is warranted by significant events that may call into question the appropriateness of the rule, so at the same time, the GEIS analyzed reasonably foreseeable events, and did not consider worst-case scenarios. I think it's time to look at the worst-case scenarios given what has been taking place in Fukushima, elsewhere, climate change, floods, potential seismic issues and so forth.

Thank you very much.
MR. CAMERON: Thank you Annie. Thank you. Next we're going to hear from Dominic Marzullo. Thank you.

MR. MARZULLO: Good evening. My name is Dominic Marzullo. I am a business agent for the Utility Workers Union of America Local 1-2. We represent 400 union workers that work at Indian Point.

I'm here to talk about the dry cask storage. It's a method of storing high-level radioactive waste, such as spent nuclear fuel, that has already been cooled in a spent fuel pool for at least one year. Casks are typically steel cylinders that are either welded or bolted closed. The fuel rods inside surrounded by inert gas. Ideally, the steel cylinders -- steel cylinders provide leak-tight containment of the spent fuel. Each cylinder is surrounded by additional steel, concrete, and other material to provide radiation shielding to workers and members of the public. There are various dry storage systems. At Indian Point the steel cylinders contain fuel that are placed vertically in a concrete vault. The concrete vaults provide the radiation shielding. The steel cylinders are vertically placed
on the concrete pad and the dry cask storage sites
use both metal and concrete outer cylinders for
radiation shielding. Currently there is no long-term
permanent storage facility. Dry cask design is an
interim safer solution than spent fuel pool.

Indian Point began dry casking spent
fuel rods in 2008, a safer alternative. According to
the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, some rods have
already been moved to casks and the spent -- from the
spent fuel pools, which they were kept, nearly full
of spent fuel leaving enough space to allow emptying
the reactor completely should it become necessary.
Dry cask storage systems are designed to resist
floods, tornadoes, projectiles, temperature extremes,
and other unusual scenarios. The NRC requires all
spent fuel to be cooled and stored in spent fuel pool
for at least five years before being transferred to
dry cask. If this was not a safe process, we would
not have our employees work and they also live very
close to the plant. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thanks
Dominic. And Susan.

MS. SHAPIRO: Hello. I'm Susan Shapiro.

I'm here tonight on behalf of Radiation Public Health
Project, and as we all know, this fuel at Indian Point is piling up and currently there is approximately 2400 tons of radioactive waste. If it's re-licensed, there will be an additional 1200 tons.

One thing that has not been discussed and is not discussed in the GEIS is how much high burn-up waste there is. And high burn-up waste is a really serious question and the NRC will not answer how much there is because that waste takes longer to cool and has to be handled differently, but the NRC will not reveal to anyone how much there is at the plant. So on top of that, the, as has been stated by other people, this GEIS is fatally flawed for a variety of reasons.

One, there is a stated rush to complete this within a two year period. This is probably the largest decision this country has to make for long term throughout the nation, and to rush it, when we know that after 60 years of nuclear fission we don't know how to handle the waste, is ridiculous. And this idea that there's a possibility, there's magical thinking that there's going to be -- in 60 years there's going to be -- we're going to figure it out makes absolutely no sense. And that's what this GEIS
relies upon.

(Applause)

MS. SHAPIRO: The GEIS cannot be generic for a hundred plants throughout this nation who have different regional issues, different concerns, different populations, different operating histories, different geological issues, multiple different issues cannot be issued. Each plant must have its own evaluation. The postulation in Appendix S -- H is that this will be cost-effective. In fact, it will be the opposite of cost-effective.

There are three basic assumptions which this document is based upon which are false and misleading and inaccurate, and therefore, the GEIS is fatally flawed. The first one is that when necessary there will be permanent waste disposal. That is absolutely impossible as I have stated already. We're just burning dollars rather than moving forward in anything meaningful. Yucca Mountain, salt mines in Kansas, many different things have been proven unsatisfactory and un-geologically safe.

The other main issues regarding Indian Point that are false and misleading is that all the spent fuels currently -- that we have leak-detection systems or administrative controls to monitor the
spent fuel pools. We know that in 2005 that the
leaks at Indian Point were only found by accident.
They were only found because an independent
contractor saw wet on the ground. There is no actual
monitoring of the spent fuel pools. In fact, there
is no actual monitoring of the releases of radiation
and I am now carrying a Geiger counter (indicating),
and I would hope that the NRC provides all of us with
Geiger counts so that we can actually create a
monitoring program.

The reality is the spent fuel pool two,
which is known to be leaking, only 40 percent of it
has been inspected. 60 percent of it, which we know
is leaking, they don't know where the leak is. It
has not been inspected. That's a false assumption of
this GEIS.

The other basic false assumption is that
the leaks are emptied into a drain that can be
monitored and then they'll be treated and cleaned up.
When in fact, the leak -- the NRC stopped cleanup of
the Indian Point site. They said "You know what,
we're just going to let it seep into the ground, into
the effluent and into the ground."

MR. CAMERON: And Susan, could you wrap
up, please.
MS. SHAPIRO: I'll wrap this up.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

MS. SHAPIRO: And there are many -- I will be submitting comments on the spent fuel fires issue, which Chairman Macfarlane has co-authored a study stating that the densely packed fuel pools at Indian Point, for example, are at great risk of fire. But the base -- the biggest problem we have with the GEIS is a lack of cost considerations. It states that every hundred years the spent fuel -- the dry cask, if we get everything into dry cask, are going to be replaced. How is that going to be funded? We all just went through a government shutdown because we almost de-funded the government. How in the world can the NRC, in this GEIS, guarantee that there will be funding in the future. And I just --

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Susan --

MS. SHAPIRO: -- want to answer your two questions. Let me just answer your two questions. No. The answer is "No." There is no feasible safe storage following the operation of the reactor. We've seen that with the safe storage at Indian Point 1.

MR. CAMERON: And the answer to the other, okay.
MS. SHAPIRO: And the other -- the answer to the other one is "No."

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MS. SHAPIRO: Having a mined geological generic repository within 60 years following the license reactor is impossible.

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MS. SHAPIRO: The only thing that's been allowed is a burial system, and there's been no investigation in reverse engineering.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Susan.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Deborah, Deborah Milone, Daniele Gerard, Brian Gutherman and Michelle Li. Deborah. Is Deborah still here? Here comes Deborah. And if Daniele and Brian and Michelle could come up and -- here's Brian coming up, then we'll have them. And this is Deborah. Hi Deborah.

MS. MILONE: Good evening. My name is Deb Milone. I'm the Executive Director of the Hudson Valley Gateway Chamber of Commerce. Thank you for allowing me these comments this evening.

The Hudson Valley Gateway Chamber of Commerce serves the communities of Croton-on-Hudson,
Cortlandt, Peekskill, and Putnam Valley. We rep -- we represent over 440 businesses and civic members. The Federal Government has spent the last three decades trying to decide where to put the more than 70,000 tons of spent fuel from our nation's power plants. The Waste Confidence Rule, although a good first step in the right direction, is not the solution the Federal Government promised us. Further, it has no bearing on the continued operation or license renewal of the U.S. nuclear power plants, including Indian Point.

The NRC conducts detailed rigorous annual safety inspections at each of the country's 100 nuclear power plants. Due to political pressure, Indian Point is the most scrutinized and it has -- and it continues to receive the NRC's highest safest rating year after year. These inspections include comprehensive review and oversight of the process for using used fuel onsite at Indian Point in both cooling pools and dry cask storage, the state-of-the-art solution.

The Hudson Valley Gateway Chamber of Commerce supports the continued operation of Indian Point because we understand its importance for the region's energy supply, electrical grid reliability,
and the economy. New York does not have the
generation or transmission infrastructure to replace
the 2,000 megawatts of power that Indian Point
supplies each day. Let alone a proposed replacement
source that could provide comparable economic
benefits and not result in higher electricity rates.

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very
much. That was Deborah Milone. Now Daniele.

MS. GERARD: Hi. I'm Daniele Gerard.

I'm a member of the board of Three Parks Independent
Democrats. We're an Upper West Side political club
in Manhattan. I'm here with my fellow board member,
Erl Kimmich, to whom I will cede some of my time.

I just have a few brief points to make.

One is that it is so rare that the public gets to
voice our feelings. We're so helpless at the mercy
of the government's corporate masters. Let me assure
you that when the government policy is set to benefit
corporate interests, we the public lose every single
time.

(Applause)

MS. GERARD: So I just want to make five
brief points and then I'm going to turn it over to
Erl. First of all, there is no solution to the problem of nuclear waste. The Waste Confidence Rule amounts just to "Trust us." My third point is that it ignores the problems with waste, the leaks, the fires, the security issues and the other items that other people have testified about and will testify further this evening.

The Waste Confidence Rule deals with waste, which is a major environmental issue, not a public relations issue.

And finally, finally, to pursue licensing on the basis of a Waste Confidence Rule that is not inspiring of confidence is both illegal and immoral, so now that I have the opportunity finally to voice my opinion, and I hope that some of you will join me in a show of hands. I just want to say that I vote No Confidence.

So here is Erl Kimmich, my fellow board member.

(Appause)

MR. KIMMICH: Thanks very much Daniele. You know, just very briefly, I've been looking at pictures of birth defects from the kids that are being born now in Iraq from the depleted uranium that their parents are being exposed to all the time and...
it's radiation poisoning. And what it does is --
it's heinous, you know, I can't -- I can't describe
the photographs. But it's too hideous and I'm just
thinking about grandkids and stuff like that, and
radiation, no matter what, is incredibly dangerous
and it can't be stored safely. It's always leaking.
There's always problems with it and it's going to
cost -- it's going to cost lives. It's going to cost
heartbreak, lives and all that kind of stuff. And,
you know, I think we should start working on the
solution and stop making more of the waste right now.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very
much. And let's go to Brian. Are you ready?

MR. GUTHERMAN: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: Good.

MR. GUTHERMAN: Good evening. My name
is Brian Gutherman. Thank you for allowing me to
speak tonight on this important issue. I'm an
engineer. I've worked in the nuclear energy industry
for 30 years. I held a senior reactor operator
certification earlier in my career. But I'm also a
husband and a father who lives with his family in New
Jersey within driving distance of ten reactors,
including the two at Indian Point. So just like
everybody else in this room, nuclear safety is important to me too.

I currently make my living providing consulting in the area of spent nuclear fuel management. I've read the revised Waste Confidence Rule and associated Environmental Impact Statement, and I commend the NRC staff on doing such a thorough and thoughtful job. The assumptions the NRC used in the EIS are reasonable and conservative, and I believe the conclusions reached are correct. I know from personal experience that nuclear power plant owners have safely managed spent nuclear fuel for decades, and the continue to do so today.

I know how both wet storage pools and dry casks are designed and operated. I know the redundancies in margins of safety in the designs of both types of storage technologies.

Beginning in the 1980s the nuclear power plants began moving spent fuel from wet storage to dry storage and have continued to do so safely for nearly 30 years. There is no reason to believe they cannot continue to do so into the future and as long as necessary until the Federal Government starts picking up the fuel.

The vast majority of today's dry spent
fuel systems, including those at Indian Point are made of fully welded stainless steel canisters stored inside thick concrete casks or modules about two feet around the outside of those. They don't leak. They don't release any reactor material. They're designed to be dropped, tipped over, withstand floods, earthquakes, tornadoes and missiles without leaking an ounce of radioactivity.

As for disposal of spent fuel, the President's own Blue Ribbon Commission recognized that a geologic repository is still the best method of disposal. Sweden and Finland are both already developing geological disposal facilities, which frankly should be an embarrassment to the country that pioneered commercial use of nuclear energy and built such large undertakings as the Hoover Dam.

Now a word about nuclear power. It's an undisputed truth that nuclear power plants produce about two-thirds of the emission-free electricity in this country. New York State's six reactors produce 30 percent of its electricity with Indian Point providing a large chunk for New York City. New Jersey's four reactors produce fully half of its electricity. These power plants do not require the sun to shine or the wind to blow to keep the
electricity flowing. They are there 24/7. They provide essential, reliable electricity to our homes, businesses, factories, and hospitals all over the country. But they also do something else. They provide jobs with good pay and benefits for our families, friends and neighbors. And that's not just the people who work at the facilities but the regulators, supplier, and local businesses that exist solely to cater to the people who work at the plants.

Let's not forget all the taxes that are paid. Have I got more time?

MR. CAMERON: I think you're -- you know what, can you just let people talk and not ridicule them, okay. Let's have some courtesy, okay. Please.

MR. GUTHERMAN: I didn't heckle you. I didn't heckle you when I was sitting in the back.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. But Brian, I think you're -- I think you're about done, okay.

MR. GUTHERMAN: I'm almost done. I've got one point to make.

The proposed rulemaking and Environmental Impact Statement are well done, accurate, and address the issues of the court's order. The Rule and EIS should be approved.

(Applause)
MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you Brian. Is Michelle. This is Michelle Lee, and then we're going to go to Darcy Casteleiro, Margot Schepart and Maureen Garner Ritter, and Peter Wolf. Go ahead Michelle.

MS. LEE: I woke up at 4:00 a.m. this morning and something was really nudging at me, and I was thinking, something I'm missing. And it suddenly dawned on me, and I speak to the representatives here of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission wherever you are, as human beings, as individuals. You are working in an institutional setting with a lot of pressures. With time pressure, with financial pressure, with political pressure, and you're probably trying to do a very good job, but we are at a point -- we are at a crossroads of our national history.

I don't think anybody in this room, whatever their political persuasion, is not horrified at the direction we as a people are going. And this is an opportunity. It is a real genuine opportunity for the people who work at the NRC to make a huge historic difference for generations to come to protect human life, to protect the beautiful Hudson Valley and the other lands that are reactor site
communities. Don't waste it. The report itself is really rather absurd honestly. 200 years -- what, 100 years in the short term, other than -- there's a little kid over there -- I don't mean to embarrass you, he'll still be alive, the rest of us won't be.

That's past -- the short term is past the life spans of virtually everybody in this room. The mid-term, where you're talking about 200 years, 200 years ago James Madison was president. Napoleon was fighting in Russia and the Prussians. The Creek Indian Nation was having a civil war, and by the way, this month 200 years ago the British burned part of New York, Buffalo. So to -- so you're actually considering 200 years in the future and you're making this -- the assumption that you understand all the possible developments of climate change, of seismic activity, of terrorist threat, of the cyber issue alone, which has emerged as a major current threat, is not only just to Indian Point but a threat to the grid, which in turn affects Indian Point. The infrastructure, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers gave the 2013 report card for infrastructure in the U.S. a D+. That's today.

There's -- there's a level of absurdity that almost cannot be responded to and so this is
simply a plea, and I speak on behalf of the Public Health and Sustainable Energy, PHASE, and the Council on Intelligent Energy and Conservation Policy, but also, of citizens and a mother and for somebody whose great grandchildren, I guess, will be around when the waste is still sitting there, please, please take this serious.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Michelle.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Do we have -- is Darcy --

Darcy Casteleiro is coming up, and then we'll go down the list. Hi Darcy.

MS. CASTELEIRO: Good evening. I'm here representing Assemblywoman Ellen Jaffee who has a very brief statement to make. Assemblywoman Jaffee represents the 97th Assembly District across the river and everyone is in --

(Applause)

MS. CASTELEIRO: More applause.

Everyone who resides in the district is within the 18 mile danger zone as we know is a fatality zone as established by the CRAC-II study. I think it was Sandia Labs.

So Ms. Jaffee says that GEIS, DEIS, EIS,
FEIS, this is the fourth environmental study I've been involved with this year, and I'm alarmed at how Environmental Impact Statements increasingly bend toward industry and away from the public good.

(Applause)

MS. CASTELEIRO: And I appreciate and respect the work of the NRC. I do believe there is a level of arrogance and to put this in common parlance, we need more Leonard and a little less Sheldon.

(Laughter)

MS. CASTELEIRO: That's a Big Bang reference from the Assemblywoman's favorite program. So I have a bill. It's A-10-38 and Entergy has lobbied heavily against this bill. If we're going to play the science card, let's look at this bill. This bill will study under the Energy, it will amend the Energy law to study alternative sources of energy to Indian Point. It does not say close Indian Point. It says study. And to the gentlemen who represent the 400 people who work at the site, this law, if it became a law, this bill will in fact protect your jobs and look at new ways to relocate because we respect the work that you do in the Valley.

(Applause)
MS. CASTELEIRO: And I call upon the NRC to support me in this effort and to please communicate to Entergy that we should work on, in the name of science and truth, getting this bill passed so that we can really look at the impact of this bill and we can look at -- we can stop the production of long-term waste.

Someone asked me a while ago, when you post -- and they asked me to ask you, when you put a warning sign on these long-terms casks, what language is it going to be in? Because do you think the people that find these casks in 500 years will be speaking English?

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you Darcy. And please thank the Assemblywoman for us, okay. Margot and then Maureen and Peter.

MS. SCHEPART: My name is Margot Schepart, and I have lived within the ten-mile zone for most of my life, and I've worked in a public school within the ten-mile zone for the past 11 years. Because I am an English teacher, I can say with total certainty that the phrase "Nuclear Waste Confidence" is the biggest oxymoron ever uttered or
appended in human history.

(Applause)

MS. SCHEPART: And I can't believe that the NRC folks don't know that. And it was really smart word-smithing to come up with that one. You should pay those people a lot of money, whoever thought that up.

I'm wearing this green headband on my head to represent something because I'm a very metaphorical person. It's my constant unrelenting awareness that Indian Point with its tons of new and old fuel rods poses an ever-present danger to myself, the people I care about, my students, my colleagues. It never goes away, and it might look funny and it might look like "Oh, there they are those crazy activists doing their thing again." We have to lighten it up a little bit, okay. You have to have some fun with it because it's serious and it doesn't go away and most people don't think about it. I do, and my cohorts do, but it's there and it's nasty and it's in my brain like background man-made radiation all the time.

I'm not a math teacher. I'm an English teacher. But I know this. I know that it's unconscionable that this stuff is going to be around
as a legacy, you know, a poisonous legacy for -- I wrote this down -- not only our great-great-great-great-great-grandchildren, but also their great-great-great-great-grandchildren. I can't even say it. And their great-great-great grandchildren. Basically, 12,000 generations. And it's just wrong. It's wrong.

The technology doesn't exist. The casks that that other person was talking about with all the thickness and everything and the cement, they don't last more than I think 300 years is the max. That's it. It's uncontainable. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. And this is Maureen. Just one second Maureen. We're going to go to David Schepperly, Evan Lapiska, Paul Steidler, and Sally Gellert after we get done with this flight so-to-speak.

MS. GARNER-RITTER: I just want to say I really like Richard's tie. It's green and maybe he is coming over to the bright side.

(Laughter)

MS. GARNER-RITTER: Good evening. It's important to have you in our community hearing from the people directly, having our comments be officially on the record. You've heard many people
tonight who are forced to live with the continued threat of Indian Point every day and the waste that it produces. And, you know, what's in a name? So I don't think EIS -- I don't think there should be the "G" before it. It's a generic.

Indian Point is anything but generic. It is a specific power plant in the most crowded region of the United States with 20 million people living in a 50 mile radius, so I think to apply a generic EIS is ludicrous. I speak to you tonight as a local citizen of the reactor community. I also am a teacher and an informed member of the public and my most important job is a mother. A mother who is adamantly opposed to leaving lethal legacy of high-level radioactive waste for my children and the generations to come.

As I understand it, the NRC is charged with the oversight, not the defense of the nuclear industry, and with all due respect, the GEIS seems to be a huge attempt at legitimizing the continued production of irradiated waste for which we have no true solution. You can monitor, matrix, and massage the facts, but it's all a con, and we need to stop making the waste now. So perhaps a more suitable name for the report is the Waste Con or How to Waste
the Confidence of the American People. So, I'm not an engineer and -- but I am a special ed teacher -- sometimes I have to put things in simplistic terms for myself, as well as my students, so here is an analogy.

As a homeowner with an old and troubled toilet, I would cease to use it if it became so filled with waste that I could no longer flush it. I would not consider -- I would not continue to sit there and eliminate any more waste into it. And the thought of leaving little empty boxes that may degrade around my house is absurd and you might say "That's crap." But we just passed a very important anniversary yesterday. The one year anniversary of Hurricane Sandy, an event of epic proportion, billions of dollars, people still displaced.

Imagine now that you have this apocalyptic event with the waste at Indian Point and we're not going to be measuring it in dollars. We will be measuring it in lives and futures. If we could have prevented Hurricane Sandy, we would have. It is counterintuitive, uneconomical, irresponsible, and I dare say immoral not to close down the waste factory now. So I -- I just have four questions that I do want to answer to the -- ask the NRC, is how
does the fact that if IP is making waste now and it
is now considered actually a storage facility instead
of a generation -- place of generation? That's one
question I have.

Who will monitor the waste if the
government defaults? I understand from what you said
tonight that the plant -- if the plant operates for
five years, they have another like 60 years before
they consider what they do with their waste. Why do
we, as taxpayers, have to foot the bill of continued
storage after Entergy sheds its corporate shell and
walks away?

And after a government shutdown last
week, you know, who is going to -- who is watching
the stuff when everybody is furloughed? So you know,
I can't, you know, have confidence that you're going
to keep this together for 240,000 years despite your
best efforts.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you Maureen.

MS. GARNER-RITTER: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. We're going to
Peter Wolf right now. There's Peter Wolf.

And could we clear the wall for people
so that they could come up here too. Peter.
MR. WOLF: Good evening. My deep concern about Indian Point started some years ago when Entergy couldn't get the sirens to work properly, and I wondered if they can't get something that simple outside the plant to work, what's going on inside the plant. And it brought back memories of mine when I was a Coast Guard officer.

First I was boating officer and realized after some time that all these boating accident reports I was looking at weren't accidents at all. They were simply incidents. Incidents of human error, human commission or omission, with unintended results.

Now, if you look at the same thing with the nuclear accidents that occurred with Three Mile Island and Chernobyl, a large part of each disaster is attributable to human error. Even in Fukushima where the nuclear reactor accident was initially ascribed to a tsunami following an earthquake, recently both the operator Topco and the Japanese government have admitted that the disaster was preventable.

Second, I was operations duty officer in the Port of New York, which meant I was the highest ranking officer on duty, and I had to respond to
fires and oil pollution and collisions. And I had patrol boats, harbor tugs and a helicopter to respond to these emergencies, but I later realized that if there was an incident at Indian Point, which is along the Hudson River, we did not have sufficient resources or training to respond to a radioactive emergency. And I wonder whether those resources and the training exists today.

Thirdly, I was group readiness officer and was involved in planning to respond to a major calamity in the port. The knowledge I gained made me dubious that a successful evacuation of significant proportions to be undertaken if there was a serious accident at Indian Point. When contemplating a nuclear mishap, I also ponder where the hundreds of thousands of evacuated people will go and how they will pay for their expenses if they suddenly have no job and their most important asset, their home, is suddenly worthless because it's in a nuclear contaminated zone.

We're here tonight to discuss nuclear waste, and it's probably a much more serious topic than even our discussion about the ongoing licensing at Indian Point because this will go on for decades, and we do not know how the protection will go, who
will pay for it, and who will monitor it. It's difficult to predict what will happen in the future. Yesterday was the first anniversary of Sandy's visit. Many didn't foresee the type or extent of that type of damage. When we look back at just the last dozen years, we did not envision 9/11. We did not envision Katrina. We did not envision the Deep Water Horizon, and we did not envision Fukushima. And as we know, Fukushima is still leaking today.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: And Peter, if I could just get you to wrap up.

MR. WOLF: Yeah. So when we look at the Proposed Rule here and we're talking about 60 years, or 160 years, or indefinitely, I think that the most important thing to do is to realize that we cannot look that far ahead, so that we have to come up with a solution that will enable our country to move forward.

Before closing I would like to note that 20 months ago the Disposal Subcommittee of the Blue Ribbon Commission of America's Nuclear Future presented its upgraded report and there's a roadmap there and certainly the NRC should follow that. However, in the interim, it's incumbent upon you to
promulgate rules and enforce them so that we will have the maximum protection to the public and the surrounding from the potential ill effects of an adverse incident which causes the release of nuclear waste.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you Peter. David.

MR. SCHEPPERLY: Good evening. My name is David Schepperly. I'm an employee at Indian Point, and I'm also a member of NAYGN. NAYGN stands for North American Young Generation in Nuclear. It's a group that supports nuclear technology and nuclear science. It's also a group that's across -- has several chapters across the United States, as well as Mexico and Canada.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the important topics of waste confidence and its relationship to continued nuclear plant licensing and operations. NAYGN strongly believes that nuclear energy is an integral part of a national energy plan and must continue to generate an essential share of the nation's clean non-emitting zero-carbon baseload energy. Nuclear energy generates 59 percent of the
carbon-free electricity produced in New York. This factor is according to the Energy Information Administration. Our nuclear energy facilities also provide substantial economic benefits to the state and local community including high-paying jobs and tax revenue that helps keep town services funded and property taxes much lower than they otherwise would be.

While nuclear energy is a vital part of our state's electricity portfolio and economy, we recognize the need to address the transportation, storage, and disposal of used nuclear fuel. The National Conference of State Legislatures said recently that it supports Federal action to develop facilities for interim storage of high-level radioactive waste until a permanent repository is ready.

We strongly urge the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to continue its strong independent oversight of the commercial nuclear energy facilities, operation of existing plants, licensing new reactors, renewing the operating licenses of existing reactors and the management, transportation, and disposal of used nuclear fuel.

We believe it is important for the NRC
to continue its transparent and efficient efforts to maintain its 24-month schedule for the current Waste Confidence proceedings so that progress on both plant licensing and used fuel management can continue.

I want to thank the NRC for holding this public meeting and providing an opportunity for comments. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. And thank all of you out there too. And Evan. This is Evan Lapiska.

MR. LAPISKA: Good evening. I'm here today on behalf of the Clean And Safe Energy Coalition or CASEnergy. The CASEnergy Coalition is a large national grassroots coalition of allies united across the business, environmental, academic, consumer and labor communities. Our members support the increased use of nuclear energy (interference) -- excuse me -- to ensure an environmentally clean, safe, affordable, and reliable supply of electricity. This is an important discussion to be having and I applaud the NRC for taking the time to hold these public meetings and for rescheduling those affected by the shutdown.
We're here to discuss spent nuclear fuel. Spent nuclear fuel is being stored onsite in well-designed, well-protected facilities in storage casks -- and quite safely at that. These facilities and storage casks are robust structures made of steel linings and reinforced concrete walls that are several feet thick. Spent fuel pools are often 40-feet deep, steel-lined with reinforced concrete walls and the structures are built to seismic standards to protect the pools. The dry storage casks where the fuel is moved are no different. For every ten tons of used fuel, facilities form a robust structure made of 100 tons of concrete and steel to protect the fuel.

The industry has been doing this for more than 30 years safely and securely and to ensure safety there is regulation. American nuclear energy is also the high -- is also a highly regulated industry with operating facilities subject to onsite inspections by NRC staff 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year. Nuclear energy has shown that it is a responsible source of electricity and a valuable community partner. Nuclear energy safely and cleanly provides nearly 20 percent of our electric power nationwide and nearly two-thirds of
our carbon-free electricity, and supports more than 100,000 high-paying jobs.

Because of nuclear energy's commitment to producing affordable clean power and its commitment to safely, cleanly, and securely storing spent fuel, it is no wonder why communities near nuclear facilities strongly support nuclear energy. The timely resolution of this rulemaking is important for long-term power planning. This issue is directly affecting re-licensing of nuclear plants and approval of pending instruction applications for new reactors which are vital if we are serious about our commitment to reliable, safe, and secure source of electricity that will help combat climate change.

As this Commission continues these public hearings, I hope to hear a discussion of the facts and that is that nuclear energy has shown the utmost commitment to safely and securely storing spent fuel and that will never change.

Thank you for your time today.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you Evan. After our next two speakers we're going to go to Marilyn Elie, Gary Shaw, Dan Fullerton, and Judy Allen. And is Paul Steidler.
MR. STEIDLER: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: This is Paul, okay. And then we're going to go to Sally Gellert.

MR. STEIDLER: Yes, hi, good evening and thank you for the opportunity to be here. My name is Paul Steidler. I'm with the New York Affordable Reliable Electricity Alliance. I have a brief statement from our chairman, Jerry Kremer, which I'll read into the record momentarily. I also wanted to provide some context and some observations before that statement.

First of all, it's important I think that we all recognize that nuclear energy is safe. In the 50-year history of commercial operation there has not been a single death from nuclear energy.

The second thing -- the second thing I'd like to add, you know, there's been a lot of discussion today about Hurricane Sandy and the one year anniversary having been yesterday and that is a tragedy that we should not forget and it's something that we should look at and look to rigorously examine so we can prevent events like that from happening again. We believe that nuclear energy is essential to that.

President Obama and his Energy Secretary
Ernest Moniz believe that nuclear energy is essential for addressing global warming and giving our kids a better world and with that as background, there is some good news. New York City today has the cleanest air it’s had in 50 years and New York State has the lowest per capita carbon emissions rate of any state in the country in large part because of the fact that 30 percent of the state's electricity comes from nuclear power.

With that said, I would like to read the statement from our Chairman Mr. Kremer. "We have every confidence that the used fuel stored at New York’s six nuclear power plants is safe and secure in good part because it is already rigorously inspected by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. We urge the NRC and other policy makers to find permanent solutions for this used fuel including the establishment of designated repositories to where it can be shipped and recycling options."

And finally, I would just add, New Yorkers have paid, everyone in this room has paid $4 billion for the state's nuclear waste to be in a repository taken from plants and put someplace else. That is something that we should be talking about and focusing on instead of rehashing the debate about
Indian Point at a forum that has nothing to do with Indian Point. The rate payers of New York, the taxpayers of New York, deserve to get their money's worth and we would implore the NRC to be an advocate for solutions, be it Yucca Mountain or elsewhere, where this used fuel can go.

Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: And our next speaker is Sally Gellert. There's Sally. And then we're going to go to Marilyn and Gary Shaw, Dan Fullerton, and Judy Allen.

MS. GELLERT: Hi, my name is Sally Gellert. I live in Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey. Thank you for allowing me to express some of my concerns regarding nuclear waste.

My home is just about 50 miles from Indian Point by main roads, substantially less by back-roads or as the crow flies. Although I had been long aware of environmental issues, once Indian Point opened I did not pay too much attention to it. Recently, however, even before the tsunami earthquake and meltdown at Fukushima Daiichi, I happened to learn more about -- begun to learn more about Indian
Point nuclear facility and what I have learned scares me.

Although I know that the risk of a serious problem under a nuclear reactor is small, the consequences can be so severe that they must be considered anyway. Indian Point lies on two fault lines and this goes to the fact that you can't do a Generic Environmental Impact Statement because not -- they don't all lie on fault lines. They don't all lie in an area as crowded as we are.

Indian Point is considered by some to be the least safe site of any reactor in the country. We live with possible disasters, remote yet frightening possibility. In addition, of course, Indian Point leaks invisible radiation constantly as well as heating river water that it draws in vast quantity every day to operate the reactor and cool the ever increasing number of irradiated fuel rods.

For residents nearby, the possibility of a fire in a spent fuel pool is hardly inconsequential. It would be disastrous. In addition, new technologies create new risks. For the past 16 years the NRC has allowed high burn-up fuel which burns longer and hotter in the reactor. When removed, this fuel needs up to twice as long in
cooling pools, as well as more space between fuel rods in an already crowded pool.

As we know, the NRC does not want to discuss the percentage of high burn-up fuel at Indian Point. It was suggested that that is a matter of national security. However, local security must also be considered. Without enough of an idea of how much irradiated fuel rods are stored safely, Woodcliff Lake and the area surrounding are less secure than they might be. I therefore request this information be made public.

(Applause)

MS. GELLERT: Regarding storage of nuclear waste both here and across the country, I firmly believe that the risks of transportation are greater than the risk of storage onsite. Transporting highly radioactive fuel over the highway is a specter of many possible errors and accidents, collisions, mechanical breakdowns, spills, and inexperienced Hazmat personnel in areas far from any nuclear facility.

In fact, a worker at Indian Point was exposed to radiation and the hospital emergency room took hours for a single one-person incident. What would a big disaster cause?
I don't have any more time. I've got more to say, but I will send it in writing. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much Sally. We're going to go to -- we're going to go Marilyn Elie next, then Gary Shaw, Dan Fullerton, and Judy Allen.

MS. ELIE: My name is Marilyn Elie. I live three miles from Indian Point in the reactor community of Cortlandt Manor. I say reactor community because we live so close there, and I think that we need to start thinking of ourselves in that term. Perhaps once, as Margot said, once we can begin to think about it, then we might be inspired to take some action to do something about it as many people in this room are right now.

I looked at the Generic Draft -- the Generic Environmental Impact Study. I looked at that draft and in print it seems very solid. The pages are there. It's all lined out. And you know, it doesn't exactly seem as ambiguous as I found out it was when I talked to the people from the NRC out in the hall. Not only are there exceptions and exemptions, but it's for the purpose of an analysis.
It's for the purpose of creating a model, which means that it's not really for us. It's not real. It's for a plant that doesn't exist. A perfect plant and a perfect world if there could be such a thing.

There's no viable option for long-term storage. People have talked about that over and over. There's a denial of the risk of a spent fuel pool and there are all kinds of studies, and I would cite the Union of Concerned Scientists for the work that they have done in that regard.

There is no long-term plan to require, encourage, force the company to put those spent fuel pools -- high-level irradiated fuel assemblies is a more accurate word. Spent means they're kind of used up. These aren't. They're worse than when they went into the pool. And the NRC was created 40 years ago, and this is the best they can offer us. All of these exemptions, all of these oversights, all of these cracks in the wall of the model, so what would the real thing be like?

Not only that. I want to express right now the fact that it's not only wrong to pass this off to somebody else, it's also very anti-Democratic. Nevada didn't want it and who does? Who wants to become the national high-level radiated dump for the
entire country? Are there citizens in this country besides those who can't say no, besides those who are poor, besides those who are Native American, besides those who are people of color that would say that? And where is our responsibility, our moral responsibility to take care of our own mess?

Those high-level radioactive rods and fuel assemblies need to be moved to dry cask storage. They need to be monitored and they need to stay onsite for as long as they are radioactive -- 240,000 years. We used the electricity. It was a fleeting good so-called and now we're stuck with it. And what's the answer?

MR. CAMERON: And could you wrap up for us.

MS. ELIE: To stop making more.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. This is Gary.

MR. SHAW: My name is Gary Shaw. I live five-and-a-half miles from Indian Point. I was going to start off talking about what a poor job I have observed the NRC doing in terms of preemption of problems. They didn't prevent Con Ed from having a
steam pipe eruption that released radioactive steam into the atmosphere and irradiated water right into the Hudson. They weren't -- they couldn't prevent more ruptures and leaks in underground piping. They had no idea that their spent fuel pools were leaking until, as somebody else mentioned, a contractor started doing excavation and said "Oh, it's wet outside the spent fuel pool." So the NRC is not very good at preemption, but they're pretty good at going "Uh-oh, what do I do now that there's a problem?" So the idea that they now have a plan to take care of nuclear waste into millennia, it would be hilarious if it wasn't so scary.

The idea that, you know, when we had public meetings with the NRC and asked how many exemptions has Indian Point received and they didn't -- they had no idea how many exemptions they've given or how they interacted. So I have very little, very little, confidence in this so-called regulator whose primary objective by law is supposed to be protection of public health and safety. They're obviously much more interested in the financials of the operator. That came out in an Inspector General's report when they almost let Davis Bessie reactor in -- outside of Toledo, Ohio, have a breach of containment because
they were concerned about the financial impact of shutting the plant down to find out what the problem was.

It's my understanding that only about 15 percent of the spent fuel assemblies that have been accumulating at Indian Point for the last 40-plus years have been moved to on site dry cast storage. This directly contradicts what the -- what the report out MIT that included a co-author, who is now the current chairman of the NRC, who said that -- who said that dry casks are much more safe than wet storage. I guess they don't want -- you know, it's just mind-boggling.

In terms of -- in terms of a one-size-fits-all GIS -- GEIS, how can you rationalize that the magnitude of risk is equal so that policy standards and protocols should be the same at all nuclear plants regardless of size, age, physical environment across the U.S. nuclear fleet stretching to the Pacific Coast to the flooded Mid-West to the east coast stretching from Florida to New England.

In terms of Indian Point, we have an intersection of two seismic faults. We have two large, high-pressure natural-gas lines between the faults and the plants. During Sandy -- Super Storm
Sandy, the plant came close to flood level from the Hudson River surge. It would seem to me that these characteristics might not be universal, so why would there be a Generic EIS.

(Applause)

MR. SHAW: Another -- another element that makes Indian Point unique is that it’s been ordered to install closed-cycle cooling. If that order is affirmed by the courts and a large structure must be built, what impact does that have on the ability to expand cask-storage space for what would be a 60-year accumulation of fuel assemblies. I would like to know what procedures are in place to conduct dry transfer of degraded fuel assemblies from the Wholetech casks when they expire in 100 years or less. How about 200 years, 300 years? That's how long it takes cesium to become benign. What about 240,000 years?

MR. CAMERON: Gary, can I get you to wrap up, please, for us.

MR. SHAW: I will be done in just a moment. Thank you. There's -- the truth is there is no real plan to isolate high-level radioactive waste materials effectively for the amount of time really necessary to protect public health and safety, their
primary objective. There's no real plan and no real solution, so we shouldn't be making any more. To do anything less than that seems absolutely self-destructive.

With all due respect, the policies perpetrated by this agency put the interests of the nuclear power operators far above the welfare of populations in reactor communities.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: This is Dan. We're going to hear from Dan Fullerton and then Judy Allen. And if I could have the group sort of gather over there, and then we'll hear from you, okay. All right. This is Dan. Go ahead Dan.

MR. FULLERTON: My name is Dan Fullerton. I live about nine miles from Indian Point. I don't have a prepared statement. I really feel that people have said a lot of things that need to be said, but the thing that keeps coming back to me is the issue of what are we doing to the future?

What are we doing to the future?

I started out in college in engineering physics, which would have led me on the path to a
career perhaps in nuclear physics, and I found it wasn't what I needed. I ended up finishing with a degree in philosophy.

There are logical and ethical issues here. One of the logical issues has to do with denial. There is a problem that we can't wish away, but we keep trying to. And the problem is what about long-term storage? What happens to this stuff when however many, 1200 generations -- well, how about even the fourth generation, let alone the 1200, okay.

If we choose not to deal with that seriously by putting it off, which is what this GEIS does, it puts the problem off. If we continue to deny, we compound the problem and we become morally sick. And it is a great regret and a matter of great sadness for me that our country is in the midst of doing that.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. And this is Judy, Judy Allen. Thank you.

MS. ALLEN: Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I would like to take a moment to remember the NRC person who used to facilitate
these meetings. He's not with us anymore. His name is Karl Farrar. He passed on last May I believe shortly after or during the last NRC meeting, and I just wanted to remember him because he was a really wonderful guy. He put up with a lot of us screaming and railing against the NRC, and he was never less than a gentleman.

Okay. So one of the things that I do is I'm a copy editor, so I'm looking -- I didn't even get to the GEIS. I didn't get to anything. All I got to was "Waste Confidence." And that stopped me right there. I have to ask the NRC members who are here and the ones who are not here, whose confidence are we talking about? Are we talking about your confidence? Because you're not talking about our confidence.

I believe that the general response here tonight has been enough to show you that we are not confident at all, so where does this confidence come from that you think you can handle nuclear radioactive waste for 240,000 years? I have a grandson who is going to be four years old this week, and the idea of 160 years, I mean that's going to be even after his lifetime. So let me see, that's his child, that's his grandchildren, his -- I can't
think. I can't think. And it just occurs to me that there is so much arrogance going on at the NRC and has been for decades, because I've been coming to these meetings for over 30 years, ever since I moved to my home which is 14 miles from Indian Point. And I'm furious, and I know that there are a lot of other people who are being more polite than I am who are equally furious that you think that you can con us into thinking that there is any solution for this.

(Applause)

MS. ALLEN: I want you to know that there is a disconnect between what the NRC says and what the public perceives. There is lip service. Only lip service paid to the public health and safety. We all know that you are beholden to the nuclear industry. We all know that organizations like SHARE and New York AREA have been created by Entergy with Entergy's money.

(Applause)

MS. ALLEN: And that the CASE organization Clean and Safe Energy is created by the nuclear -- the nuclear energy industry. So we want you to know about the disconnect. We want you to know that we don't believe you anymore, if we ever did. And the people who do, I just want to say one
word, which is Kool-Aid. I believe that a new study has come up that shows that there -- it's going to take the best minds of the century for the next hundred years to figure out what to do at Fukushima; is that correct? Right? Right. Okay. So I will stop now.

Thank you for letting me speak.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Now we're going to hear from Nora Freeman, Sunny Armer, Ariana Holback, Pam Drake, Kathryn Groth, and Betty Perkins. And after that, we're going to hear from David Amram, Yuki Endo, Valery Cypser, Betty Cypser, and Ellen Ginsberg, but we'll hear from each of them separately. This is going to be a gathering.

And do you want to -- why don't you -- you know what, why don't you -- do you want to be down here and I can hold the microphone.

MS. ARMER: No, Pam though. That would be good. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MS. ARMER: Hold the music for her, Ana. Hold the music for Pam. Hold the song sheet in front of Pam. Thank you.
MR. CAMERON: Okay. You're all set?

MS. ARMER: I believe so.

MR. CAMERON: All right.

MS. ARMER: My name is Sunny Armer, and we are Raging Grannies WOWW. Umbrella (indicating).

(Applause)

MS. ARMER: I live six miles from Indian Point. This hotel is less than 20 miles from the nuclear power plant. Do you remember when Fukushima began to melt down and the NRC told all the Americans in Japan that it was dangerous to be within 50 miles of the reactors in spent fuel pools. If we heard sirens right now, we have to get in our cars and drive 30 miles. Unfortunately, the sirens can't be heard this far from Indian Point. That's one of the many reasons that Raging Grannies demand that Indian Point be shut down immediately. Here you are within the 50-mile range, okay.

MR. CAMERON: And there is a song?

MS. ARMER: There is a song, but that was just a statement. There are three songs -- four songs. We would like you to sing along with the last one. Where's our sign.

MR. CAMERON: And if you could try to keep it to the --
MS. ARMER: Right.

MR. CAMERON: Keep it short, okay.

MS. ARMER: We'll keep -- they're all short.

MR. CAMERON: All right.

MS. ARMER: The last song, if you have a song sheet, starts with these words. Ready.

RAGING GRANNIES: [Singing:] Indian Point's a nuclear power plant near here. Nineteen Miles. That makes 50 tons of spent fuel every year. That waste is stored in pools and because we are not fools, we know we have good reasons to be scared.

Sing along.

If Entergy keeps spinning what it's spun, and their fight for re-licensing is won, 15 million on the roads will flee their doomed abodes. A 50-mile race they'll have to run.

A terrorist could hit it with a bomb. The earthquake in Japan gave us some qualms. Where will we find the answer to protecting folks from cancer, who haven't yet been blown to kingdom come?
Bring us solar, bring us hydro, bring us wind.
Bring us energy from sources that won't end. Before we could trust uranium, we'd need holes in our cranium. We haven't yet gone that far 'round the bend.

(Applause)

MS. ARMER: Hold the applause. Hold the applause.

MR. CAMERON: Could you do the last, just the last song for us, please.

MS. ARMER: The last song?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah, can you do that please for us?

MS. ARMER: No, what we're going to do next, we're going to do one more song and then we're leaving the stage.

MR. CAMERON: Oh, good.

MS. ARMER: But it's not the last one on the list. It's the next page.

MR. CAMERON: I don't mean good you're leaving the stage. That you have one more song.

MS. ARMER: The next page --

MR. CAMERON: All right. Good.

MS. ARMER: -- where it says "Gaggle of
Grannies Protest Indian Point."

MR. CAMERON: All right. Okay. Go ahead.

RAGING GRANNIES: [Singing:]

Oh, we are a gaggle of grannies urging you off of your fannies. Indian Point is a dangerous joint. Shut it down.

With all that Entergy's spending to keep their license from ending, you'd think go broke with mirrors and smoke. Shut it down.

The NRC approves of waste storage by Entergy.

The NRC is a lapdog to the nuclear industry.

So, we may be a gaggle of grannies, but we've gotten off of our fannies. Stop Entergy's spin. If they lose, we win. Shut it down. We really mean it. Shut it down. And we mean business. Shut it down. Shut it down.

MS. ARMER: Now we go off singing. We go all singing.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you all.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you all.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
(202) 234-4433
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com
MS. ARMER: One, two, three. One, two, three.

RAGING GRANNIES: [Singing:] How will we leave town, if Indian Point melts down. Hi-ho, if that place blows, we'll wind up underground. Imagine crowded roads when we leave our abodes. Hi-ho, this plant must go before the thing explodes.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. We're going to go to David Amram. And I should point out that David mentioned to me that he was a composer, so I think it's appropriate that he follow the grannies.

(Applause)

MR. AMRAM: Hi, my name is David Amram. I'm one of the 20 million people who live close to Indian Point and where these materials are stored. I live about 13 miles from that place. This is a statement for the people at NRC, so the NRC folks in the hallway, if they want to come out and listen, I love listening to you. You're more than welcome to hear what we have to say because we're here to have a dialogue with you, not to insult you. So maybe if they could ask the people out there to come in --
MR. CAMERON: Well, there's a lot of NRC people right here, David.

MR. AMRAM: Terrific. Okay.

MR. CAMERON: So let's go.

MR. AMRAM: As someone who will turn 83 next month, I've had a full and a wonderful life, so my survival is not an issue. But for millions of younger people in the area affected by this ticking time bomb, we owe it to them to have the chance to live out their lives by using common sense and exercising responsible behavior before it is too late. We're told that we shouldn't worry because it's less expensive to continue to store the waste as we've been doing, and more business-like than finding a safer way to store the deadly poisons of nuclear waste and that there's really no danger.

(Laughter)

MR. AMRAM: The last time I checked the Sunday New York Times real estate section, Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, and Fukushima were not places with many listings. Nor were there any articles indicating that there were customers looking to move to either of these three places. While I'm certainly not qualified to make any decisions for other concerning either our economic well-being or how to
become a successful real estate entrepreneur, I know
that an ecological catastrophe forcing millions to
flee permanently from their homes and others not so
fortunate who could not escape in time and are left
to die of various cancers due to radiation poisoning
is bad for business.

(Applause)

MR. AMRAM: And since millions of dead
people are no longer able to be customers, it might
be more cost-effective in the long run for those who
are responsible for the storage of the lethal
material which can kill us all to deal with the
problem in a sane and sensible way that will assure
the safety of the millions of people who have no
desire to become casualties of a nuclear disaster.
No amount of lawsuits or gracious letters of sympathy
could ever undue the tragedies of Three Mile Island,
Chernobyl, and Fukushima.

The National Regulatory Commission has
the chance today to avoid another one at our
backyard. I'm sure that most of those in charge of
renewing the license for Indian Point, as well as
planning a safe way to store the waste, also have
families and have worked hard their whole lives to
give their kids a better life than they had. That's
the great tradition of our country.

MR. CAMERON: And David, I'm going to have to ask you to wrap up.

MR. AMRAM: I'm almost done, sir.

I'm almost sure that no one working for the NRC wants to have an emergency phone call telling them that they and their families have to pack up and flee immediately from where they live even if it means becoming homeless. And if they survive, seeing aerial photographs of where they used to live now reduced to ghost towns. And this is not a plot for a grade-B movie. This is the reality of what's already happened.

And unless we receive a substantial number of requests of the NRC to allow everyone within 70 miles of the plant to request the Commission what's best for everyone, we cannot allow ourselves to commit suicide by ignoring what's obvious. Dr. Kevorkian was requested by people who wished to terminate their lives and there's no documentation of anyone in the greater New York area who has requested another Jamestown.

MR. CAMERON: David, I'm going to have to ask you to wrap up, please.

MR. AMRAM: So I request on behalf of my
neighbors, my friends, and my family with equal respect to all of you and your friends at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and your families, a solution to ensure our survival. Your decision at the National Regulatory Commission will determine our shared destiny. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, David.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: We have Yuki Endo, Valery Cypser, Betty Cypser, and Ellen Ginsberg. And I should just tell you that we are going through the people who pre-registered first, and then we're going to get to the people who registered -- came in tonight, so that's the way we're doing this. And don't forget the meetings that the NRC is going to have where you can phone in and talk and give your comments. One November 14th and one on December 9th. And this is Yuki.

MR. ENDO: My name is Yuki Endo, resident of Jackson Heights, Queens, and I am Japanese. I am not happy with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission fracking gas land industry and coal industry, which cause major problem for health and global warming. I am urging all NRC, liquified natural gas, White House and United States government
to shut down all nuclear power plants factories, fracking gas land station, and coal industry because they all have same issue. People living or working in nuclear, fracking, or coal zone are contaminated and dangerously exposed by chemical and radiation.

Radiation covers entire New York State, portion of Connecticut, and New Jersey. If the state declares emergency evacuation due to nuclear explosion, Long Island -- Long Islanders have nowhere to go and New York streets are not meant for evacuation route. Remember during Hurricane Sandy, or Irene, or snowstorm, moment people heard the news, all New England colonies went to get gas before major storm hit and evacuated.

Some people will not evacuate because they think they will be safe. Long Islanders has no way to evacuate unless ferry companies reach to help. Just like in the movie, evacuation means heavy traffic jam. If this happens during the rush hour, it will be impossible to evacuate because millions of people will be stuck in traffic.

Please shut down nuclear, coal, fracking industry. All this in -- all these industries destroy a beautiful view of the New York and all other states.
I thank you for your cooperation.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you Yuki. Thank you very much.

(Applause)


MS. CYPHER: We represent the Raging Grannies and their friends of Westchester County. Raging Grannies are an international group working for peace, a healthy environment, and social justice. We are one of many gaggles in Westchester in New York, the United States, Canada, Europe, and around the world.

Raging Grannies work to make the world a better place for everyone's grandchildren. We're here today because the production of nuclear waste and the absence of adequate plans on how to store it safely for 250,000 years threatens the health and the lives of everyone's grandchildren.

Europe accepts that "There is no safe lower limit" of radiation exposure. That means that low-level exposure, even close to background levels, cause the death rate to spike. We don't hear about no safe lower limit from the NRC, though you know the laws of physics are the same on both sides of the
Atlantic.

What will our grandchildren think of our actions today relating to making more nuclear waste. Their lives, their friends, family, and community's lives depend on what we do today in this era.

The injustice is that the choice is ours not theirs. They have no choice, no voice. It takes everyone working together to make a better world for our grandchildren. We have two short songs, and we ask if you can to join in. At least hum along. You need to drown us out. The first song is Killer Radioactive Waste to the tune of "Home on the Range."

Just hum it. Hum "Home on the range." This is for the grandchildren.

[Singing:]

Oh, give us a home where the grandkids grow strong, where they live long, live strontium free. Where we don't have to fear, waste vision is near, where rain fall is iodine free.

We've made tons of that waste. It's a waste we don't know how to store. It can't be made safe. It costs billions to make. Where's the sense in us making some more. The waste is not safe.
Oh, we're told that it's safe. Now we know that's not true. Exposure to low levels kills. No safe lower limit means we've had more than our fill. Un-contained the waste circles the globe.

We've made tons of that waste. It's a waste we don't know how to store. It can't be made safe. It costs billions to make.

Where's the sense in us making some more. Who pays?

Who pays for the waste? It's our taxes and kids. We pay with our health and our lives. Oh, fission and leaks have caused millions of deaths. It's the cost of that cheap energy.

Tons, tons of that waste. It's a waste that's a hazard to store. It can't be made safe. It costs billions to make. It's insane to be making some more.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you ladies. Thank you very much. You have to go.

[Singing:]

It can't be made safe. It costs billions to make. It's insane to be making some more.
MS. CYPSTER: We have a second song.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. Please because --

MS. CYPSTER: Can we wrap up?

MR. CAMERON: -- you've taken a lot of time. Thank you. Thank you. Very good. Thank you very much. No. Thank you very much. I'm sure you do.

[Singing:]

Don't put your waste in my backyard, your backyard, our backyard. Don't put your waste in our backyard --

MR. CAMERON: Is Savannah Bailey here?

-- our backyard is clean.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: We're going to Savannah Bailey. Then Ellen Ginsberg, then Yuko Tonohira and William Mooney. Savannah.

MS. BAILEY: Hi, my name is Savannah Bailey, and I'm here today on behalf of the Clean and Safe Energy Coalition or CASEnergy Coalition. As a national grassroots organization, the CASEnergy Coalition unites over 3,000 individuals and
organizations across the business, environment, academic, consumer, and labor communities.

Our members support the expanded use of clean-air nuclear energy to ensure an affordable and reliable supply of electricity for America. I would like to thank the members of the Commission and its staff for holding this public hearing and giving us the opportunity to share our perspective.

Nuclear energy facilities play an important role across America by producing clean reliable power for many and it's necessary that they be allowed to continue their safe and efficient operations.

First, please let me express my support and confidence in the storage of spent nuclear fuel onsite at facilities. Throughout its history the nuclear energy industry has proven that it is committed to responsible safe and secure storage onsite.

Although storage of spent fuel onsite was not intended as a permanent solution, the industry has committed to making it a very safe and secure process. All containment structures are required to meet the rigorous requirement set by the Commission, and billions of dollars and thousands of
labor hours have been invested by the nuclear energy industry in recent years to upgrade physical structures and ensure security at nuclear facilities across the country. Beyond the nuclear energy's industry --

AUDIENCE: Is this the same speech that the guy gave before just out of curiosity?

MS. BAILEY: No.

AUDIENCE: It sounded the same.

MS. BAILEY: Beyond the nuclear energy's commitment to safe storage of spent fuel, nuclear energy plays a crucial role in our country's future environmental health. The inter-governmental panel on climate change recently released an update assessment of the state of global warming and found with 95 percent confidence that humans are responsible. The report also found that the surface -- that surface temperatures are likely to exceed 1.5 degree Celsius and possibly even meet 2 degrees Celsius by the end of the century. Most consider 2 degrees Celsius to be the dividing line between tolerable and dangerous global warming.

While nuclear energy provides about one-fifth of our country's electricity, it provides more clean-air energy than every other source of emissions
free electricity combined accounting for nearly two-thirds of our clean-air energy. At a time when climate change is a paramount concern for all Americans, nuclear energy cannot be ignored, serving as one of our only forms of baseload, always on power that produces zero harmful emissions.

To end I would like to restate my support for an industry that continues to provide clean-air energy while storing spent fuel safely and securely on site for decades. Beyond being reliable and affordable, nuclear energy does not put harmful greenhouse gas emissions, sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxide and mercury into our air making it our largest source of emissions free electricity.

Throughout the industry's history it has shown that spent fuel can be stored on site safely, securely and cleanly. In the Commission's consideration of both this and future issues I urge them to take into account the incredible clean-air power of nuclear energy and consider ways to strengthen its commitment to clean-air – clean-energy technologies across the U.S.

Thank you for allowing me to speak tonight.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you
Savannah.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Next we're going to go to Ellen Ginsberg and then to Yuko Tonohira and Bill Mooney. This is Ellen Ginsberg.

MS. GINSBERG: Good evening. I'm Ellen Ginsberg and I serve as Vice President and General Counsel of the Nuclear Energy Institute. NEI's members include all operating reactor licensees. I appreciate the opportunity to present my views before this audience this evening.

As time is short and the hour is late, I will make only two points this evening.

The first is that as was true in the several meetings prior to this one, there's been -- there have been questions asked about the NRC's evaluation generically of the period for storage from the time of license expiration until pick up for disposal. Much has been made of this point and the question then is can the NRC and should the NRC treat these issues generically?

The answer has been long ago answered -- the question has been long ago answered by the courts, and again, in 2012 it was affirmed by the D.C. Circuit. The NRC may proceed by rulemaking on
certain environmental issues and the courts have said particularly this is true on the issue subject of this rulemaking.

In the context of the initial lawsuit in 1979 which challenged the NRC's failure to consider the environmental impacts associated with continued storage, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia stated succinctly where factual issues do not involve particularized situations, an agency may proceed by comprehensive resolution of the issues rather than re-litigating the question in each proceeding in which it is raised.

Parsing the issue even further, the court said "We agree with the Commission's position that it could properly consider the complex issue of nuclear waste disposal in a generic proceeding such as Rulemaking and then apply its determinations in subsequent adjudicatory proceedings. A few years later in 1983 the Supreme Court endorsed the NRC's long-standing approach. Its commentary was as follows: "The generic method chosen by the agency is clearly an appropriate method of conducting the "hard look" required by NEPA."

I would like to finish with what I would describe as the value proposition of nuclear energy.
First, it provides large quantities of electricity around the clock, safely and reliably when needed, but the value proposition doesn't end there. Nuclear plants provide clean-air energy. They also provide voltage support to the grid, helping to maintain its stability. Nuclear plants provide forward price stability and are not subject to the price volatility that many in the northeast experienced with gas-fired generation being dominant.

Finally, nuclear energy plants contribute to the fuel diversity and technology diversity that is one of the bedrock characteristics of a reliable and resilient electric sector.

With that, I thank you for your time.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much, Ellen. Yuko. Go ahead. There's some murmuring out there, but go ahead, Yuko.

MS. TONOHIRA: Hello. My name is Yuko. I live in Brooklyn, which is probably about towards the end of 50 mile radius reactor community of Indian Point.

First of all, on behalf of people who are not here, I want to say, like a lot of people, just everyday people like myself, they're already catching up with all the deceptions of nuclear energy
and it's amazing to see NRC people whose doing amazing job in keeping status quo even after the post-Fukushima wall. We are in an incredible situation, an extreme situation, and people in suits today from the industry and from Regulatory Commission might be just doing their job to keep their, you know, career and all that. And it's just obvious that people like us and people from Japan need to be heard.

I also went over some of the summary of the EI -- what is that? GEIS and it still strikes me that it's going under the safe dose myth of radiation exposure, and I want to ask all of you that, okay, there's -- to set up the standard for a safe dose of radiation, there's this model. Okay, this model is created around reference man. That's a man. It's usually a white male in their 20's and 30's who is living based on Western diet. Raise your hand if you fall into that category?

(Laughter)

MS. TONOHIRA: Raise your hand if you don't. So I have zero confidence in any kind of policy and rulemaking that doesn't think about women, mothers, young people, kids, you know, people of color.
(Applause)

MS. TONOHIRA: And disabled people and sick people.

MR. CAMERON: And Yuko, I'm going to have to ask you to --

MS. TONOHIRA: Okay. So I just want to say we are the generation to stop producing this mess, okay. I'm determined and a lot of people, who you don't see here, are also determined.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

MS. TONOHIRA: Thanks.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you Yuko. How about Bill Mooney, is he still here?

Why don't we go to Catherine Skopic, Sheila Geist, Jessica Azulay, Jeanne Shaw, Jeffrey Brown, Michelle Solomon, and Julie Woodward.

MS. SKOPIC: My name is Catherine Skopic. I've worked with writing environmental groups, including IMAC, the Interfaith Moral Action on Climate, and I'm speaking mainly as a resident of New York City.

In baseball one has three strikes and you're out. In the nuclear industry we've had three strikes. Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, and
Fukushima. You're out. It's time to close Indian Point.

(Applause)

MS. SKOPIC: This deadly nuclear plant threatens the lives of over 21 million people in the most densely populated metropolitan area, poisons the Hudson River and groundwater. Indian Point is situated on two fault lines. Scientists of Columbia University reported that a 7.0 magnitude earthquake is possible at Indian Point, and this aging structure was built to withstand a 6.1 earthquake only.

In 2005 NRC and Entergy reported that radioactive water was leaking from IP2 spent fuel pool. 2007 -- a tritium leak was found, leaks into the ground water and Hudson River. The now over 2,700 tons of high-level radioactive waste that contain plutonium will remain deadly as we've heard over and over again this evening for 240,000 years and is being stored in ordinary buildings, not dry cask storage.

And what about the amount of high burn-up fuel that presents an even far greater threat. How much is being produced? I would really like to know. We all would like to know. The radioactive material being stored at Indian Point is the
equivalent of over 1,000 Hiroshima bombs. The spent fuel pools are overcrowded, as we've also heard, making an incident far more likely. There is no room for more spent fuel. Stop producing them.

Indian Point uses 2.5 billion gallons of water and the fish have been found with strontium-90 in their flesh. Cancer rates are 66 percent above the average in communities surrounding Indian Point according to U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. There is no evacuation plan and we don't need it. We have viable renewable energy.

This summer I paddled on the Hudson River with about 200 native and non-native people. (Applause)

MS. SKOPIC: For the 400th anniversary of the Two-Row Wampum in the first covenant between native peoples and Europeans. They agreed to respect each other, work together, and protect Mother Earth. No matter what side of this issue one is on, we are called to honor this covenant today. The time of environmental destruction is over. It is now a time of healing for each other, for the earth, for all creation.

And lastly, going back even further than 400 years and I quote, "The earth lies polluted under
its inhabitants for they have transgressed laws, 
violated the statutes, broken the everlasting 
covenant." Isaiah 24:5. It's time to close Indian 
Point.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: This is Sheila Geist.

MS. GEIST: Yes, I'm Sheila Geist, and 

I'm a member of Shut Down Indian Point Now in New 
York and --

AUDIENCE: Speak into the mic, please.

MS. GEIST: And I'm speaking also as a 

New Yorker who is deeply concerned about the con job 
that seems to be going on here. I have absolutely no 
confidence in this Waste Confidence Rule nor in this 
Generic Environmental -- the GEIS Plan. Anyway, the 
-- to start with, I was here about two years ago, and 
at the time, my mind was blown by the presentation 
from the NRC that they had issued, that year, 1100 
exemptions from safety procedures. So today while I 
was waiting before this began, I was encouraged to 
speak with the staff outside and there was graph. 
And it was a generic graph, which I didn't 
understand, so I asked for clarification, and I was 
curious about how much of the waste at Indian Point
was in dry cask storage. The person told me they didn't know. They had no clue.

There was a graph showing 60 years, 160 years, for dry cask storage, for open fuel ponds, whatever it was. It didn't make any sense. So I began to ask some questions and again, no clues. So I would like to contextualize what I'm saying in that context as well as the fact that as Cathy pointed out, Indian Point is located on these faults and that the possibility of a 7-point earthquake is probable. When is up for grabs. Well, we don't have to worry about earthquakes because severe hurricanes are expected sooner than later, and I remember during Hurricane Sandy I was up all night listening to reports about anticipating the surge, the storm surge, and it came within inches of the fuel ponds here at Indian Point.

Now, New York City does not need the energy from Indian Point, and they -- it's clear from just a few days ago, the Public Service Commission approved a series of three projects that would enable the upstate energy to get downstate through changes in the transfer policies and in changing the grid. So it's not for any kind of necessity that we need Indian Point and we must move -- not only shut it
down, not produce any more waste and put this waste that we have into dry cask storage. And I would wish that somebody knew about that.

I have several questions that remain, and I don't know where the answers are coming from. Where is --

MR. CAMERON: Could you state them pretty quickly?

MS. GEIST: Yes, I'll just state them very quickly.

MR. CAMERON: Yes, thank you.

MS. GEIST: Where is the money for decommissioning Indian Point? Does this fund include plans for converting to hard cask storage? What happens if Entergy walks away and goes out of business? If the operating permits are not renewed now, when does the de-commissioning start? Under whose management? The guy outside told me that Entergy wouldn't have to do anything for 60 years if it stopped, you know, operating the plant.

MR. CAMERON: Sheila, I'm going to have to ask you to wrap up.

MS. GEIST: All right. The last question is what money and plans are in place to oversee this transformation?
MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you Sheila.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: And next we're going to go to Jessica. And then to Jeanne.

MS. AZULAY: Hi, my name is Jessica Azulay, and I'm here from Syracuse, New York.

(Applause)

MS. AZULAY: Thank you. It was a long drive. I'm a staff organizer with Alliance for a Green Economy. We're a statewide coalition of environmental and social justice organizations, and we're concerned about the waste building up at Indian Point, as well as New York's four other nuclear reactors, which are all on the shore of Lake Ontario, Fitzpatrick, Ginna, Nine Mile Point 1, and Nine Mile Point 2.

I was born in 1979 and that's the year the NRC started writing the first version of its Waste Confidence Rule, so for my entire lifetime this rule has been used by the NRC to dodge hard questions about the legacy of the dangerous radioactive waste building up at our reactors.

(Applause)

MS. AZULAY: I'm now 34 and tens of
thousands more tons of nuclear waste have been generated since 1979, but in all this time, we've not come any closer to a solution. In fact, with the cancellation of the Yucca Mountain project, we may be farther away than ever, and we have more radioactive waste problem than ever.

I have to tell you, no offense to the people in the room who have been fighting this issue for a long time, but it makes me pretty mad that previous generations decided it was fine to create piles of deadly toxic waste without a plan.

(Applause)

MS. AZULAY: And now the NRC has crafted this superficial new document to justify the same old policy. This is a policy that deprives people like me from the ability to challenge the continued production of radioactive waste at reactors near where we live even when we can clearly see there is still no actual plan for storing it or removing it.

I can only imagine how the next generation and the generations after that are going to feel when the amount of nuclear waste has grown even larger and they are dealing with the inevitable problems of dangerous leaking old fuel pools and the difficulties, costs, spills, and accidents that will
come from moving waste from pools to dry casks and then from dry casks to other dry casks.

I have confidence that they will wonder in bewilderment what people in our day were thinking when the choice was made to continue with nuclear power and continue generating this waste instead of switching to renewables. I imagine they won't be amused by the rosy predictions in this Generic Environmental Impact Statement just as I am not amused by the prediction from 1979 that a centralized repository would be ready around 2009.

The Draft Waste Confidence Rule, in this rule the NRC makes the assumption that the storage of spent nuclear fuel poses a sufficient hazard to the environment and to humans that Regulatory controls and oversight will continue indefinitely, decades even centuries after a reactor shuts down.

Likewise, the Generic Environmental Impact Statement is full of predictions that we will have a yet to be invented or tested equipment like dry transfer systems and casks that can reliably last for 100 years.

MR. CAMERON: Jessica, could you just wrap up for us. Thank you.

MS. AZULAY: Yes. This reveals the true
nature of the Waste Confidence Rule. It's not about confidence in an existing plan. It's about confidence that if reactors are allowed to continue to create dangerous waste, future humans will, out of necessity, take on the responsibility for dealing with that waste to the best of our ability precisely because it's so dangerous. Basically, this is a policy of spew it, and they will have no choice but to deal with it.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you Jessica. We're going to Jeanne, Jeanne Shaw. Then Jeffrey Brown, Michelle Solomon and Julie Woodward.

MS. SHAW: Hi, I'm Jeanne Shaw. I live in Croton-on-Hudson about five-and-a-half miles from Indian Point. And I'm not going to talk about any of the things everyone else has already talked about because I think we're all tired. But one thing I want to go back to is Richard Thomas. There was something he mentioned early on in this meeting, and really it stuck with me a lot, so I want to address that.

And it comes down to what's real and what's imaginary. What's imaginary is gridlock in
Washington. Gridlock in Washington is something that we create as humans, as citizens and it means nothing. What's real is nature and science, and what's real is that nuclear waste is forever. There's no time span that's conceivable to human beings that can deal with nuclear waste and its time span.

Not only that, the seismic reality at Indian Point is ridiculous and that's not something that any gridlock in Washington can affect either. Seismic reality tells us that Yucca Mountain couldn't work. Sure, there was politics against it, but ultimately, those politics will come and go with the decades. Ten years from now the politics that affected that will have no meaning whatsoever, but the reality in science will still be the same if not worse. You can't go burying this stuff anywhere in the world and expect to get away with it.

Just because they're doing it in Finland doesn't mean we can do it here. It doesn't even mean they can do it there. They just are. Hello. It's the world. The earth is not static. The earth moves constantly, and I mean constantly. Everything in the world is going to what we now think of as hell or heaven and that's real. And that's not theological,
so what are you going to do with nuclear waste? It's not anything you can do with. It's beyond not being worth the risk. It's not worth anything. It's got to stop being made.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Jeanne. Thank you. And Jeffrey. This is Jeffrey Brown. Then we're going to go to Julie Woodward, Jerry Bonanno and Alfred Meyer.

MR. BROWN: My name is Jeffrey Brown. I live about 18 miles from the Oyster Creek Nuclear Waste generating station at the Jersey Shore. I was delighted that our Attorney General joined your Attorney General in the original action that led to this having to be done. I hope that he is going to re-join the efforts as were indicated by the first speaker to deal with this legally.

The previous Waste Confidence was a house of cards built on a foundation of wishful thinking and it's clear that everybody here or majority of the people here are saying we don't want another wishful thinking document. That the only function that this Waste Confidence decision seems to be providing is aid and comfort to the industry to
continue business as usual.

Frequently within the document, as I skimmed it, I noticed a phrase "the reasonable approach," the reasonable approach which basically eliminated what most of the people here tonight have asked for, but it seems to me the only reasonable approach is Germany's. Stop making it.

(Applause)

MR. BROWN: Phase it out in a decade. Figure out how to operate an advanced industrial economy with safe alternatives. We in Oyster Creek also have the problem of the unknown unknowns as was alluded to a couple of times earlier, namely of the high burn-up fuel issue. Just as recently as Monday we've asked the NRC "Do we have high burn-up fuel at Oyster Creek?" And we're assured, no, no. But the document from the U.S. Department of Energy Inventory and Description of Commercial Reactive Fuels in the United States published in March 31, 2011, clearly states we do. And many other reactors do.

Now, the problem with high burn-up fuel for this waste confidence issue in part is that it makes the fuel rods embrittled, much worse than they would be otherwise. Therefore, even handling them becomes more difficult. There's more likelihood of
damage. It makes it more difficult to transport, so that the problem is multiplied. And so how can we have confidence that whatever the unknown unknowns that are going to be discovered going forth will be handled. I say we do not.

We in New Jersey join you in saying "No confidence."

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you Jeffrey. And Julie, Julie Woodward.

MS. WOODWARD: My name is Julie Woodward, and I get my energy from Croton Close Indian Point, and tonight some of my remarks will overlap what's been said before, but I wrote this this afternoon.

I know this evening is focusing on Waste Confidence, but we can't do that without talking also about confidence in the NRC and in most of our elected officials.

Onsite waste storage at nuclear plants is literally a very hot topic for the people who live and work in the vicinity, but you would never know it from the inexcusable silence on the part of most of our elected officials. And by local, I mean from congress-people down. We keep putting these people
back in office because we think the alternative candidates would speak even less to our interests. But people like Schumer, Gillibrand, aren't doing us any favors on this issue.

I'm too old to learn how to tweet, but I do know how to Google, and this afternoon I Googled both of these senators and a number of other elected that should be out there fighting for our safety or the -- and their constituents in this region. Schumer seemed to have gingerly stepped up to the plate 13 years ago after Con Ed reopened Indian Point Number 2 in 2001. The Times reported that he faulted Con Ed and the NRC for not providing a full, timely accounting of the new leaks and said that until NRC verifies that Indian Point is in good working condition and will not leak, the doors of this nuclear power plant cannot in good conscious be reopened.

I'll shorten my remarks, but the next time he spoke on the issue of Indian Point was in 2007. That's six years later. The most recent comments he made were about barbeque grills at a time when we expected him to be talking about Indian Point.

Senator Gillibrand seemed even less
concerned. Lohud reported almost two years ago that she actually supported building new reactors in communities that want them. Her quote "There's lots of places in the state that would certainly welcome a nuclear facility."

One minute. Really? I guess so. So the point that I'm trying to make is that it is incomprehensible to me that with all the information that's out there on the amount of spent fuel being stored at Indian Point and the questionable way in which Entergy is storing it, that with all the experience we've had with terrorism and catastrophic accidents here and abroad, not to mention the President's campaigning against the Yucca Mountain site starting in 2008, scudding it in 2011, that most of New York electeds cannot find a way to come out against storing such seriously hazardous waste in this part of their state.

These people need to break the ties they have with big money and start to think reality. Nuclear waste does not go away. Right here in Buchanan this stuff is not on our doorstep but inside our house. We need whomever we put into office to start feeling very uncomfortable about the money they accept from a corporation like Entergy, the whole
industry in fact --

(Applause)

MS. WOODWARD: -- that puts profit over limited half-baked solutions and potential long-term devastation. Many of us already have no confidence in the NRC. It's been said tonight. We don't know how many of their policies are colored by this kind of money, nor do we believe anyone can have confidence in any so-called solutions that allow for waivers or for the continued production and storage of nuclear substances.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much Julie.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: And this is Jerry Bonanno. And next we'll go to Alfred Meyer and then James Levin. Jerry Bonanno.

MR. BONANNO: Thanks Chip. My name is Jerry Bonanno. I'm an attorney with the Nuclear Energy Institute. My comments tonight are going to focus on what I know best which are the legal issues and specifically, the division of responsibility among the agencies in the Federal Government with respect to used fuel management.

There's a lot -- there's been a lot of
focus on the issue of repository availability in these public meetings and there's understandably a lot of frustration regarding the politically motivated delays in siting and constructing a geologic repository in the United States. It's worth noting that the NRC's role in a Federal repository program is distinct from the agency's consideration of repository availability when it licensed commercial nuclear power reactors.

Focusing on the NRC's role in the Federal repository program, it's important to understand that the NRC is not responsible for siting, constructing, or operating a geologic repository for used nuclear fuel. Under the current legal framework, that responsibility falls squarely with the Department of Energy. Instead as the D.C. Circuit recently reiterated, the law requires that the NRC review DOE's application, make a decision about whether the proposed repository can be constructed and operated safely.

Setting aside decisions regarding the licensing of specific repositories, the relevant question in this proceeding is what, if anything, is the NRC obligated to conclude with respect to repository safety when licensing commercial power
reactors. For the past 35 years, the Commission has characterized the necessary finding as reasonable assurance that methods of safe permanent disposal can be available when necessary.

This reasonable assurance finding does not equate to a definitive finding on the safety of a specific repository. In a 1978 decision called NRDC versus NRC, Second Circuit Court of Appeals clarified that halting reactor licensing until definitive findings on repository safety are reached is not required by the Atomic Energy Act. In that decision the court recognized that Congress enacted a framework that calls for development of a repository and parallel with the development of commercial nuclear power in the United States.

It's equally clear that uncertainty caused by the political and social resistance to the development of a repository might justify examination of extremely unlikely scenarios such as in a repository scenario in order to satisfy NEPA. But it's not the NRC's role to resolve such uncertainty or cure such resistance.

In fact, the same decision -- in the same decision, the Second Circuit concluded that resolution of such political and social resistance to
the development of a geologic repository must come from a legislative branch of government, not the NRC. The primacy of a legislative branch in setting national nuclear energy policy was also stressed by the U.S. Supreme Court in its 1978 decision Vermont Yankee versus NRDC. So absent a clear scientific or technical barrier to achieving safe geologic disposal or continued storage or a drastic change in the Federal Used Fuel Policy completely abdicating the government's responsibility to dispose of used fuel in position of a broad open ended moratorium on licensing commercial power reactors by the NRC would raise serious separation of powers issues.

I'll wrap up. I know I'm out of time. I'll end by just saying that, you know, our position is that as an independent health and safety regulator, the NRC has asked and answered the appropriate questions regarding repository availability in the Draft GEIS and Proposed Rule.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you Jerry.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Is Alfred Meyer?

Emily, do you want to come up? This is
Emily Sack. And then James Slevin, Allegra Dengler, Barbara Kidney. Emily.

MS. SACK: Good evening. Thank you. Not that it should really matter, but I, too, live inside the ten-mile zone of Indian Point. When I contemplate 250,000 years, I just ask everyone to think a moment who could even imagine that span of time, and that's the amount of time that this, what is referred to as "Poison Fire" by Joanna Macy, who has thought about these issues a lot, has called it. And how can we conceive words like "always, certainty, leak-proof, safe, rigorously inspected, safely and reliably, and confidence."

I have confidence that the sun will rise in the east and basically, death and taxes. But I don't have confidence that any agency could actually take responsibility and carry out a responsibility to deal with this huge, huge issue. When I hear news or information presented as fact, I ask myself what's the source of the information and what does that source have to gain by their so-called facts? Follow the money is my motto, and I respect everyone here who has spoken and who has spoken on both sides of -- on whatever side of this issue. However, it cannot be said that somebody who works for the nuclear
industry is disinterested, is a disinterested party.

I'm old enough to remember a whole lot of lies starting for me with the Vietnam war, with what got us into the Vietnam war, the Iraq war, asbestos poisoning, the tobacco industry, the risks of smoking and enough of the lies except the lie about clean nuclear power. When -- it's true that nuclear energy doesn't produce carbon in the actual production of energy of electricity. However, from the start of mining and building and all the other things that go into making a plant startup, there's plenty of damage done and it's not economical. It's definitely not economical. Amory Lovins, a brilliant scientist who works on practical solutions and is a co-founder of the Rocky Mountain Institute, has said nuclear power is not -- is not viable and that efficiency and the development of more sustainable methods of getting energy are the way to go but --

MR. CAMERON: Emily --

MS. SACK: Yes. I just urge everybody to look up on Google Joanna Macy and her idea for the storage onsite of this poison fire and the creation of communities around each site that will keep the story -- that will tell the story of the poison fire for generations and generations and pass it along so
that as people come up, they know that this is something that they have to respect and that as science and storage improves, the most up-to-date storage will be taken and --

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

MS. SACK: Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you Emily.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Is James Slevin? James Slevin. How about Allegra? Okay. And then Barbara Kidney, Mark Fry, Andrew Dalton, Steve Laifer. And this is Allegra?

MS. DENGLER: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: Hi.

MS. DENGLER: Hi. Boy, this is a great crowd to stay until the bitter end. Allegra Dengler. I'm representing the Sierra Club. I have some remarks, but I think I'll leave those to written remarks because I can't fit it in three minutes.

Indian Point contains almost three times the amount of radioactive material in the spent fuel pools that are causing so much trouble from Fukushima. Three times as much radiation in the spent fuel pools. But, on the other hand, Indian Point is number one. We're -- Indian Point is number
one in safety violations of any plant in the United States. It's number one in the risk of earthquake damage of any plant in the United States. It's number one in the risk of flooding of any plant in the United States. It's number one in the most impossible evacuation plan -- plan of any plant in the state. It's number one in the most risk to the most people of any plant in the United States.

(Applause)

MS. DENGLER: And it's number one in risk to the United States economy of any plant in the United States. World Series night, Yankees alone is an over three billion dollar economic industry within this -- within the 50 miles, within 20 miles.

There is nothing generic about Indian Point and if any of this rulemaking should address the worst-case scenario at Indian Point, what you do with this waste? Staying on the theme of waste, just segue way into "S*T happens." Just speaking from myself, we're remembering Sandy. A year ago my family lost our little beach house out at Breezy Point Queens. It was one of the 135 houses that burned. 345 houses were destroyed. Most of those were owner occupied. In July, the big tree in my backyard got caught in one of these little micro
bursts and was broken off and dropped on my house, and I still have, you know -- I'm dealing with contractors, roof repairs, no heat. So I personally am feeling that climate change is personal. It's real. It's here. My personal pain, economic dislocation is nothing compared to what other people are suffering from climate change around the world.

In Breezy Point my neighbors, for whom these were their primary homes that they lost, where there's nothing left now but sand, but we can -- somehow or other people will go back to Breezy Point. Now you look at the maps there's nothing there. In two years, three year it will be back, but you look at those same maps of Fukushima, people aren't going back. Tens of thousands of people are never going back, so just make -- put this waste, which is now overflowing these spent fuel pools, into dry cask storage immediately and stop creating more of the stuff.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

MS. DENGLER: Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you Allegra.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: This is Barbara, and then we're going to go to Mark. Thank you. This is
Barbara.

MS. KIDNEY: Hello, my name is Barbara Kidney. I live in southern Ulster County. I work in Orange County, and I'm here in Westchester County tonight having shut my business down early and, you know, coming, as you all have, to stay for a very long meeting because I think this is such a very important issue. And -- but it's kind of hard for me to make a coherent statement for a couple of reasons. One, I'm about to fall asleep through my own remarks. Secondly, other than that, the situation is so absurd, is it not? I mean here we are, hard-working people coming from all over the place.

(Applause)

MS. KIDNEY: And it's kind of like we're having this long meeting to determine "Gee, is it safe to drink the arsenic," you know. You know, is it safe to jump off a ten-story building? Well, we're at story number five. Everything is cool, right, why worry? It's safe, you know, it's that kind of thinking. So I'm just going to touch on a few points to emphasize a few points that other speakers have made so well.

The denial process, you know, Daniel Fullerton, I think, touched on that. By trade I am a
psychologist, so I think I'm somewhat, you know, equipped to deal with the issue of denial and dysfunctionality, as in, "Well, sure, I drink five quarts of vodka today, but I'm not an alcoholic. Come on, you know."

So anybody who has any kind of intelligence or is past the age of five knows for sure that nuclear energy is very unsafe. But -- thank you. But a process that human beings, we all engage in this at times, is rationalization, right. If a truth is too inconvenient, we generate pseudo reasons why what we're doing that's really dangerous is really okay. So that's something that's going on. Thank you.

The other thing I would like to point out and emphasize again, is of course, how shall I put this? Well, I will put it this way. In a functional society the decision-making on any issue would not be open to anyone who has a vested interest in the outcome of that decision, right.

(Applause)

MS. KIDNEY: Meaning -- meaning of course that the honorable thing is that if you're making money off of, say, Indian Point, you recuse yourself from decision-making about waste storage and
whether it should be open because even if you try to be devoid of the conflict of interest, it's going to be there and present, you know, your livelihood depends on it. And for those people who are making a living by, you know being engineers or management people or secretaries at Indian Point, yes, I have sympathy for your predicament, but it's kind of like, you know, you're making money off something that's very dangerous.

The witch burnings in Europe went on for 300 years because the interrogators of witches and the people who made instruments of torture for the interrogation, it was a big money-maker in Europe, you know. We got to put money behind good stuff that we need and take it away from poisoning the water, poisoning the air, poisoning the earth, poisoning ourselves, et cetera.

Thank you.

(Appause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you Barbara. And this is Mark. Mark Fry.

MR. FRY: Good evening. My name is Mark Fry. I live in Sleepy Hollow, New York, and in spite of the fact I have on a nice jacket, I want to point out I am an environmentalist. That I do not
represent --

(Laughter)

MR. FRY: -- the United States Nuclear Regulatory Agency. Let me see if I -- can I get this a little closer. I guess I'll just lean forward.

I want to give a little different perspective on this. When I came to Tarrytown in 1977, I met an old man. Now, my own grandfather was born in 1882. The old man I met, Wally Buxton was born in 1900, and in the business I owned on Main Street in Tarrytown everyday he gave me a lesson in the history of Tarrytown. So if you ask Wally, "What do you know about 18 Main Street?" He said "Oh, George E. Cole lived there in 1904." I said "Well, how do you know that, Wally?" He said "I used to play with George Cole in 1904." And Wally never drove. I was born before the horseless carriage, and he died on his way to work at a bus stop with his wife at the age of 92.

He'd seen a lot of changes in Tarrytown. He -- we only had in the building I ended up buying at 18 Main Street and restoring, we had gas lamps, gas lamps. And the -- all of the piping was still there, and I was helping the electrician remove the old dead piping, and he was telling a story, "Oh, in
Yonkers we found out it was still live." I said "Oh, man, I'm glad that's not true here." Well, it was. We wrenched open a pipe in the attic and it was still live. Everything had been taken out 40 years -- I'm sorry, 50 years previously except for one pipe running up behind the wall against the foundation.

Fortunately, we were able to shut that gas off, find -- I'm sorry, okay, one minute to go. Prevented an explosion, but I'm here to talk first of all, let me jump to a legal conclusion. I write DEIS's for a living and I -- not for a living, but I've had occasion to write them.

Let me jump to my conclusions first of all on this and I analyzed them. I don't think I agree with Philip Musegaas of RiverKeeper absolutely that this particular -- there cannot be a Generic Environmental Impact Statement. It is not sufficient when there's a broad variety of different risks at different locations, so I reject the very basis of it.

Secondly, I have analyzed a lot of -- enough of the DEIS's, usually looking critically at a developer's DEIS, to make a couple of points. It's like the old -- what they used to say about computers, garbage-in, garbage-out. And when I look
at this Generic EIS and I see line after line of small risk, small risk, small risk, it's their unsubstantiated assertions and conclusions based on those unsubstantiated assertions are necessarily false.

We've gone through a lot of technologies. The coal that we were mining, we thought was harmless and we found that tens of thousands of people died of black lung disease. The manufactured gas that was manufactured here in Tarrytown, $14,000,000 to clean up the coal tar. We thought that --

MR. CAMERON: Mark, could you give us the rest -- I think we would like to hear the rest of your conclusions, but if you could just wrap up.

MR. FRY: Yes, I will

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

MR. FRY: I should note, I think RiverKeeper certainly, I've been a member of RiverKeeper, Clearwater, and so forth, but all of the new technologies we've gone through whether it was leaking gas, gas tanks that have taken out aquifers in Armonk, New York, where I lived, permanently destroyed the aquifer in Wilton. All of these technologies were unproven and brought with them all
kinds of risk that were unmeasurable at the time. We thought it was all safe.

We think this is safe. In my view it is not safe technology. We didn't expect the pools to leak. They're leaking into the Hudson River I love right now this minute as we are speaking. These are unacceptable risks. The process by which the risks are being evaluated are unacceptable and I would ask the NRC most respectfully to reject -- answer the two questions in the negative. I don't think we have shown that the safely -- we can safely store spent nuclear fuel for the -- after the operational life of the reactor. And I don't think we're going to have an answer in 60 years. I was in Germany recently. They have a fabulous sustainable energy program. It's incredible the progress we've made. Let's make that our model going forward.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you Mark.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: And is it Andrew, Andrew Dalton and Steve later if he's still here. Then Craig Waters, Eric Burgher, and Susan Kelly.

MR. DALTON: Yes, my name is Andrew Dalton and I think it's time for a major shift in
thinking towards evaluating risks and, you know, et
cetera. And I'm going to call upon somebody whose
name may ring a bell, Dick Cheney. Remember him? He
used to be vice president. He said the following
about a completely different matter, the war on
terror. Sometime after 9/11 he is supposed to have
said this, "You may convince me that the risk of
another 9/11 attack on our country is low. Low
probability we'll call it, but if it does happen, the
consequences will be huge. So we will call it low-
probability, high-consequence equation."

Bringing the top around to this one, I
could believe perhaps, I don't really, but I could
believe everything I've heard from, you know, the
union gentleman from Indian Point, the engineer about
the safety of the casks, the young people talking
about clean energy and how we need it. I could
believe all of that and yet I'm still stuck with this
low-probability, high-risk equation.

Low probability is not the same thing as
saying no -- no possibility, right. I keep hearing
this phrase "small risk" in the GEIS, but small risk
is not no risk, and unless we had -- we really have
no risk in all of this, the consequences are so huge.
We spent millions and billions of dollars in pursuit
of Cheney's idea about low risk but high probability, so we have the war on terror. If we use the same kind of thinking towards solving our energy problems, getting rid of the low-risk nuclear and, you know, some of the other things that are also low risk, I'm sure like fracking, and really put that same attention, you know, into solving our energy and environment problems that we're putting into the war on terror, I think we could do it.

I mean frankly, if Germany, the high-energy use country that it is, can do away with nuclear power plants, why can't the states?

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Is Steve Laifer here?

How about Craig Waters or Eric Burgher?

How about Susan Kelly?

Janet Marcley-Hayes? Here she is.

MS. HAYES: I will be brief. It's so fundamentally and fearsomely apparent that a mistake has been made. Starting to generate nuclear energy before a plan was formulated regarding the used rods was the mistake and is now a huge problem.

We can stop compounding this mistake by
closing operations until such time as we have a solution to that problem. There is a time for every purpose, to make mistakes and a time to recognize that a mistake has been made and to stop making that mistake.

It is so absurd. It reminds me of "How do we make pigs fly?" Well, we don't know, but let's just forward -- go forward as if we did know and drop them out of planes and hope a plan will be developed before they land. It's double speak. Waste Confidence. I mean the ministry of truth has been at work folks.

(Applause)

MS. HAYES: We have to close the nuclear reactors, put that money, the millions and billions of dollars into developing renewable energy. It's not that hard.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.

Thank you.

Ayumi Mergee?

AUDIENCE: She had to leave.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And I think Lawrence. Lawrence Salley probably left. I think he
was here earlier. George Klein. There's George.

MR. KLEIN: Hi. Thanks to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for holding these hearings and I beseech you to live up to your title there. You probably can't see it back there. It says "Protecting people and the environment."

I'm George Klein. I'm the Chairman of the Sierra Club Lower Hudson Group which has about 4,000 members in Westchester, Rockland, and Putnam counties, and we have called for years for the closure of Indian Point, as has the state entity of the Sierra Club.

I live about six miles from Indian Point and I'm speaking for the Sierra Club. I'm speaking as a grandfather and as a father. The remarks I'm going to read were written by Laurie Seeman of New City, New York, over in Rockland. She is a member of the Rockland Water Coalition and a member of the Sparkill Creek Watershed Alliance and the Director of the Strawtown Studio.

"I have no confidence that under any rules that waste stored at Indian Point will be handled appropriately." This is Laurie speaking.

"Recently I received a Geiger counter to take part in the project for monitoring radiation from levels in
our atmosphere caused by Indian Point for citizens to live within the ten-mile dead zone. The impossible-to-evacuate zone, and I work with children. The experience of using the Geiger counter makes the reality of Fukushima so profoundly real.

I've seen a documentary with the citizens of Fukushima with Geiger counters. It is haunting to walk about with a Geiger counter thinking of what it means that we need a detection program. We can only hope that this detection program is only going to be something that will wisely inform the shutdown of Indian Point and never to become a program that tells us which of our beds and pillows are too contaminated to lay down on at night.

When the women farmers from Fukushima came here a year ago, as they did, that is one thing that they said that stuck with me hard. That in Fukushima they had no place to rest safely at the end of each exhausting day. This is traumatic. Imagine you go to lie down and you know your pillow was contaminated with radiation.

Then also imagine that your family is divided maybe forever. The elders did not want to leave their homes. Men stayed behind to work while women left with children. Imagine. Imagine. But
don't just imagine. People need to realize the vulnerability we live with every day with Indian Point is tick-tocking toward the eventuality of causing increased sickness. The women of Fukushima came here to tell the people of the Hudson Valley and the NRC 'learn from Fukushima. Do not let this happen to you.'"

MR. CAMERON: And could we -- can we put that on the record.

MR. KLEIN: Yeah, I'm going to give it to you and you can put it on record.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Can you just wrap up for us.

MR. KLEIN: But let's -- let's close Indian Point and the many tons of radioactive material that are impounded at Indian Point. If we relicense Indian Point we're going to add at least 50 percent more. This is -- this is lunacy. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. Is Susan Leiter. Hi Susan. Do you want to come up and speak?

MS. LEITER: I don't know if you can
stand it anymore.

MR. CAMERON: And thank all of you for
hanging in there. This is Susan.

MS. LEITER: Hi. I work with the Sierra
Club, and I also work with a group of Close Indian
Point people called Stony Point 55. And I'm
listening to all of this and I'm thinking we're
dealing with Entergy. It's a specific corporation.
It does specific things. Its stockholders decided
not to change the spent fuel rods that were ready to
go into dry cask. Only 15 percent of them in dry
cask. 85 percent is left and they don't do anything.
They don't care about it. Who is going to pay for it
when they depart from the scene?

Entergy ran Indian Point during Sandy.
The buses had been canceled the day before. The
trains had been canceled the day before. There were
logs all over the roadways. They had no evacuation.
Not even a pretend evacuation. And still they
decided to keep running it. We're leaving the
responsibility for something as dangerous as this to
a corporation that doesn't act as if it cares. It
doesn't believe that its responsibility is to take
some of the profit and put the spent fuel rods that
are aged enough out of the pools which are too
crowded and put them in dry cask.

I don't believe the Nuclear Regulatory Commission can actually twist it enough to follow -- get them to follow anything that's real and I'm not assured that their staff, their engineers, and anything have a bigger picture in mind. And so, I would say let's close Indian Point.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you Susan. Thank you very much. Rachel Clark, Elizabeth Segal and Laurie Evans and Andrea Sadler. Rachel or Elizabeth. Elizabeth Segal is here.

MS. SEGAL: Good evening. So I'm Elizabeth Segal. I live right here in Tarrytown and like at least one of the other speakers, I don't have prepared remarks and I don't think I will be nearly as eloquent as that person was because I was very impressed.

So first of all I -- to me it is, yes, incredible that we continue to generate profoundly, profoundly toxic material whose toxicity lasts, as many people have said, beyond our imaginations and which I do not have any confidence that we can store safely. I don't -- I don't think anybody has figured that out, and the one thing that I think I can maybe
add to this conversation is, two people spoke about the program in Finland. And there is a wonderful movie whose name I can't remember now, but I'm going to -- Here to Eternity, right. Sorry, Into Eternity, and it is about the program in Finland Onkalo. It is a -- I'm going to send that to this email and I really hope that everybody involved in anything at the NRC watches it, because what is really impressive about it is that on the one hand, if you could think of the ideal way of doing this, Finland of course is relatively remote and certainly not extremely densely populated, and they have picked a site that is as much in the middle of nowhere as you could possibly imagine. I believe the geology is such that the rock base is very firm. They are going incredibly far down.

This is all shown beautifully in the film, and yet despite all of that, the risks and the problem of beginning to deal with what is going to happen in 1,000 years, 2,000, there are lots of very interesting problems, and they would be more interesting if they weren't endangering the entire planet.

One of the people asked the -- I think it was Darcy, what language are the signs going to
say? Well, they are dealing with that. They're even dealing with the question of should there be signs. What would it mean to people if they say, you know, don't go, this is very dangerous. Some people might react and think oh, there's something there that I -- anyway, so Onkalo, the Into Eternity film shows both sort of what the best-case scenario of best minds trying to deal with the storage and despite all that, the fact that it is far from inadequate -- far from adequate.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Yes, sir, if you could join us up here and just introduce yourself to us.

MR. MEYER: Hi, my name is Bill Meyer. I'm with the Sierra Club as well. I'm the Conservation Vice Chair for the Chapter of New York State. In 1972, the Sierra Club National Group first voted to stop nuclear energy generation in this country, and we're continuing to do that here today.

I would like to thank the NRC for having us and Attorney General Schneiderman for making this issue come to the courts.

First, I would like to dispel the myth that nuclear power is carbon-free energy. It is the
seventh most carbon-intensive energy source we have. Uranium mining is one of the most fossil-fuel intensive industries out there. Converting yellowcake into uranium is very fossil-fuel intensive and transporting the fuel is very expensive as well and takes a lot of truck trips.

Nuclear energy in general is the most expensive way we have in the world to generate power. I don't know why we're still generating power using nuclear energy. The fact is that cheaper wind is closing down nuclear power plants. Yankee -- Vermont Yankee closed because it was losing money.

The only nuclear power plants being built in this country are in South Carolina, and they have to pre-charge their rate payers in order to afford to build these plants, and these rate payers are also paying for the cost overruns of these plants. These plants are unsustainable economically. They're also unsustainable environmentally. We need to take away government-subsidized insurance policies for these plants.

(Applause)

MR. MEYER: We need to stop the farce that we can find safe geological storage for nuclear waste for 250,000 years. Once we stop the farce and
take away the nuclear-subsidized policy, there will be no nuclear industry in this country or anywhere else.

We heard from nuclear storage engineer earlier tonight. Do you think there's a conflict of interest there. He testified unequivocally that storage systems for spent nuclear fuel work, that they are tight, and that there is no possible way for these systems to leak. Well, I have news for all the other engineers who have worked on these systems. They are leaking.

Vermont Yankee closed in part because it was leaking and it was too expensive to dig up all the miles of pipes to figure out where the leak was. Indian Point is leaking. There are plants across the country leaking as we speak. This is what scares me the most. Engineers make questionable assumptions to support their designs. Designs that may be built under conflict of interest, that is to support the nuclear industry.

This GEIS, the flaws in this GEIS make this clear that there are conflict-of-interest issues. No matter how much detail goes into these designs, there will be unforeseeable circumstances in the future that future generations will have to bear.
With all due respect, the engineers who have made these assumptions in the GEIS should be ashamed of themselves. These are real people lives that we're talking about.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you Bill. Is Laurie Evans here?

MR. MEYER: One more point here to make. It's not here. Oh, yes. How can we trust NRC when we see all of these flaws in their assumptions? The point I would like to make here is that the system for long-term mined geological storage has failed. We see that through Yucca Mountain, through the salt caverns in Kansas, and I would ask the nuclear -- NRC to -- the only solution we could have is to immediately stop generating all nuclear power. Move to wind, solar, and efficiency. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: And this is Laurie, Laurie Evans.

MS. EVANS: Hello, my name is Laurie Evans. I'm Director of Westchester Safe, and I've been a resident of Westchester for 26 years. I'm here to say "No confidence."
An image I have in my mind right after Fukushima is a young mom in a shelter with her five-year-old and she said "Before the accident I didn't think about it. Now my husband is still working at the plant after the accident, and I don't know what our future holds."

Another person trained as a nuclear physicist, her sister asked her "What is the impact on human health?" She said "We didn't learn that in our studies."

And I was with Laurie Seeman the day we met with the organic farmers, the moms from Fukushima a year ago, who said they had to send their soil to France to be tested, and that instead of protecting their children at the schools, the government raised the allowable levels.

Last week at an event on nuclear energy, Naoto Kan, the prime minister of Japan when Fukushima occurred, said that he had been a supporter of nuclear power, but after the Fukushima accident I changed my thinking 180 degrees. He said that the first days of the accident it looked like an area that included Tokyo. He said "We do have accidents such as an airplane crash and so on, but no other accident or disaster can affect 50 million people."
And Jaczko, the former NRC Chair, said Fukushima exploded the myth that severe accidents wouldn't happen. Severe accidents can and will.

Just yesterday I got word that more marine life is dying in the Pacific Ocean. Food in California is contaminated. It's time now to shut down Indian Point and put the fuel that is already there into dry cask storage.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Is Andrea Sadler here? Or perhaps Edie Kantrowitz?

Paula, Paula Gotsch? Katherine Congdon?

How about Blake Rowe? Or Joe Porrovecchio?

Jackie Drexler?

Jocelyn DeCrescenzo -- Jocelyn, is that you?

Good.

MS. DECRESCENZO: (Inaudible)

MR. CAMERON: So I guess we got you just in time.

And DeCrescenzo?

MS. DECRESCENZO: Actually, that's my sister Josie.
MR. CAMERON: Oh, that's Jocelyn.

MS. JACKIE DECRESCENZO: I'm Jackie.

Thank you. So it's a pleasure to be here once again. And I'm usually quite eloquent. I really respect everyone that has spoken tonight. But all I can think of, and I know this is going to be very crude and rude, all I can think of is my father, who really would have just been aghast at what is going on. And all I can think of is the expression he told me once. All you can do is put your head between your knees and kiss your ass goodbye. That's all.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: That's your sister?

MS. JOCELYN DECRESCENZO: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: All right. Okay. This is Jocelyn.

MS. JOCELYN DECRESCENZO: Yes.

Yes, here we are again. Some things never change it seems. I have absolutely no confidence in the NRC. I'm actually just going to look at you four gentleman because you are from the NRC, yes? Yes.

I'm really shocked by the audacity that you have presented such a general document for Indian Point. And I know I should say thank you for being
here, but I don't thank you. You had two years to work on similar problem with Indian Point and nothing is done. It's just another rubber stamp.

I think your arrogance is shameful and I don't know how any one of you can look at me full in the face and tell me that I am safe.

I'd like to hear one of you say that to me.

MR. McCONNELL: We believe, as we said in the report, that spent fuel can be stored safely.

MS. JOCELYN DECRESCENZO: I don't believe that. And I'm -- I'm very upset. I think quite honestly that you've all insulted the intelligence of many people here tonight, and I am really shocked and dismayed by this, so that's all I have to say. I want Indian Point shut down immediately if not sooner, and I agree with my sister's statement that you can -- well, she said it very well. I don't need to repeat that.

So do your jobs and protect the public. I am the public. You are the public too. Protect me. That's your job so do it. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMERON: Is Bob, Bob Corn? Or Joe Asarat?
Well, I think that we've covered everybody and again, thank you for your patience and concern and comments. And we usually -- we're going to ask Keith McConnell to just close the meeting for us. Keith.

MR. McCONNELL: Just as Chip said, we do want to thank you for your participation. We want to thank you for keeping with us through this long meeting, and also, thank you very much for staying within the time and allowing all your colleagues and all your residents here to be able to participate and to provide their input, so we appreciate that very much.

So thank you and goodnight.

(Time noted: 10:45 p.m.)