

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Waste Confidence Proposed Rule and
Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement

Docket Number: NRC-2012-0246

Location: Oak Brook, Illinois

Date: Tuesday, November 12, 2013

Work Order No.: NRC-401

Pages 1-144

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

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 + + + + +

3 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

4 + + + + +

5 PUBLIC MEETING ON WASTE CONFIDENCE:

6 PROPOSED RULE AND DRAFT GENERIC

7 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

8 + + + + +

9 TUESDAY

10 NOVEMBER 12, 2013

11 + + + + +

12 CHICAGO MARRIOTT

13 1401 WEST 22ND STREET

14 OAK BROOK BALLROOM

15 OAK BROOK, ILLINOIS 60523

16 + + + + +

17 The above-entitled matter commenced at

18 7:00 p.m., facilitated by Ms. Miriam Juckett.

19 PRESENT:

20 MIRIAM JUCKETT, Facilitator

21 KEITH McCONNELL, Director

22 PAUL MICHALAK, Branch Chief

23 LISA LONDON, Attorney

24 SARAH LOPAS, Assistant Facilitator

25 SUSAN WITTICK

26 **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P R O C E E D I N G S

(7:07 P.M.)

MS. JUCKETT: Good evening, everyone. I'd like everyone to take a seat. We'll get started here in just a second.

Good evening, and welcome to this evening's Nuclear Regulatory Commission public meeting on Waste Confidence Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Rule. My name is Miriam Juckett and I will be your facilitator for this evening's meeting.

Before we get started, I'd like to go over just a few things that have to do with the process and the objectives so that everyone has a good idea of what to expect this evening. First of all, the objective for the NRC is to hear your comments and your recommendations on the draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement. We'll be calling that the GEIS during this meeting. And the staff will be here to hear your comments and will be taking these comments back to consider in the finalization of the EIS.

There are many ways to submit comments on this, and you'll hear about some of that in the presentations. But we want to make sure that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 everyone knows that whether you submit comments in
2 writing or whether you submit comments by speaking
3 them onto the record tonight, all of the comments
4 will be considered the same, all of them will be
5 considered equally. So, we do want to make sure that
6 we get your comments tonight for the NRC staff to
7 consider.

8 As part of the process for tonight, this
9 evening, we will be going through a couple of very
10 brief presentations by a couple of NRC staff members.
11 And then we'll go to a very short question and
12 answer, we'll take two or three questions, and the
13 main purpose of that is to make sure that everyone
14 understands the process for finalization of the EIS,
15 the schedule and things like that. But we'll just
16 take only a couple of questions since the main
17 portion of this evening's meeting is the comment
18 portion and that's when we'll open up the floor to
19 people who have registered to speak and those who
20 have walked up and said that they would like to
21 speak. And we'll ask you to come and make your
22 comments at the podium.

23 Now, our court reporter over here, Ron,
24 will be taking a transcript of this evening's
25 proceedings. So, you'll have a chance to speak your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 comments on the record for consideration. When we do
2 go to the comment portion, what I'll be doing is
3 calling everyone's name one by one, and I'll call two
4 or three at a time, and if you could make your way to
5 the front and take a couple of seats here for people
6 to get ready to go to the podium. Because we do have
7 so many people signed up to speak tonight, we are
8 very happy that we have a big crowd out tonight,
9 we'll ask everyone to stick to a three-minute limit.
10 And my colleague Pat LaPlante here will be holding up
11 a little sign to remind you when you're at one
12 minute, and that would mean how long your comment has
13 gone and you have one minute remaining. After that
14 one minute, I'll give you a signal to let you know to
15 wrap it up.

16 So, we do want to make sure that
17 everyone gets a chance to speak tonight. So, I'm
18 sorry in advance if I have to cut you off and let you
19 know that your three minutes are up. But we do want
20 to make sure that everyone gets a chance to speak.

21 So, with that, I just want to add a
22 couple of other housekeeping items before we
23 introduce tonight's speakers. You have a couple of
24 forms that are on the chairs. If you didn't, we
25 would be happy to provide you one. There's a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 feedback form that just lets us know how you felt
2 about how tonight's meeting went, and you can either
3 give it to any of the NRC staff who are here or if
4 you want you will be able to mail it in postage free.
5 We also have a few comment forms so that after
6 listening to the comments and maybe you already spoke
7 or you think of something that you want to be able to
8 say, you can write down your comments and give them
9 to the NRC staff members, and we'll be happy to take
10 those from you.

11 The other thing is the restrooms are out
12 the door to the left, right back here just in case.
13 We'll probably take a quick break towards the middle
14 depending on how the flow of the meeting is going and
15 we're getting everyone in to speak.

16 So, with that, I want to real quickly
17 introduce to you the NRC staff members who are here
18 today. We have Dr. Keith McConnell who is the
19 Director of the Waste Confidence Directorate. And we
20 have Paul Michalak who is the Branch Chief in the
21 Environmental Impact Statement Branch. We have Lisa
22 London who is from our Office of General Counsel.
23 And we would be remiss in not acknowledging Susan
24 Wittick, NTRO, who has done a lot of logistics for
25 this and for really helping us out.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Also, I want to make sure to mention
2 that you probably got to speak with some of the folks
3 that are out here from NRC. We are only taking
4 questions that have to do with process but we make
5 the staff available to you so that if you do have
6 more technical comments or questions that you want to
7 go up and speak with someone about, you're welcome
8 to, at any time, go talk to people out in the foyer,
9 that's what they're there for. And we want to make
10 sure that we keep the meeting to most of the
11 comments. That's why we're not going to be
12 responding to what you say from the podium, it will
13 just be the comments.

14 So, with that, let's get started with
15 our presentations, and Dr. Keith McConnell will give
16 the first presentation.

17 DR. McCONNELL: Thanks, Miriam, and good
18 evening, everyone. As Miriam indicated, I am Keith
19 McConnell and I am the Director of Waste Confidence
20 Directorate at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
21 Commission. I want to welcome you here
22 tonight for this public meeting on the Proposed Rule
23 called Waste Confidence. The purpose of the meeting
24 tonight is to gather your comments on this draft
25 Generic Environmental Impact Statement and proposed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 rule for the storage of spent nuclear fuel after the
2 operating life of a power reactor and before it's
3 disposed of in a geological repository, otherwise
4 known as Waste Confidence Rule.

5 These two documents, the draft Generic
6 Environmental Impact Statement and the Proposed Rule,
7 represent the culmination of the Directorate's
8 activities over the past year to respond to a U.S.
9 Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia decision
10 to vacate or void the 2010 version of the Waste
11 Confidence Rule and remand it back to the NRC staff
12 to fix certain deficiencies that relate to the impact
13 analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act.

14 Given that the purpose of tonight's
15 meeting is to gather your comments on this draft
16 Generic Environmental Impact Statement and proposed
17 rule, we the NRC staff intend to limit what we say so
18 that we can maximize the opportunity for you all to
19 provide us your comments. And it's our goal to stay
20 here until we hear everyone who signed up to speak.
21 So, we do encourage you to participate.

22 As Miriam has indicated, we do have a
23 technical staff back in the back of the room and out
24 in the foyer who have written the vast majority of
25 the draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 And I encourage you to take the opportunity to talk
2 to those individuals because they will be considering
3 your comments and they will be writing the final
4 draft of these two documents.

5 I also would like to take a few minutes
6 to talk about our rulemaking process. It's a very
7 important part of what we do at the NRC. It's how we
8 implement national policy and standards. And it's
9 how we maintain and achieve the NRC's goals of
10 maintaining public health and safety and security and
11 protection of the environment.

12 The meeting here tonight is a very
13 important part of that process. We're here to gather
14 and hear your comments. So, again we encourage you
15 to participate.

16 Tonight's meeting, which is one of 13
17 interactions with the public, formal interaction with
18 the public that we're having during this public
19 commentary, is just one of the efforts that we have
20 undertaken to make this Waste Confidence Rulemaking
21 effort as open and transparent as possible. In that
22 regard, we do appreciate those of you who
23 participated in the scoping meetings that occurred
24 last October and November, and also those of you that
25 have followed along the waste confidence activities

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 during our monthly public status calls. We do want
2 to hear your comments.

3 I would note that the five NRC
4 commissioners, when they reviewed the draft Generic
5 Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Rule
6 before it went out for public comment, specifically
7 asked that the public comment on five particular
8 questions. And they relate to the format and content
9 of the Waste Confidence Rule. And those questions
10 are out on the table so you can specifically pick
11 them up and know what they are. We'll be encouraging
12 you to provide your comments on those questions.
13 Those specific questions, as well as any generic
14 comments you have, will help us to improve the final
15 document in order to provide vital information to the
16 commissioners when they consider our final document
17 and how we've done -- and how well we've done to
18 respond to public comment.

19 So, with that, I'll turn it over to Paul
20 Michalak who will provide us with brief introductory
21 remarks.

22 MR. MICHALAK: Good evening. I'd like
23 to add to Keith's welcome and thank you for
24 participating today. My name is Paul Michalak and
25 I'm the Branch Chief of the Environmental Impact

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Statement Branch in the Waste Confidence Directorate.

2 At tonight's meeting, I'll give a brief
3 history of waste confidence, outline key aspects of
4 the draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement and
5 the proposed Waste Confidence Rule, and explain how
6 you can comment on these documents. Then we'll go to
7 the public comment portion of the meeting which is
8 really the heart of the matter.

9 Waste confidence accomplishes two
10 things. It generically addresses the environmental
11 impacts of continued storage and makes a
12 determination about the feasibility of safe storage
13 and the time frame for repository availability. A
14 draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement for
15 waste confidence satisfies part of the Commission's
16 National Environmental Policy Act obligations for
17 reactor licensing and relicensing, and the licensing
18 and relicensing of spent fuel storage facilities.
19 The generic environmental impact statement also
20 serves as the regulatory basis to support Waste
21 Confidence Rule.

22 The Environmental Impact Statement and
23 Proposed Rule only cover the time frame after the
24 licensed life for reactor operation. However, it is
25 important to note that the Proposed Rule on waste

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 confidence does not license any particular site or
2 facility. Nor does it allow for the long-term
3 storage of spent nuclear fuel at any site.

4 The NRC's history with waste confidence
5 started when the Commission issued the rule back in
6 1984. Since then, the rule has been updated, most
7 recently in 2010. In 2012, the rule was challenged,
8 and the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit vacated
9 the 2010 rule. The court identified three
10 deficiencies with the Commission's environmental
11 analysis to support the 2010 Waste Confidence Rule.
12 The Court found that the analysis didn't evaluate the
13 environmental effects of failing to secure permanent
14 disposal of the spent nuclear fuel.

15 It also directed the Commission to
16 provide a forward-looking assessment of spent fuel
17 pool leaks and the environmental consequences of
18 spent fuel pool fires. The court did conclude that a
19 generic approach, either with an environmental
20 assessment or environmental impact statement, would
21 appropriately address the issues associated with
22 waste confidence. Following the Court's decision,
23 the Commission directed the staff to prepare an
24 environmental impact statement evaluating these
25 issues with the possibility of issuing an updated

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Waste Confidence Rule.

2 There are two things that I would like
3 you to remember. The first is that waste confidence
4 is just a small part of the overall environmental
5 analysis for reactor -- for storage facility
6 licensing and relicensing. Secondly, the Waste
7 Confidence Rule does not license any facility or
8 authorize storage at the expiration of the facility's
9 license. The draft Statement describes the impacts
10 of continuing to store spent nuclear fuel beyond the
11 license life for operations of a reactor, whether it
12 be a spent fuel pool or an independent spent fuel
13 storage installation located at the -- both the
14 reactor and away from the reactor site.

15 The draft Statement describes why we're
16 revisiting waste confidence. It discusses the
17 alternatives to consider. It describes how the
18 environmental impacts were evaluated. It describes
19 what facilities are covered and the environmental
20 impacts of continued storage at reactor sites and
21 away from reactor sites.

22 It also contains information on the cost
23 of the alternatives to the rulemaking. It describes
24 the cumulative environmental impacts of continued
25 storage. And it contains information on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 feasibility of a repository and the feasibility for
2 safe storage of spent fuel.

3 The draft Statement assessed impacts of
4 continued spent fuel storage for three time frames
5 based upon when a repository would become available.
6 We evaluated the short term or 60 years beyond the
7 license life or reactor operation time frame. We
8 also evaluated a long-term time frame which is 100
9 years beyond the short term, or 160 years. And then
10 finally, there was an indefinite storage scenario
11 where no repository becomes available.

12 The draft Statement serves as the
13 regulatory basis for the Proposed Rule. The Proposed
14 Rule would generically address the environmental
15 impacts of continued storage. These impacts would
16 not be revisited in future site-specific licensing
17 procedures unless the NRC discovers something about
18 the site that would make the application of the
19 conclusions in the environmental impact statement
20 inappropriate.

21 The Proposed Rule would revise the
22 Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulations;
23 specifically, the citation is Title 10 of the Code of
24 Federal Regulations Section 51.23. The Proposed Rule
25 also states that the analysis supports the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Commission's determinations that it is feasible to
2 safely store spent nuclear fuel following the
3 licensed life for operation of a reactor. It also
4 states that it's feasible to have a mined geologic
5 repository within 60 years following the licensed
6 life for operation of a reactor.

7 We are specifically seeking comment on
8 whether the Final Rule should contain these last two
9 statements. To ensure that your comments are
10 considered, they must be received by December 20,
11 2013. Mailed comments must be postmarked by December
12 20th. All comments, whether submitted in writing or
13 provided orally, are considered equally.

14 Of course we are here tonight so you can
15 tell us your comments to the Generic Environmental
16 Impact Statement and the Proposed Rule. Tonight's
17 comments are being transcribed and will become part
18 of the record. You can also leave written comments
19 with the NRC staff located at the registration table
20 and we will make sure that those comments are added
21 to the docket. You may also e-mail, fax, or mail
22 your comments to the NRC. You may also provide
23 comments using the Federal Rulemaking site,
24 www.regulations.gov.

25 Thank you for listening to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 presentation. And I'll turn the meeting back over to
2 Miriam.

3 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Paul. We're
4 going to go very quickly to a couple of questions
5 people have. Are there any questions that anyone has
6 regarding the schedule or finalization of the Rule?
7 And could you please introduce yourself?

8 MR. SCHRAMEK: Yes, Jeffrey Schramek,
9 NEIS. Is there any possibility you could back the
10 slide about one slide so we can see the exact text of
11 what was just verbally described. It was on there
12 for two seconds or so.

13 MS. JUCKETT: Certainly. And I just
14 want to make you aware that these slides are
15 available outside, too, like a hard copy of the
16 slides. Any other questions?

17 MR. LESHAK: Will the docket be made
18 public? Mike Leshak with Independent Television. I
19 was wondering if the official docket with all the
20 public comments will be made available to the public
21 or only if you went to the NRC.

22 MS. JUCKETT: Certainly. Let me go
23 ahead and get Keith McConnell to answer that question
24 for you. The question was about whether or not all
25 the documents on the docket will be made public.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 DR. McCONNELL: The answer to your
2 question is yes. All of the documents will be made
3 public. The comments will be public. There will be
4 a comment response section in the final Generic
5 Environmental Impact Statement. And all of that
6 information will be available on our website, the
7 waste confidence website.

8 MS. JUCKETT: Any final questions on
9 process or schedules?

10 MS. THOMPSON: I was wondering, oh, I'm
11 sorry, I'm Tammy Thompson. I was wondering that the
12 spent fuel that you're talking about, will this be
13 coming from other facilities traveling to Illinois to
14 be stored here or is it the waste that's already at
15 the facilities that are here?

16 MS. JUCKETT: Okay, we want to make sure
17 that we're primarily concentrating on the process
18 questions here. But, why don't we take this one to
19 Paul Michalak.

20 MR. MICHALAK: Hi, Paul Michalak. The
21 fuel, the spent fuel that's considered in the
22 environmental impact statement is from commercial
23 reactors licensed by the United States. So, the
24 answer to your question is no, the fuel we're
25 considering is domestic commercial fuel. If the NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 licensed the facility, that fuel is considered in the
2 Generic Environmental Impact Statement.

3 MS. THOMPSON: Right. But are we
4 accepting fuel from other states into our state? Or
5 does our stuff stay here?

6 DR. McCONNELL: This is Keith McConnell.
7 In terms of the impacts analysis, the impacts the
8 analysis considered was generated onsite and was just
9 stored on the site.

10 MS. THOMPSON: Okay, thank you.

11 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. And I'm sorry to
12 cut this off. We have to make sure that we go ahead
13 and get to the comment portion. But I do want to
14 make sure that you know that we do have NRC folks
15 available out in the lobby to speak with if you do
16 have more questions. We will also stick around
17 afterwards so that you're welcome to come and ask us
18 questions individually.

19 So, let's go ahead and enter the comment
20 portion of the program. And when I call your name,
21 please make your way up to the front. We've got a
22 couple of chairs here for -- if you'd care to wait up
23 here as opposed to, it's just a little easier to get
24 out. Please do state your name and affiliation if
25 you can. And also, we need to make sure that, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 everybody has got differences of opinions and we'll
2 hear a wide variety of opinions today, we'd really
3 like that you be polite to each other and as we need
4 to get a clean transcript of this evening's meeting.

5 So, one speaker at a time and we'll go
6 in order, and also, if you didn't pre-register, we
7 are still accepting your comments. You're welcome to
8 go ahead and see if you can sign in at the
9 registration desk, or if you did pre-register and you
10 didn't get a chance to check in with the registration
11 desk. That just helps us to know that you're here
12 and you would still like to speak.

13 So, our first two speakers I'm going to
14 go to are Reed Wilson from the Office of Congressman
15 Adam Kinzinger, and next we'll go to Tom Wolf.

16 MR. WILSON: Good evening. I'm Reed
17 Wilson representing Congressman Adam Kinzinger
18 representing the 16th District in Illinois.

19 Dear Commissioners, I have a letter to
20 read here, thank you for allowing my office the
21 opportunity to address this public meeting regarding
22 Nuclear Regulatory Commission Rulemaking to address
23 waste confidence. As many Illinois residents rely on
24 nuclear clean and portable energy, this rulemaking
25 will have an important impact to consumers across the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 state. In the 16th District alone, there are four
2 nuclear power plants providing great price stability
3 to consumers throughout our nation. Nuclear power
4 provides half of our state's energy and generates
5 almost 93 percent of the carbon-free electricity
6 produced in Illinois. Without the availability of
7 this baseload power, there is no doubt that prices
8 would skyrocket and energy stability would plummet.
9 In addition, the nuclear energy industry support
10 thousands of high-paying jobs, which in turn supports
11 the tax base of our local communities.

12 We are here today to discuss the Nuclear
13 Regulatory Commission's Proposed Rule on waste
14 confidence. The Proposed Rule simply clarifies the
15 issues and processes surrounding the safe and secure
16 storage of spent nuclear fuel. It does not authorize
17 individual licenses. It is only one step in the
18 Commission's National Environmental Policy Act
19 review. And hence, the clarity of this policy will
20 lead to a more efficient licensing process which
21 would benefit consumers throughout our region.

22 In addition, the NRC rulemaking process
23 is the kind of open and transparent process that
24 should take place in all aspects of government
25 regulation, especially the widespread participation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 of all aspects of government, industry, and the
2 public in order to ensure that all viewpoints are
3 considered. A total of 12 public meetings will take
4 place, and members of the public will have the
5 opportunity to submit comments to the Commission
6 through December 20th of 2013. Upon the completion
7 of this process, it is my hope that NRC will complete
8 this rulemaking in an expeditious manner.

9 Lastly, I want to talk to the fact that
10 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has suspended all
11 final licensing decisions while this rulemaking
12 process moves forward. I believe it's time to
13 provide this industry that provides a clean source of
14 energy to billions of consumers the ability to move
15 forward with a greater level of certainty for the
16 long-term operations. Sincerely, Adam Kinzinger,
17 Member of Congress.

18 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. The next one
19 is Tom Wolf.

20 MR. WOLF: Good evening and thank you.
21 My name is Tom Wolf. I'm the Executive Director of
22 the Energy Council of the Illinois Chamber of
23 Commerce, and a proud member of the Illinois Clean
24 Energy Coalition.

25 It's clear that for our overall quality

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of life as well as our overall economic well-being
2 that we need a reliable, cost-competitive, diverse,
3 and stable supply of energy. In the past few months,
4 I've been to public hearings on license extensions
5 for nuclear power plants, USEPA regulation on
6 emissions for coal plants, regulations on fracking in
7 Illinois, and permitting for efficient lines that
8 would bring more green energy in Illinois.

9 Every single energy project that I was
10 at had its detractors at these meetings. Yet no one
11 has come to any of the hearings with the perfect
12 solution, just reasons why the current system isn't
13 perfect. Well, of course it's not perfect. Everyone
14 in this room knows that there is no perfect form of
15 energy. If there was one, believe me, we'd be using
16 it.

17 So, we're stuck with an abundance of
18 imperfect choices. But we've done pretty well with
19 these and I want to thank the NRC, IEMA, and all
20 those for working with the owners of our nuclear
21 facilities to keep the onsite storage of spent
22 nuclear fuel safe. And it is safe.

23 Unlikely scenarios that are designed to
24 scare people are not productive to the discussion nor
25 to our energy debate in general. Opponents of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 nuclear energy paint a picture of piles of growing
2 glowing waste sitting out in open air or implying
3 that they're easy targets. All this hyperbole and
4 hot air just obscures the fact that there has never
5 been a single incident where spent nuclear fuel
6 storage has been compromised by any outside
7 individual or group. It's been safely stored for
8 decades and I believe the NRC and IEMA and the owners
9 of nuclear plants can keep it that way for decades to
10 come.

11 Of all the reasons people give for
12 wanting to move away from Illinois, I can say that no
13 one has ever talked to the Chamber about the stored
14 nuclear waste as the reason that they moved out of
15 the state. The tax structure, the pension problem,
16 the high workers comp rates, restructured attitudes
17 in Springfield, those are the major active issues
18 that keep businesses from coming to or growing in our
19 state.

20 In conclusion, we certainly hope that
21 the Federal government will meet its long overdue
22 obligation and will soon figure out a solution to
23 long-term storage of spent nuclear fuel. But until
24 then, we are happy that the industry and its Federal
25 and State regulators have determined a strategy that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 works on many levels, the most important of those is
2 our safety. Thank you very much.

3 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. For our next
4 speaker, let's go to David Kraft, and then let's go
5 to Scott Fleming, and then S.Y. Chen.

6 MR. KRAFT: Good evening. My name is
7 Dave Kraft, I'm Director of Nuclear Energy
8 Information Service. We're an environmental safe
9 energy advocacy organization based in Chicago,
10 Illinois. We represent nearly 900 supporters in
11 Illinois, 34 states, and 4 countries. And we thank
12 the Commission for allowing us three minutes of
13 meaningful comment on a problem destined to haunt
14 humankind for tens of thousands of years.

15 We hope we've demonstrated that people
16 in Illinois, while not having the original NRC list
17 of sites for the GEIS public meeting, are indeed
18 interested in radioactive waste issues after all.
19 And we hope you enjoy Orlando, one of the NRC's
20 originally proposed sites despite the turn out in
21 what was Disney World central.

22 All right. I'll use my time to
23 summarize the main points that were going to be put
24 in detail in a more elaborate comment which we will
25 put in before the deadline. The first point we want

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to make is that we submit that the GEIS, as written,
2 is inadequate to both the task of satisfying the
3 directives of the 2012 Court of Appeals and it's also
4 inadequate in protecting the health and safety of the
5 public and the environment. For these reasons, we
6 would ask the NRC to withdraw the current DGEIS.

7 Second point, we believe that the
8 moratorium on licensing of new and the licensing of
9 the currently operating reactors should remain in
10 place until such time as a permanent geological,
11 high-level radioactive waste disposal facility is
12 designed, licensed, built and in operation, not just
13 a theory. We ask the NRC to maintain its moratorium
14 until this condition is reached and ask that the
15 moratorium be extended to include the siting and
16 licensing of any temporary away-from-reactor storage
17 facilities such as those referred to as centralized
18 interim storage facilities. It's irresponsible to
19 continue the production of such waste without a
20 demonstrated and operational means of disposal.

21 The third point, we ask that you
22 withdraw all statements to the effect that, because
23 of NRC oversight programs, NRC asserts and guarantees
24 that spent fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites
25 indefinitely. Such a guarantee implies that the NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 will be providing constant oversight into that
2 indefinite period of time. Yet, one month ago, the
3 NRC could not even guarantee that its workers would
4 be able to come to work the next day. The hubris of
5 such an assertion, therefore, borders on colossal.

6 And finally, we find that NRC's finding
7 of no significant impact regarding issues like spent
8 fuel pool fires, spent fuel pool leaks, the
9 vulnerability of the spent fuel pools and dried cask
10 sites to natural disasters and terrorist assaults,
11 and the NRC's belief in the adequacy of generic
12 findings of reactors to be unfounded, inadequate to
13 the protection of the public health and safety, and
14 in contradiction to the NRC's own definition of what
15 constitutes a nuclear safety culture.

16 And I would like to quote to you from a
17 viewgraph that was presented at the Palisades Nuclear
18 Reactor last year, "The NRC version of a safety
19 culture is a core of values and behaviors resulting
20 from a collective commitment by leaders and
21 individuals to emphasize safety over competing goals
22 to ensure the protection of people and the
23 environment." These assertions will be elaborated
24 out in detail in our subsequent submittals. So, I
25 want to thank you for having this time.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 (Applause.)

2 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Next we'll go
3 to Scott Fleming.

4 MR. FLEMING: My name is Scott Fleming
5 of Will County Center for Economic Development. The,
6 let me put my glasses on here, the Will County Center
7 for Economic Development is committed to creating a
8 healthy business environment to attract businesses
9 and jobs to Illinois. We know that having a
10 competitive, safe energy infrastructure is a key part
11 of the economic growth equation. We are fortunate to
12 be home to one of Illinois' nuclear power generating
13 stations at Braidwood. This facility employs nearly
14 a thousand people and supports many thousands of
15 additional jobs in the region. Braidwood Station
16 pumps tens of thousands of millions of dollars
17 directly into the area and economy and invests in
18 many worthwhile community causes.

19 But those of us who live and work in
20 that area, especially someone who is looking to
21 attract new business in the area would not be
22 satisfied with the substantial economic impact that
23 we gain at the expense of our safety. The Center for
24 Economic Development is also a member of the
25 Braidwood Citizens Advisory Panel and have been

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 fortunate to closely follow the way Braidwood
2 operates. Its culture of safety and security is
3 second to none, and its transition to dry cask
4 storage of spent fuel is a good example.

5 Exelon took the initiative to invest in
6 dry cask storage that provides an added level of
7 safety and security, and we applaud them for taking
8 that step. We also encourage the NRC to continue to
9 work with industry to promote innovations that will
10 improve or enhance operational safety and ultimately
11 lead to the creation of spent fuel repository for the
12 storage of this material.

13 The Will County CED is confident with
14 the safety and security of the storage facilities at
15 Braidwood and we look forward to the continued
16 positive impacts of the station in our community for
17 many years to come.

18 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Next, we'll go
19 to S.Y. Chen.

20 DR. CHEN: Good evening. I'm S.Y. Chen,
21 I'm a professor and also Director of the Health
22 Physics Program at the Illinois Institute of
23 Technology in Chicago. I appreciate the opportunity
24 to speak tonight. I have several brief comments here
25 for the effort that NRC has done and I just want to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 go over that briefly.

2 First is expectations. Confidence, we
3 all know, is in the eye of the beholder. So, sitting
4 here tonight, people have different expectations of
5 what confidence means. Certainly, when the NRC --
6 limited. We heard about maybe only two, the spent
7 nuclear fuel and the generating site, but spent
8 nuclear fuel goes well beyond that.

9 And there's just a disparity of
10 expectations because, as we know, until and unless
11 the spent nuclear fuel becomes eligible to be put in
12 the ground in a repository, I'm not too sure how much
13 confidence the public is going to have. Certainly it
14 is not within the scope of the GEIS but, however,
15 they're interconnected. At some point, I think that
16 in a large part either as a constraint or something,
17 the EIS really has to mention automatically the
18 interconnection with the repository which isn't
19 available and we don't even see anything in sight.

20 So, this is just an observation I have
21 is that what kind of confidence do you have? And
22 what expectations do you come to the public to say I
23 have this confidence, what do you mean by that?

24 (Applause.)

25 DR. CHEN: Secondly, we've heard about

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the three scenarios about the fire or things like
2 that. But I'll just tell you, what had happened in
3 the last couple of days, the typhoon Haiyan, 370
4 kilometers per hour. Climate is changing. So, that
5 means, according to the prediction -- raised maybe
6 half a meter high. What happens is that a lot of
7 plants that we have here are going to completely
8 store the fuel by the shore there and we're going to
9 have problems. But I'm not too sure of all these
10 climate issues after 60 years of operation here, that
11 could become a reality. So, we are assessing the
12 potential risk that's involved and that's the real
13 issue. We don't see that as being analyzed.

14 The third point I have is actually in
15 the EIS, which I partake a lot in my career when I
16 worked at Argonne, uncertainty of the generic EIS,
17 there's a lot of assumptions coming into that. But
18 every assumption has a lot of uncertainty involved.
19 So, I'm not too sure of how exactly uncertainty has
20 been analyzed much more specifically.

21 MS. JUCKETT: Dr. Chen, we would ask you
22 to wrap up please.

23 DR. CHEN: Right, okay. So, that's
24 basically what I have. And maybe the last one would
25 be the site-specific management part of that, how

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that ties into the uncertainties I mean here would be
2 very important. And I'm stopping there.

3 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 MS. JUCKETT: Let's go to Maureen
6 Headington followed by Lora Chamberlain and Rick Fox.

7 MS. HEADINGTON: My name is Maureen
8 Headington. I'm a proud resident of Burr Ridge,
9 Illinois. I am a domestic environmental activist --
10 oops, sorry. Start me over with the time.

11 My name is Maureen Headington and I'm a
12 resident of Burr Ridge, Illinois. I'm a domestic
13 environmental activist. I am not paid for anything I
14 do, it is totally sweat equity. When I'm not, well,
15 let's put it this way, there's a lot of sweat and no
16 sleep. There's others in the room who have similar
17 lifestyles.

18 I am a past Director of the Illinois
19 Environmental Council, on this board I served for six
20 years. And I'm coming here today to explain why I do
21 not have the confidence in this Generic EIS and why
22 you shouldn't either. I do not have confidence when
23 I see reactor licenses being renewed without
24 exception regardless of a plant's track record. The
25 APY recently, I discovered the State of Illinois

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reactors racked up 1,120 safety violations. In fact,
2 that was from the period 2000 to 2012, and yet the
3 NRC has never met a license renewal it has not liked
4 and licenses routinely are renewed.

5 Here in Illinois, I don't know how many
6 people from the NRC come from this state, but we have
7 more reactors than any other state, four are the same
8 make and model as the ones that blew in Fukushima.
9 Again, we have the safety violations which are
10 treated so routinely, they're seldom reported in the
11 news except the headlines at Braidwood. So, I would
12 take exception with how fine Braidwood's track record
13 has been, especially dumping polluted, irradiated
14 water on the community unbeknownst to them for ten
15 years.

16 In addition to leaks, we also have, in
17 recent days, the felonies created by folks over at
18 Dresden. So, if our futures are in the hands of an
19 entity and we hear that the people that they're
20 hiring are of this caliber, I do not have confidence.
21 I don't have confidence in an industry that relies on
22 our tax dollars to subsidize its own interests, long
23 guarantees to build new reactors, expecting main
24 street to invest in what Wall Street will not. Wall
25 Street refuses to take on the risk and why should we?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 For that, I have no confidence.

2 I also have no confidence when the
3 President's Blue Ribbon Commission is made up of
4 industry promoters like John Rowe, former Chairman of
5 Exelon, and others for whom there is a clear conflict
6 of interest in any decision-making capacity. The
7 BRC's recommendation for CIS, centralized interim
8 storage, is no solution, it just puts lethal
9 materials onto our streets and expressways and opens
10 it to traffic accidents and terrorist attacks. Just
11 because, to the statement I heard, just because we
12 haven't had an accident yet means that it's safe is
13 shortsighted and unrealistic.

14 I thank the Federal District Court for
15 throwing us a lifeline. The nuclear power industry
16 puts us at risk, our families at risk, our
17 communities at risk. Their claims of infinitesimal
18 risk do not reconcile with the major nuclear accident
19 happening every ten years. Go back and do the math.
20 You need not be scientist for that. I taught Chicago
21 Center City schools for 20 years and my third graders
22 could do that now.

23 How could anyone have even allowed one
24 reactor to be built with no end plan for waste? Your
25 recommendations are not a solution. There is still

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 no end plan. Interim means indefinite, that's not a
2 plan, except to stockpile in facilities beyond the
3 capacity for which they were built.

4 We citizens are the only ones in this
5 room not being paid to be here. Be mindful when you
6 listen to the accolades of industry or politicians who
7 have been the recipients of campaign dollars in terms
8 of listening to them. These reactors are unsafe and
9 unreliable, they are not clean, they are not green.

10 I have no confidence in the -- Anderson
11 Act because it's being reauthorized in 2017. It
12 limits the nuclear power industry's liability and
13 it's a pittance compared to what the people in Japan
14 are facing in trillions of dollars. Our accidents
15 will be paid for by our own tax dollars just like the
16 loan guarantees and subsidies that are building these
17 atrocities in the first place. And I thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 DR. CHAMBERLAIN: That's a harder act to
20 follow. So, the NRC has stated they have a mandate
21 to ensure the protection of the people and the
22 environment. And I want to state here in argument to
23 some of the statements earlier by some of the
24 industry folks, that nuclear power is neither safe,
25 clean, affordable, or cost effective. On the safety

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 issue, I merely have to mention Three Mile Island,
2 Chernobyl, and Fukushima. And that's all that needs
3 to be said about the safety issue of nuclear power.

4 The clean tag on nuclear power is
5 absolutely ridiculous when you factor in the carbon-
6 intensive and toxicity of uranium in our, for
7 stations, areas across the country. And affordable
8 and cost competitive is a joke. As Ms. Headington
9 just said, the loan guarantees and the taxpayer
10 subsidies of nuclear power should certainly be
11 factored in to every kilowatt hour that we think
12 we're getting from the nuclear power plant. And I
13 assure you that all economists agree that nuclear
14 power without Federal subsidies is neither cost
15 competitive nor affordable.

16 But about the confidence in the Nuclear
17 Regulatory Commission and their ability to safely
18 store spent nuclear fuel following the licensed life
19 of every operator, or of every reactor, excuse me,
20 and 60 years from now, them finding a safe geological
21 repository really is laughable. I want to just ask
22 the audience right now, who here right this moment
23 feels terrorized, terrorized of what's happening in
24 Fukushima with the spent fuel -- exactly! There we
25 go.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 So, nuclear power is really a terrorist
2 organization. We all feel terrorized by this. Any
3 accident, a disaster can occur at every nuclear power
4 plant. I have absolutely no confidence that the NRC
5 has investigated every single possibility at every
6 single power plant for fires, leaks, natural
7 disasters, and terrorist attack. So, I for one and
8 every single person that put their hand up has no
9 confidence in the NRC's supposed Environmental Impact
10 Statement. Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MS. JUCKETT: The next speaker is Rick
13 Fox.

14 MR. FOX: Hello there. I'm Rick Fox,
15 I'm here tonight representing the Global Warming
16 Solutions Group of Central Illinois. Our group has,
17 as long as we've existed for the last two years,
18 focused on finding things to address global warming
19 on a local basis. We come out and strongly oppose
20 the nuclear power in general because we feel, despite
21 some of the carbon arguments, that this is not the
22 argument to justify the issue really we're here to
23 talk about tonight, which is our confidence in how
24 you deal with the spent fuel and the hazards that we
25 face with the nuclear energy.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 My background, I have an engineering
2 degree. I'm a software guy today but I know a little
3 bit about engineering. My father is an engineer.
4 One of the things, when you look at engineering
5 projects, and this is fundamentally what the argument
6 here is, that we can engineer our way out of this
7 issue. And as was stated before, in any engineering
8 project there's a number of assumptions when you
9 build something to a particular set of
10 specifications. And I think that with this
11 particular issue, you can't set the assumptions at a
12 point that's strong enough for us to have confidence
13 that you could come up with, really, a solution that
14 would justify keeping new plants being licensed.

15 In particular, I think that the EIS does
16 not do enough to address the issues related to the
17 climate change and the things that may be coming
18 along as part of, you know, as our climate is already
19 changing, we're seeing things happening. What
20 happens over the next 60 years, 160 years, and
21 further into the future, I think that there's a lot
22 of question marks there that really have not been
23 adequately addressed.

24 And then my final point I think on
25 confidence, this is even if we step back and assume

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that the engineers had the perfect solution both from
2 a long-term and a short-term solution, which I do not
3 have that confidence, even if we assume that, the
4 reality is for any of this to work, we've got to have
5 the policy makers and the funding to pay for this.
6 And I don't think that any of us can say that we have
7 the confidence in our government to put the amount of
8 money behind this that really is going to take to
9 address these issues that are in front of us. And
10 that's really one of my biggest concerns with this is
11 simply that we don't have the policies in place and
12 we won't in the future to address this issue.

13 (Applause.)

14 MS. JUCKETT: For our next speakers,
15 let's go to Jerry Peck, followed by Linda Lewison,
16 and then Bette Pierman.

17 MR. PECK: Hello, my name is Jerry Peck.
18 On behalf of the nearly 4,000 members of Illinois
19 Manufacturers Association --

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear you.

21 MR. PECK: I'm sorry. Hello, my name is
22 Jerry Peck. On behalf of the nearly 4,000 members of
23 the Illinois Manufacturers Association, I appreciate
24 the opportunity to offer testimony today.

25 The Illinois Manufacturers Association

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is the oldest and largest state manufacturing
2 association in the United States. Manufacturers in
3 Illinois employ more than 600,000 workers and
4 contribute the single largest portion of the gross
5 state product. Illinois manufacturers were
6 responsible for over \$92 billion in economic output
7 last year alone. Illinois residents benefit greatly
8 from a quality energy policy.

9 Our state's energy portfolio of coal,
10 nuclear, natural gas, and renewable sources ensure
11 that we have a strong, stable energy supply at
12 relatively low cost. Reliable and affordable energy
13 is a key factor that helps ensure that Illinois
14 manufacturers can remain competitive in the world
15 economy. Nuclear plants account for 48 percent of
16 electric power generated in Illinois.

17 We encourage you to carefully consider
18 the economic impact of regulations governing the
19 transportation and storage of spent nuclear fuel.
20 Nuclear power plants were never intended to be
21 permanent storage sites for spent fuel. Since 1983,
22 we have paid more than \$29 billion into the nuclear
23 waste fund, yet no permanent storage site has been
24 built.

25 As a result, 13 percent of our nation's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 spent nuclear fuel remains in temporary storage in
2 Illinois power plants. It's time to open Yucca
3 Mountain or similar long-term storage facilities.
4 Illinois residents and manufacturers greatly benefit
5 from reliable and affordable energy produced by
6 nuclear power plants. Any efforts to cripple the
7 industry through vexatious regulation is dangerous,
8 not only for our state's economy, but to the long-
9 term health and safety of Illinois residents. Thank
10 you for the opportunity to offer testimony.

11 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Next speaker
12 is Linda Lewison.

13 MS. LEWISON: Good evening. I'm
14 speaking tonight as a member of, sorry, I'm Linda
15 Lewison, speaking tonight wearing my hat as a member
16 of the Sierra Club. I want to address my remarks
17 especially to speak about Zion.

18 40 miles up the road at the Zion Nuclear
19 Power Generation Plant in December, over a thousand
20 tons of high-level radioactive waste is going to be
21 transferred into dry casks, as reported by Pat Daley
22 of Zion Solutions in August 2013. In the near
23 future, in Fukushima, over 400 tons of high-level
24 radioactive waste were transferred out and into dry
25 casks. Zion was operating from '76 to '78.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Fukushima was operating from '78 to 2011.

2 What we have here is a situation where
3 we in the Chicago-Milwaukee Metropolitan Area, over
4 six million people, are going to be exposed to
5 comparative or greater risk - from a larger and
6 dirtier radioactive waste fuel transfer, which is
7 projected to take about a year to complete in both
8 places - than what's going to happen soon at
9 Fukushima.

10 Although everyone is doing their best at
11 Zion Solutions, a shell company authorized through
12 Exelon, the scale of decommissioning fuel transfers
13 has never, this scale of decommissioning has never
14 been attempted before. We the people who live within
15 a 50-mile radius of Zion remain deeply concerned
16 because the public oversight and transparency is far
17 from adequate to the enormity and riskiness of the
18 task. Irradiated fuel transfers have never been
19 attempted before on this scale.

20 So, where does a generic environmental
21 impact statement figure into the decommissioning
22 process? The situation in Zion and Fukushima changes
23 from moment to moment, not only on the physical
24 level, which we can see, but even more critically at
25 the molecular and subatomic level.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 This is a quote from an authority from
2 Canada, Dr. Gordon Evers:

3 "The central fact about radioactivity is
4 that no one knows how to turn it off. Radioactive
5 materials continue to emit atomic radiation at a rate
6 which cannot be influenced by any of the usual
7 factors, heat, pressure, chemical reactions,
8 absorption, dilution, nothing can be used to speed
9 up, slow down, or stop the process of radioactive
10 disintegration from occurring."

11 This central fact means that
12 'radioactive cleanup' is a very misleading phrase.
13 It suggests to ordinary people that we can somehow
14 get rid of radioactive contamination. But we cannot
15 do so, at least not in any actual sense. All we can
16 do is move the contamination from one place to
17 another. If you decontaminate one site, you must be
18 contaminating another site.

19 The contamination, whether repackaged,
20 consolidated, or managed are made less available to
21 the environment of living things but it cannot be
22 eliminated. Governments and their electorates have
23 been misled by the nuclear industry into believing
24 false notions about nuclear waste. Lots of impact,
25 millions of dollars spent, they do not know how to do

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 this. There is no way to clean up or dispose of
2 radioactive waste.

3 So, how can we ever capture one moment
4 in time with something called GEIS and presume that
5 it will capture what is happening in this ever-
6 changing reality? Every reactor site is unique. If
7 they were to drop one cask out at Zion, you could
8 punch a hole in the bottom of the pool. It would
9 partially drain and, in a worst case scenario, set
10 fuel on fire in a few hours in an order of magnitude
11 greater than Chernobyl. These are catastrophic risks
12 and we cannot address them through this absurdity of
13 a generic impact statement. And these are site-
14 specific impacts in this very densely populated area
15 that we need to take into consideration as we make
16 our future plan.

17 In closing, we oppose the Nuclear
18 Regulatory Commission's waste confidence draft GEIS
19 and ask NRC to withdraw it for a thorough revision.
20 We have no confidence in the NRC's lack of a plan in
21 place. As my colleague Shirley Bain from California
22 put it years ago, why would we ever support an energy
23 source that had no plans and knew that there was no
24 way to safely dispose of its deadly radioactive waste
25 when it began, hidden this from the public, and we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 are now left with the creation of endless waste,
2 endless economic and environmental cost, and endless
3 risk to ourselves and to the plant? Why would we
4 ever pick such an energy source in the first place?
5 Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. PIERMAN: Hello and thank you for
8 providing an opportunity for me to speak tonight. My
9 name is Bette Pierman. I'm here on behalf of
10 Michigan Safe Energy Future which is an environmental
11 activist group located in South Haven, Michigan. We
12 formed in January after a number of safety issues in
13 the Palisades Nuclear Plant in Covert, and our focus
14 was twofold. One, to shut down Palisades before it
15 melts down, and the other was to promote alternative
16 clean energy sources.

17 I come before you today because I had
18 serious concerns. Nuclear waste is toxic. Clean and
19 safe are not terms that you can use to describe
20 nuclear waste or its production. And yet members of
21 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and their staff are
22 repeatedly trying to sell to the public those
23 falsehoods. Therefore, one wonders how the members
24 of the NRC could determine an environmental
25 assessment finding of no significant impact regarding

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 nuclear waste and its storage resulting in the
2 recommendation of a generic treatment with no further
3 oversight for a hundred years.

4 While reviewing the documents for
5 comment, the term 'adequate' repeatedly appears
6 regarding the steps currently used to store toxic
7 nuclear waste. Whenever I hear the term used by NRC
8 staff to describe any of the nuclear plants across
9 the country, excuse me, whenever I hear the term used
10 by NRC staff to describe any of the nuclear plants
11 across the country, but in particular Entergy's
12 Palisades Nuclear Plant, I cringe. I am not sure how
13 the use of this term is supposed to be reassuring to
14 the public since it means 'good enough.' The
15 connotation connected with 'good enough' is mediocre.

16 So, I ask you, how safe would you feel
17 with an 'adequate' pilot on a turbulent
18 transcontinental flight? Or how quickly would you
19 employ an 'adequate' heart surgeon if you required
20 surgery? Yet you throw the word 'adequate' around to
21 the public like that is supposed to reassure us about
22 the safety of these aging, decrepit, nuclear power
23 plants in this country and what you propose as the
24 generic treatment of high-level radioactive waste
25 storage for a number of years far into the future.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 This member of the public does not share
2 your confidence. You write as if you have access to
3 a crystal ball providing you access to the state of
4 our planet for a hundred plus years, when in fact
5 with the accelerating global warming and increasingly
6 apparent climate change, you have no idea what is to
7 come. We are seeing an increasing detrimental super-
8 storms wreaking unimaginable havoc, the level of
9 which has never before occurred.

10 Supposedly you studied what happened at
11 Fukushima Daiichi, and yet I see no evidence that you
12 have learned anything from your study. If you had,
13 you would be shutting down all of the nuclear plants
14 in this country to halt future production of toxic
15 nuclear waste, and would be devoting your full
16 attention to resolving the problem of current toxic
17 nuclear waste accumulation.

18 Okay. I have a lot more to say and
19 I'll submit my written comments, but I'm going to
20 finish with this paragraph. As stewards of this
21 planet, it is time for the members of the Nuclear
22 Regulatory Commission to begin to act responsibly and
23 stop all further toxic nuclear waste production.
24 Your job is not to represent the greedy, reckless,
25 and irresponsible nuclear industry. We need to be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 prepared for a super-storm and how you will handle
2 the consequential impact on nuclear waste storage.

3 Contrary to what you have presented,
4 each plant's situation and environmental impact will
5 be different, and all will be catastrophic. Climate
6 change is real. Super-storms are occurring along
7 with earthquakes in regions where they did not
8 previously occur with regularity. If you do not
9 begin to make responsible decisions regarding the
10 protection of this planet and its humanity, then you
11 need to remove your NRC motto, "protecting people and
12 the environment," because your 'adequate' effort will
13 have failed and all will be harmed as a result.
14 Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MS. JUCKETT: We seem to be having a
17 little bit of trouble with our microphones. If you
18 guys would just hang tight for just a second, we'll
19 try and get this worked out more positively.

20 This one if you speak loud enough is
21 just fine. So, if you can hold on to this mic while
22 you're talking and project, I think we should be
23 okay.

24 (Microphone test.)

25 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. Thank you,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 everybody, for your patience.

2 (Microphone test.)

3 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. What we'll do now,
4 and I'm sorry that this is not working out. You
5 never know how these things are going to work out in
6 advance, but for those of you who are kind enough to
7 want to speak, could you just please hold the
8 microphone and make sure you talk into it? From up
9 here, you can kind of hear. However, if you can be
10 heard in the back, then people will give you a thumbs
11 up or thumbs down I'm sure. So, thank you.

12 For our next speakers, let's go ahead
13 and go to Brandon de Graaf, followed by Kevin Kamps,
14 and Carol Kurz. And as a reminder, since it's been a
15 few minutes, please introduce yourself when you get
16 up to the podium.

17 MR. de GRAAF: Good evening. My name is
18 Brandon de Graaf. I'm actually an engineer that
19 works for Exelon Nuclear. I have worked in the
20 nuclear fuels department so I have expert knowledge
21 of what we're talking of here today.

22 To give just a background on me, I have
23 a Bachelor's degree in Chemical Engineering, a
24 Master's degree in Nuclear Engineering. I have been
25 working in the industry for about four years now and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 currently responsible for managing the reload, so,
2 I'm in the class of engineers with Exelon in the
3 nuclear industry.

4 So, the fundamental question of today's
5 meeting is do we have reasonable assurance that it's
6 safe to store spent fuel beyond the license life of
7 nuclear power plants. And to answer this question,
8 the NRC put out the generic environmental statement
9 which concludes that it is safe to store. And upon
10 reviewing it and using my engineering background and
11 knowledge from the industry, I agree with their
12 conclusions.

13 The fact of the matter is, even if we
14 never get a repository, spent fuel pools and dry
15 casks are both safe options based on their continued
16 performance. In fact, Illinois has the largest
17 inventory of used spent nuclear fuel and has not had
18 a spent nuclear fuel accident. And that's not
19 shortsightedness, that's proven engineering.

20 This is because both technologies are
21 designed to be robust. Everyday we think about
22 what's the worst case scenario. That's what I'm
23 trained to do and we design to protect the health and
24 safety of the public. So, for example, spent fuel
25 pools are designed with reinforced concrete walls,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 stainless steel liners, leak-detection systems,
2 redundant monitoring and cooling, and makeup water
3 systems. Dry casks, they are designed with the tight
4 steel cylinders, they're actually welded shut, and
5 they have concrete liners which protect and shield
6 the environment from the radiation.

7 I walk by these things everyday. I've
8 worked in the spent fuel pool buildings. And I still
9 get more radiation from flying on an airplane to
10 visit my sister in the south.

11 The casks are also air-cooled and, have
12 no moving parts, and are not dependent on any
13 operator or system actuation to be safe. In fact, in
14 Fukushima, there were casks at that facility, they
15 were knocked over, they were wetted, but they were
16 safe and won't leak any radiation. And the spent
17 fuel pool, as much as some of the media might have
18 said that there was accidents because a spent fuel
19 pool had lost water, none of the fuel became actually
20 uncovered if you actually read the reports from the
21 analysis after the accident.

22 So, on top of all that, the fuel itself
23 is robust. I mean we take materials so that they can
24 handle the harsh environment of the reactor, so it
25 has to be degradation-resistant. So, once it becomes

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 spent nuclear fuel, that's a property that won't
2 actually disappear, it's still degradation-resistant.

3 So, it comes down to this. I mean as
4 nuclear engineers, the last thing we want to do is
5 cause any harm to the environment. I mean I have a
6 son, and a family, and a home, and I care about the
7 environment as much as you. You know, many of us
8 became nuclear engineers because we know it's a great
9 technology and it's a workable technology today.

10 So, I hope one day we can actually get
11 one better and reprocess the fuel and minimize the
12 amount of waste actually produced. But until then,
13 there is reasonable assurance that it is safely
14 stored spent fuel in dry casks and pools. Thank you
15 for your time.

16 (Applause.)

17 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you.

18 MR. KAMPS: Hello, my name is Kevin
19 Kamps. I work at Beyond Nuclear as radioactive waste
20 specialist. We're a national watchdog group on the
21 nuclear power industry. I also serve on the board of
22 directors of Don't Waste Michigan which is a
23 statewide coalition. And I represent the Kalamazoo
24 Chapter, which is my hometown. And I was planning to
25 speak about some site-specific issues in this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 country, specifically the Great Lakes Basin.

2 So, as some of the previous speakers
3 have mentioned, there are four reactors in Illinois
4 which are Fukushima Daiichi twin designs. These are
5 General Electric Mark I boiling water reactors
6 located at Dresden and Quad Cities. And we've seen
7 on live television what these reactors are capable of
8 in terms of risks if you lose the electric grid and
9 the emergency diesel generators for a long enough
10 period of time. And the pool risks are also
11 highlighted by what's happened after Fukushima
12 Daiichi.

13 As Linda Lewison mentioned earlier, the
14 extraction of the high-level radioactive waste from a
15 unit fuel pool is about to begin at Fukushima Daiichi
16 Unit Number 4. It's a very dicey operation. The
17 cooling water at one point was saltwater, so the fuel
18 is likely corroded. The fuel may be bent, it may be
19 damaged, it could fail during this unloading
20 procedure.

21 There's the largest General Electric
22 Mark I boiling water reactor in the world at Fermi
23 Unit 2 in Monroe, Michigan, and ironically enough it
24 shares a lot in common with Fukushima Daiichi Unit
25 Number 4. Some 40 years ago, the structural welds

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 were not put in place that can support the crane and
2 the hundred-ton waste transfer casks that would be
3 used to remove the fuel. So, despite having a permit
4 for dry cask storage for several years now, Fermi
5 Unit 2 still has all the waste it's ever generated in
6 its high-level radioactive waste storage pool.

7 The dangers include just simply dropping
8 one of these heavy loads through the floor of the
9 pool as Linda mentioned. The scenario of partial
10 drain-down is the worst case scenario where you have
11 no air cooling whatsoever. And you could have
12 radioactive inferno in just a few hours time which
13 would dwarf what we've seen at Fukushima Daiichi thus
14 far.

15 I want to just shift with my remaining
16 time to dry cask storage risks in this part of the
17 country. The way I got involved in these issues 20
18 years ago was at Palisades near Kalamazoo on the Lake
19 Michigan shoreline. A lot of people, including the
20 Attorney General of Michigan, fought the loading of
21 those dry casks, and for a very good reason. They're
22 a hundred yards from the water of Lake Michigan. In
23 fact, they're in violation of NRC earthquake safety
24 regulations.

25 This was brought to light in February of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 1994 by the NRC Region III Dry Cask Storage Inspector
2 Dr. Ross Landsman who is now retired. He warned that
3 an earthquake could open up the sand that those casks
4 rest on and they could find themselves on the bottom
5 of Lake Michigan. And in fact, there's enough
6 fissile material still in the waste that, in the
7 presence of water, you could have a chain reaction in
8 the waste. So, that's a risk going on on the Lake
9 Michigan shoreline right now.

10 My final point has to do with a
11 whistleblower right here in the Chicago area, Oscar
12 Shirani, who passed away a number of years ago, who
13 called attention to the shortcuts on safety going on
14 with the Holtec cask design. In a short three-day
15 inspection, he and a team of experts from across the
16 country identified nine categories of quality
17 assurance violation with the Holtecs. These are
18 deployed at Dresden and he questioned the structural
19 integrity of these dry casks sitting still.

20 So, for over a decade now, hundreds of
21 environmental groups have called for the pools to be
22 emptied into hardened onsite storage, a major safety
23 upgrade on the status quo of dry cask storage,
24 fortifications against terrorist attacks, safeguards
25 against accidents. That's what needs to happen.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Thank you.

2 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you.

3 (Applause.)

4 MS. JUCKETT: Following Carol, let's go
5 to Sandy McComb, Doug O'Brien, and then Tom Rielly.
6 This is Carol.

7 MS. KURZ: Hello, everybody. A lot of
8 the comments that I was going to make had been
9 covered at some point, but I have gone through what I
10 have and hopefully it will be an addition.

11 I'm concerned about the safety of
12 nuclear energy. It does not have a reliable safety
13 history. There have been 26 accidents in the U.S.
14 since 1961, some with fatalities. That's one every
15 two years, the most notable being with the Three Mile
16 Island.

17 Fukushima in 2011 is important because
18 we have four Mark I's here in Illinois. Radiation is
19 still pouring into the Pacific Ocean as workers
20 frantically try to keep rods covered with water. Now
21 there's talk of robots to remove rods from the
22 reactor without causing a catastrophic fire. This
23 accident wasn't supposed to happen but it did. And
24 it should be a wake-up call for all of us.

25 In the U.S., spent fuel pools are even

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 more crowded than Japan's. The NRC was -- I'm sorry,
2 I didn't mean to -- okay. The spent fuel pools are
3 more crowded than Japan's. The NRC was to find a
4 permanent site for spent fuel. With Yucca off the
5 map and our nuclear waste growing to 70,000 tons, a
6 Federal court ruled in 2012 that the NRC could not
7 proceed with new licenses or extensions until they
8 completed an environmental study to show the
9 environmental and health effects over time if spent
10 fuel is not stored in a repository.

11 The NRC's draft waste confidence GEIS
12 skirts the issue of long-time storage safety by
13 assuming fuel and dry casks can be managed
14 indefinitely for hundreds of years. It is not
15 considered an impossibility, but imagine the impacts
16 of pool leaks, especially tritium where there is a
17 significant history of such accidents nor show
18 concern for earthquakes, tornadoes, floods which grow
19 stronger with climate change. In addition, the waste
20 problem is further convoluted by NRC's proposal to
21 include in reactor licenses their idea that spent
22 fuel can be stored safely aboveground forever which
23 would end any public discussion about permanent
24 storage and creation of more waste since there is no
25 problem.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 There is talk about Illinois becoming a
2 centralized interim storage site although interim
3 seems to be taking on a new meaning of possibly
4 forever. Maps from Oak Ridge National Laboratory put
5 Illinois number one and all but a few, because of our
6 centralized location. We also have the most reactors
7 and the largest amount of waste. We don't want
8 interim storage here. Fuel should be moved only once
9 on the way to the repository. Interim storage wastes
10 time and money and we'd be a prime destination for
11 terrorists.

12 The cycle of making waste that we can't
13 dispose of is insanity. There is already enough
14 waste for one Yucca, now we're working on two. We
15 should follow the lead of recent events and bury it.
16 Aging nuclear power plant licenses should not be
17 extended nor new ones built until a permanent
18 repository is built. We ask that the NRC withdraw
19 its proposed DGEIS until the NRC provides substantial
20 proof and scientific evidence of the safety of their
21 conclusions. Thank you.

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. JUCKETT: Next, we'll go to Sandy
24 McComb, followed by Doug O'Brien.

25 MS. McCOMB: Good evening. I do like

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 speaking in microphones. The Federal courts have
2 said NRC must have a valid and realistic assessment
3 of the environmental impact of long-term storage of
4 spent nuclear fuel. In response, the NRC plans to
5 take only two years for the EIS, and more correctly,
6 the environmental review. NRC's own staff says it
7 will take seven years to do an EIS.

8 The two-year time frame NRC is using has
9 been only enough time to summarize the currently
10 available information about the risks of long-term
11 storage and the existing information is inadequate.
12 One study that's looking at the long-term storage has
13 been started but it will take until 2019 to finish.

14 NRC is currently assuming what will
15 happen in the distant future. Assumptions on the
16 effect of climate change, for example, and some of
17 these we can already see are wrong, for example, the
18 GEIS says a meter rise in water level won't endanger
19 any plant. There are in fact three plants that would
20 be impacted by this rise in water level. NRC also
21 has not adequately studied the environmental impact
22 of fuel degradation and cask deterioration over time.

23 Finally, since the NRC is doing,
24 engineering, an environmental impact study, the site-
25 specific issues, of which there are several major

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 issues, aren't being addressed. It sounds to me like
2 we're inviting a catastrophe. Is this what we want?
3 Should NRC be licensing and relicensing plants based
4 on their grossly inadequate GEIS?

5 The answer is a resounding NO! They
6 must not be allowed to just say they are confident
7 that waste will be safely stored without any basis in
8 fact. NRC's response in their GEIS is not any better
9 than their past position of just stating they were
10 confident that waste could be safely stored. I don't
11 feel safe.

12 (Applause.)

13 MS. JUCKETT: Next will be Doug O'Brien,
14 and following up we'll go to Tammy Thompson, Amanda
15 Stenson, and Edward Smith.

16 MR. O'BRIEN: My name is Doug O'Brien,
17 I'm the Executive Director of the Illinois Clean
18 Energy Coalition. And I appreciate the opportunity
19 to speak at this hearing today.

20 When it comes to the rhetoric of a lot
21 of the activists who oppose nuclear energy, the story
22 always remains the same. There is some hypothetical
23 scenario or red herring issue concocted to represent
24 the immediate peril supposedly created by nuclear
25 power. But as always, upon closer examination, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 story unravels.

2 The storage of spent nuclear fuel has
3 been taking place in Illinois for decades, in fact
4 for half a century since the first commercial reactor
5 went online in Illinois. In that time, there has not
6 been a single breach at a spent fuel storage
7 facility. There has not been a single case of public
8 injury or contamination as a result of spent fuel
9 storage facility failing. There has not been a
10 single incidence where any person or group has been
11 able to obtain spent fuel for nefarious purposes.

12 Now, of course the past is no guarantee
13 of what's to come in the future. These are facts,
14 plain and simple. To try and counter these facts in
15 the overall safety record of nuclear energy with
16 scenarios worthy of the most inventive Hollywood
17 screenwriter is to irresponsibly distract from what
18 should be a serious discussion of the important role
19 of nuclear power in creating a diverse and
20 independent energy supply for our country.

21 These tactics also divert attention from
22 the growing forest of support for nuclear energy from
23 the environmental movement itself. Among those who
24 realize that if we are going to reduce our carbon
25 footprint in a meaningful way, we must rely on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 single great source of carbon-free emission, nuclear.
2 There are many examples in the recent media about the
3 environmental leaders, about how the global warming
4 and the leaders in the environmental community wisely
5 embrace nuclear power, and the Energy Secretary who
6 states that nuclear power will play a key role in the
7 fight against climate change.

8 Now, we can juxtapose the hypothetical
9 scenarios that try to paint spent fuel storage as
10 some impending doom with some very tangible data.
11 According to NASA Climate Sciences James Hansen who
12 is a leading voice in the battle against global
13 warming, the use of nuclear power generation has
14 globally prevented the emission of over 60 billion
15 tons of greenhouse gases and has prevented as many as
16 one million premature gas globally. This is
17 quantifiable. It's not based on what ifs, maybes,
18 theoreticals, or scenarios.

19 The Illinois Clean Energy Coalition
20 promotes the use of clean energy sources in a
21 competitive and sustainable marketplace that will
22 fuel our economy while benefitting our environment.
23 The coalition supports the Proposed Waste Confidence
24 Rule because the facts show that spent fuel can be,
25 and is, safely and securely stored in Illinois. We

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 further urge the NRC to move forward expeditiously
2 with the construction of a central spent fuel
3 repository which will help us further develop
4 potential nuclear energy and nuclear science across
5 the nation. Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. THOMPSON: Hi, I'm Tammy Thompson.
8 Everybody hear me? No? I'm Tammy Thompson, can
9 everybody hear me?

10 Who here is a nuclear neighbor? If you
11 live in Illinois, you're a nuclear neighbor. If you
12 live in the United States, you're a nuclear neighbor.

13 It is insane to me, the previous
14 gentleman that was up here talking about Mr. Hansen.
15 I've seen him speak before. I have some respect for
16 him. He doesn't live in a nuclear neighborhood,
17 never has, doubt that he ever would, considering
18 Dresden. He has leaks out there and water still
19 hasn't been fixed for the people that have the leaks.
20 The moms can't explain why their kids are leaking
21 from their eyes, and the parents are paying really
22 high medical bills for dentistry to have their jaws
23 wired shut for kids in the 4th and 5th Grade because
24 their teeth are separating due to radiation exposure.
25 Not to mention all the kids that keep showing up at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the Mayo Clinic that have radiation overdoses and
2 nobody knows anything about it.

3 People quote movies, but this one I'd
4 like to quote, "What we have here is a failure to
5 communicate." This NRC meeting, I can't thank you
6 for, it's a farce. It was not publicized. I was
7 told that they had paid to publicize this. There's
8 many newspapers and organizations that would put it
9 out there. And I guarantee you that if the public
10 knew exactly what was going on at all these
11 facilities, they would say no to this.

12 How many people do you know have died
13 from radiation, or excuse me, exposure to solar
14 panels? How about wind? Think if they had solar and
15 wind backup rather than diesel and that was only a
16 limited amount of time, what would have happened in
17 Japan? I do have friends and family in Japan, and
18 what they're living through is a living hell. What
19 these communities are living in in Braidwood and
20 Dresden, which by the way do, you know, on occasion
21 shut their emergency alarm systems off but it doesn't
22 get reported, it's just wrong for you to even
23 consider this and call it something that is safe.

24 It's not safe. It was designed to be a
25 bomb. It was designed to kill, and kill it does.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I don't want it in my state, I don't
2 want it in my country. And there's better
3 alternatives than that. We are smarter than this.
4 We are Americans and we can do better.

5 (Applause.)

6 MS. STENSON: Hi, good afternoon, or
7 good evening, everyone. My name is Amanda Stenson.
8 I am at Braidwood Station this woman was just talking
9 about seconds ago.

10 I've worked in radiation protection for
11 three years and to a lot of people it may not seem
12 like a very long time to really gain a grasp on how
13 serious it is to work in the nuclear industry. I've
14 talked to a lot of you before the meeting and I
15 appreciate all of those that did come up and talk to
16 me about their opinions on the nuclear industry.

17 I want to talk to you about my opinion
18 on the nuclear industry and what I've worked with in
19 the three and a half years. I have confidence in my
20 plant. I have confidence in our safety. There are a
21 lot of different examples I can give you, but one of
22 them -- we were mentioning terrorist attacks.

23 Every three years, the government comes
24 up with a team of military individuals to break into
25 our power plant called -- and every year since I've

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 been, or for the last ten years, Braidwood has been
2 successful in passing that. They, like, really try
3 to break in, they break down wires, they shoot fake
4 weapons at each other, kind of like really high-tech
5 laser tag. But that's really safe. I mean we've
6 come up with scenarios, we try to put it on ourselves
7 against terrorist attacks.

8 I also wanted to bring up operating
9 experiences. We learn from our mistakes. TMI
10 happened in 1979, and out of that INPO was created.
11 And I don't know any other industry that is open to
12 other businesses talking to each other about their
13 problems as the nuclear industry.

14 We have forums set out across the
15 country to discuss with each other whatever problems
16 they might be having to kind of gain insight to all
17 those. And that's unheard of in any other industry.
18 That's why I have confidence. We're not afraid to
19 say that we made a mistake and we fix it.

20 Another thing about safety is that
21 Braidwood has created a VPP star safety site. And
22 that's not something that corporate pays for, that's
23 something that comes from the people that work there.
24 A lot of people have jobs in other manufacturing
25 industries, you may have to wear a hard hat, you may

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 have to wear safety glasses, you may have to wear
2 steel-toed shoes. Those are just requirements to
3 work in our plants. And it goes beyond just those
4 things, too. It goes to the level of checking
5 components to a degree that you never would have
6 thought that we actually do. So, that's another
7 reason why I have confidence in our station's safety.

8 The first week that I started at
9 Braidwood, I started in radiation protection as I
10 mentioned before, the first for me was on dry cask
11 storage. And it wasn't because I was on a team, it
12 was because I work for a power plant and they wanted
13 me to understand what they were going to be doing
14 outside. And that's the kind of level of effort that
15 our company puts on its employees. They want us to
16 understand what's going on and how to explain to
17 other people, I give a lot of tours and, you know,
18 watch citizens come in and talk to them about the
19 safety of the plant and just really answering any
20 question that they have. I've also talked to college
21 students as well about this as well. And that's why
22 I'm confident.

23 I thank you, the NRC, for having this
24 meeting. And I urge you to finalize the Waste
25 Confidence Rule in a timely manner to help our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 company work to its best. Thank you.

2 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you.

3 (Applause.)

4 MS. JUCKETT: After our next speaker,
5 we're going to go to Jeff Dunlap, Jan Boudart and
6 Kristin Gregory.

7 MR. SMITH: Hello, everybody. My name
8 is Ed Smith. I work for the Missouri Coalition for
9 the Environment in St. Louis, Missouri as the Safe
10 Energy Director.

11 St. Louis purified the first uranium
12 self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction. We have some
13 of the oldest radioactive waste on the planet and it
14 doesn't take a nuclear accident to have to worry
15 about cleaning it up. We're still dealing with it.
16 So, regardless of a hypothetical accident, release of
17 radioactivity into the environment is a significant
18 challenge that takes decades to address.

19 One problem we have, just so everybody
20 knows, is some of this radioactive material, a
21 significant amount of thorium-230, made it into a
22 landfill in the Missouri River, unlined, which is
23 currently experiencing a surface landfill fire a
24 thousand feet away from the radioactive wastes. And
25 we're bickering with the EPA and other government

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 agencies on exactly how to disposition these
2 radioactive wastes. There's actually people who want
3 to leave it there.

4 We can't find the proper solution to
5 deal with this so-called low-level ionizing radiation
6 in the landfill, what the heck are we going to do
7 with the stuff that's sitting in the spent fuel
8 pools, like the 2,363 fuel pools at the Callaway I
9 nuclear reactor that my organization is legally
10 challenging the license extension of.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. SMITH: But when we went to go
13 challenge the license extension, we faced challenges
14 including challenges with respect to nuclear fuel
15 pool. We'd have to prove that there were site-
16 specific degradation to the fuel pool is my
17 understanding. I'm not a lawyer but we couldn't
18 comment or challenge the future integrity of that
19 unless we had experienced issues.

20 So, the NRC incorporates the draft GEIS
21 into every reactor license, the conclusion that spent
22 fuel, excuse me, with the conclusion that spent fuel
23 can be safely stored aboveground indefinitely with
24 future analyses of spent fuel and reactor licensing
25 actions like ours, silencing the concerns of growing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 populations around nuclear reactors. The draft GEIS
2 reinstates 'kick the can down the road' approach
3 that has failed to address the magnitude of our
4 nuclear waste problem and legacy.

5 Assuming that institutional controls
6 will work is absurd. Like this landfill that I
7 mentioned, the Environmental Protection Agency
8 doesn't know our pile of radioactive dirt land. It
9 said so in its documents. It's ridiculous to think
10 that institutional controls will work for centuries
11 let alone a couple of decades.

12 Putting the GEIS into effect after the
13 operating life of a nuclear reactor is a sham and in
14 no way a proper approach to spent fuel management. I
15 say this because reactors are licensed to operate for
16 40 years and then they are going to retire. The NRC
17 has allowed reactors to operate up to 60 years and
18 possibly 80. That means it will be 140 years or
19 longer before we figure out where that stuff is
20 going.

21 It's important to get this right because
22 the nuclear industry wants thousands of small modular
23 reactors around the world, which means at least
24 hundreds if they get their way around the country.
25 And this will be the guidance for hundreds of small

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 modular reactors. It's important that they get it
2 right, which is why they should be withdrawing this
3 current plan and going back to the drawing board.

4 Underestimating the risk puts taxpayers,
5 as some of the folks said, to significant risk due to
6 the liability factor. Just because we haven't had
7 one doesn't mean one can't happen. There's tons of
8 unknown unknowns out there, and one accident will cap
9 the liability of \$21 billion -- I believe it is. And
10 with Congress not being able to allocate funding to
11 Sandy, how are we going to expect them to fund a
12 nuclear disaster? Thanks.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. DUNLAP: Good evening. I'm Jeff
15 Dunlap, I'm a manager in the area of spent fuel at
16 Exelon. And I appreciate the opportunity to provide
17 these comments on behalf of Exelon.

18 What we have shown and continue to show
19 as an industry is that we safely store fuel at our
20 sites, both dry and wet storage. It is important to
21 continue progress on a permanent solution of the
22 storage of spent fuel. Exelon supports the
23 development of the GEIS as a stepping stone in this
24 process and supports and agrees with the conclusions
25 in this report.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 The draft report is a rigorous
2 examination of the environmental impact based on 50
3 years of research and operating experience. The
4 report draws on industry, government, and academic
5 references to compile a complete view of the
6 potential impacts of spent fuel storage. The report
7 appropriately looks at bounding conditions over the
8 time periods in question, and the conclusion forms a
9 sound basis for continued nuclear fuel storage and
10 disposal.

11 As a generic report, we understand the
12 use of bounding assumptions. These types of
13 assumptions result in a conservative approach being
14 used on a generic basis. But it also may not be
15 fully representative of what will occur at a site
16 with fuel storage in the future.

17 For instance, the report assumes that a
18 dry transfer facility will be built at all dry cask
19 storage facilities, and that all dry casks will be
20 replaced every one hundred years. While the
21 conditions of the casks will of course be closely
22 monitored over their lifetime and a rigorous aging
23 management program is already in place, it is
24 unlikely that wholesale replacement of all casks
25 would be required and the transfer facility may not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 be needed at all sites.

2 Furthermore, NRC is correct in
3 concluding that it is feasible to have a mined
4 geological repository available in 60 years after the
5 license operating life of a nuclear power plant and
6 the analysis of a short-term impact in the GEIS.
7 There should be no technical obstacles to achieving
8 this, nor are there any financial obstacles given
9 that the nuclear waste fund now has a balance of more
10 than \$26 billion.

11 Despite delays in the process because of
12 political and legal maneuvers, progress is being made
13 in establishing a permanent repository. NRC is
14 resuming the licensing proceedings with the Yucca
15 Mountain application which will further inform
16 efforts in developing a geological repository.
17 Legislation is pending in the Senate to begin the
18 process of selecting alternate sites using a consent-
19 based approach consistent with the recommendations of
20 the Blue Ribbon Commission. This progress supports
21 the conclusion of the draft GEIS.

22 We have the technology to develop a
23 geological repository for spent nuclear fuel. And we
24 have the money to do so. The only thing blocking the
25 United States from building a geological repository

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 is political decision-making.

2 In the interim, for storage at the
3 reactor, as I have said, we continue to safely store
4 fuel in both wet and dry storage. And just to add a
5 little perspective, the amount of storage required is
6 very small. If you stacked all the stored fuel in
7 Illinois up to the height of the average person, it
8 would only fill up half of one football field.

9 The NRC environmental assessment of
10 nuclear fuel storage accurately reflects the
11 environmental impacts, which is small for the
12 continued storage at plant sites and away-from-
13 reactor storage, even with many bounding assumptions
14 that may overstate the impact. This conclusion is
15 based on storage systems for nuclear fuel that are
16 proven technology with robust design and safety
17 features that prevent environmental impacts. The
18 analysis contained in the Draft Waste Confidence
19 Generic Environmental Impact Statement supports what
20 the industry has long known. If necessary, used fuel
21 can be stored in a safe, environmentally sound manner
22 for a long period while we wait for the political
23 process to reach agreement on a disposal solution.
24 In the meantime, the NRC can and should issue its
25 Waste Confidence Rule. Thank you for the opportunity

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to comment.

2 (Applause.)

3 MS. JUCKETT: And after Jan, let's go to
4 Vincent Headington and Susan Korn.

5 MS. BOUDART: I'd like to start with a
6 basic question about the fact that there has been
7 some anecdote testimony here about the effects of
8 living near nuclear power plants, and the people who
9 come to represent the industry have nothing to say
10 about the anecdotal evidence, the stories about what
11 happens to families and children who are living near
12 these plants and the possibility of birth defects
13 that are almost unbelievable. So, I'm asking this
14 question really because there was an earlier comment
15 about this. Residents around reactor sites may not
16 have signed up to store radioactive waste
17 indefinitely, but they also did not sign up for 20-
18 year extensions of operating licenses. Yet the NRC
19 imposes that on communities without pause and without
20 exception.

21 So, I'm very moved by the anecdotal
22 evidence because the anecdotal evidence from
23 Chernobyl was cut off and the difficulties of tracing
24 the effects of the exposure at Chernobyl were massive
25 and eventually the strong scientific minds says,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 well, gee, you're just giving us anecdotal evidence,
2 when it was all the evidence that they had. And I
3 have a question. Why can't insurance companies
4 insure these sites? If the nuclear power plants are
5 so safe, then there should be a way for insurance
6 companies to insure them. But that doesn't happen
7 because the consequences of accidents at nuclear
8 power plants run into millions. I thought it very
9 interesting that the last speaker said, well, we've
10 got \$26 billion to take care of nuclear waste.

11 I believe that the cost of Chernobyl has
12 exceeded a trillion at this point. And nobody ever
13 mentions the first responders there at Chernobyl that
14 are now all dead and the effects of the whole nuclear
15 power project is having in the world. We're very,
16 very much against having Iran developing nuclear
17 power of their own because we know that the byproduct
18 of a nuclear reactor is plutonium that is used in
19 atomic bombs. And this is the most dangerous element
20 or it's the most dangerous isotope in the world. And
21 it had to be gone from the earth before the biosphere
22 could develop. Now that the biosphere has developed,
23 and we're bringing the plutonium back to our enormous
24 risk.

25 (Applause.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you.

2 MR. HEADINGTON: I'm Vince Headington,
3 citizen, a resident of Burr Ridge. And can you
4 believe it? Can you really believe it? Sometimes
5 listening to the comments here tonight of the
6 proponents of nuclear power, I think they're from
7 another planet.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. HEADINGTON: Can you believe that we
10 are supposed to believe that nuclear power plants can
11 continue producing waste without an adequate plan for
12 its disposal? This toxic radioactive waste, we're
13 supposed to go along on this gamble, on this grand
14 experiment, that an industry can produce waste in a
15 way when it doesn't know how it's going to handle it.
16 In the meantime, we are exposed to the possibility of
17 a nuclear accident. Nobody here in this room can say
18 with assurance that there will not be an accident.

19 We have the evidence of Fukushima. I
20 listened to the proponents. They downplay the
21 effects of Fukushima. They downplay the accidents
22 that can happen. And we're supposed to bear that
23 kind of a risk.

24 I refuse to bear that kind of a risk.
25 What needs to happen, we need to stop producing the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 waste. We need to stop licensing nuclear power
2 plants and their relicensing. We need to stop this
3 insanity. Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 MS. JUCKETT: Next, we'll go to Susan
6 Korn. And after Susan, we'll go to Corey Conn and
7 Dale Lehman.

8 MS. KORN: Good evening. Can you hear
9 me back there? A little louder? Okay. My name is
10 Susan Korn. I'm a director in the nuclear project
11 management organization at Exelon. My project team
12 is responsible for the construction of spent fuel
13 storage infrastructure at our sites.

14 First and foremost, I just want to say
15 that I am extremely proud to be an Exelon Nuclear
16 employee. I have a degree in nuclear engineering.
17 I've worked in the industry for 25 years. And a side
18 note, I have had three children, I had been pregnant.
19 Through working at the plant, I have three healthy
20 young adult women, so on the testimony that working
21 in the plant and being pregnant has no impact on
22 bearing healthy children.

23 What I would like to tell you is I have
24 worked for a long time in the industry and I can tell
25 you that the folks that I work with throughout the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 organization from top to bottom have an appreciation
2 that nuclear power is special. We get that. We
3 understand it's special. And it's our priority every
4 day in what we do to ensure that we operate these
5 plants in a manner that protects the health and
6 safety of the public.

7 We do live in the vicinity of plants.
8 We have family, we have friends, we have our
9 colleagues we care about deeply. We would not put
10 any of those people in harm's way.

11 As an employee, we are committed to
12 ensure that our plants run safely. Our plants
13 operate 93 percent of the time, regardless of the
14 weather or the time of day, providing a reliable
15 baseload output greater than any other generation
16 source. We understand that the decisions we make on
17 a daily basis have a potential to impact the lives of
18 our coworkers, our families, and the surrounding
19 communities. Because of this, we hold each other
20 accountable. We challenge, we train, and we
21 continuously improve.

22 You spend a day with us in our
23 facilities, it would be apparent to you, we take
24 nothing for granted. We get independent expert
25 opinions on technical issues. You would see that our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 employees are encouraged to and are comfortable with
2 challenging each other. You would hear every morning
3 across our organization industry experience being
4 shared and actions taken to ensure that we mitigate
5 potential issues.

6 We take our jobs seriously, and its
7 essential to the design, building, maintenance, and
8 security of our spent fuel storage system. Our dry
9 cask storage containers, they're lined, they're steel
10 lined with thick concrete post structures. They are
11 designed to improve and to protect the fuel under the
12 most extreme weather conditions or other destructive
13 forces.

14 I personally have no doubt that this
15 passive technology offers a long-term solution that
16 will protect my colleagues, my family, and my
17 neighbors. And I fully support the Rule. Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MS. JUCKETT: We'll go to Corey Conn
20 followed by Dale Lehman.

21 MR. CONN: My name is Corey Conn, I'm a
22 resident of Chicago for the last 17 years. And we
23 know a lot of defective casks arrived from Holtec at
24 Dresden and were loaded after some welding was done
25 without -- in violation of 10 CFR 50 Appendix B, a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lot of those casks that lead to the reasonable
2 expectation that they do not have the strength that
3 the original designs have. I'm sure you've heard of
4 -- dirty operation.

5 Years ago, I read a phrase that startled
6 me, and I mentioned it to a friend who was also
7 actively concerned about nuclear waste and the
8 reactors which made it. I was equally startled by my
9 friend's reaction which was don't even say that.
10 That phrase was "nuclear waste tends to remain where
11 it's first placed." Now a dozen years later, I'm
12 getting the exact words from NRC. As my friend may
13 have then foreseen that it is being offered as a
14 foundation for licensing decisions - - so don't say
15 that at this time.

16 In the original waste confidence, the
17 decision was published and the NRC believed and
18 assured us that a repository would be available in
19 just 24-25 years into the future. Soon, the belief
20 receded to a repository available 41 years after the
21 Waste Confidence Decision was first articulated.
22 Now, the NRC assures us that a suitable repository
23 will be available when necessary, a term which I took
24 to mean repository availability prior to onsite
25 storage failure.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 That's just in time, JIT, just in time
2 inventory management. I've always understood that
3 term to be a euphemism for almost too late. An
4 available repository is actually of little value if
5 the thousands of tons of freshly radiated fuel
6 remains precariously perched in elevated pools. It
7 matters not that the waste may also be stored in dry
8 casks as every operating reactor must also have its
9 pool.

10 As a conclusion, the updated decision is
11 not even a reality, when necessary it's science
12 fiction or fantasy. The Commission hasn't performed
13 a thorough and comprehensive analysis of the future
14 dangers and consequences on the site, onsite storage
15 60 years after cessation, and offers only a
16 retrospective - Yet, we all know that past
17 performance is not necessarily indicative of future
18 results. So, pool breakdown -- comprised of natural
19 end state for which nuclear -- are naturally drawn by
20 the great fact of the natural course of things. Only
21 through the ongoing interventions of dutiful
22 employees has it been forestalled like jugglers --
23 for reasons of their own.

24 Where are the NRC's thorough,
25 comprehensive, and informed analyses of the future?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Should we expect to find such dutiful employees six
2 decades after the nuclear supply business has gone
3 bust? I'll just make a casual reference to Michael
4 Burn, the convicted masked gunman, car-jacking senior
5 operator with the six years unescorted access to
6 Dresden, it's a big waste policy, licensing and
7 relicensing --

8 Is it true that the hazards and its
9 security of pool storage are so great that they must
10 sacrifice security? Could anyone possibly believe
11 that redacted material supports NRC's finding of
12 those significant impacts? We require a much larger
13 margin of safety about spent fuel pool fire to make
14 better decisions about plutonium, NRC should perform
15 Court-ordered analysis.

16 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. LEHMAN: My name is Dale Lehman, I'm
19 a citizen of Chicago. I appreciate the chance to
20 speak to the NRC's, or in the NRC's confidence game.

21 The fact is that this kind of meeting
22 and conversations pro and con took place in Japan not
23 so long ago where the technicians and the proponents
24 of nuclear power assured the public that they were
25 informed, that things operated carefully, well-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 designed, highest technology, security, no previous
2 accidents. All that is gone now. Japan itself
3 almost became a failed state. It remains to be seen
4 whether they can sustain themselves.

5 Tokyo was heavily irradiated in the
6 accident. The Japanese government lied about that
7 because of business interests. Japanese government
8 elevated the standards of radiation allowable for
9 children to address the severity of the contamination
10 rather than evacuate them because the main concern
11 was money. A healthy business climate, which was
12 addressed earlier, is not necessarily a healthy
13 future for mankind. Business operates generally in a
14 current state at the expense of the public's health
15 and the future of the planet.

16 A lot of people think that this is
17 hyperbole. Yet we cannot act to deal with climate
18 change in a meaningful way. The NRC has no ability
19 to assure me with confidence that a super-storm, a
20 super tornado will not pass over any of the proposed
21 future storage sites indefinitely. Can you guarantee
22 me that 200 mile-an-hour winds will leave those fuel
23 pools unaffected? Will you force the operators of
24 those plants to upgrade to a level to ensure that? I
25 don't think so, because they don't want to spend the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 money necessary to make an unsafe technology
2 theoretically safe.

3 There's a question of whether we're
4 going to survive as a society just like Japan in the
5 event of regional super-storms coming from increasing
6 disturbances in the Arctic -- are big news, a real
7 time website of observations documents what's
8 happening there now and how it's affecting the
9 Northern Hemisphere, especially over the Mid-
10 Continent. We cannot be assured that a major,
11 extreme freak storm will not pass over a nuclear
12 power plant and drain a fuel pool of its water.

13 What happens then to your promises about
14 safety? To your families and to the legions which
15 will be exposed to the same type of radiation that
16 spewed from Fukushima? I think you should think
17 twice about whether the food you put on your table
18 because of the industry you work for is worth the
19 future that you threaten without the industry. I
20 mean no disrespect for people who work for nuclear
21 industry. It's not a personal issue. It's a
22 systemic issue and the fact that this country has
23 been overwhelmed by corporations and businesses whose
24 first concern is profit over safety. Thank you.

25 (Applause.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. I know everybody
2 has been very patient and we want to do a very quick
3 break. We'll come back in, let's say, ten minutes.
4 We'll start promptly at ten minutes, so if you can
5 come back a couple of minutes sooner that will be
6 great.

7 (Short recess.)

8 MS. JUCKETT: Let's go ahead and go to
9 Ashley Kovacs. And after Ashley, we'll go to Douglas
10 Ower, and Christopher Rosso.

11 MS. KOVACS: Good evening. My name is
12 Ashley Kovacs. I'm an engineer for nuclear fuels
13 department at Exelon. I'm responsible for managing
14 and designing the fuel reloads -- sorry. We are all
15 here to comment on the Proposed Waste Confidence Rule
16 and the draft Environmental Impact Statement. The
17 Rule discusses the long-term storage of spent nuclear
18 fuel. I'd like to give some insights on why I
19 support the Rule.

20 I have spent some time in my career
21 working at the nuclear station and I have first-hand
22 experience with spent fuel storage. I personally
23 walk down the dry cask storage area and work next to
24 a loaded dry cask, and I have spent considerable time
25 working near spent fuel pools. Storing fuel in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 spent fuel pool or in dry cask storage is very safe.

2 First, I'd like to discuss the spent
3 fuel pool and spent fuel storage, the dry cask
4 storage. I have spent many hours working near spent
5 fuel pools, observing the fuel and the actions of
6 moving the fuel. This is a safe location designed to
7 withstand severe natural accidents including floods,
8 tornadoes, and earthquakes. The safety of the spent
9 fuel pool is ensured by maintaining sufficient water
10 level above the fuel, even during -- This pool is
11 designed to be about 40 feet deep, and to maintain
12 about 20 feet of water above the fuel in an accident
13 condition.

14 Everyone involved with the spent fuel
15 pool recognizes the importance of spent fuel pool.
16 And as an employee, I can tell you we consider safety
17 in every decision that we make.

18 Next, I would like to discuss dry cask
19 storage. Dry cask storage is proven safe technology
20 that is designed for long-term isolation of spent
21 nuclear fuel. The casks themselves are robust
22 concrete in steel structures with no moving parts.
23 These casks are engineered to monitor and protect 10
24 tons of spent fuel per cask. Over the last 30 years,
25 the nuclear industry has over 1,700 dry cask storage

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 systems. All these systems are still in service and
2 have had zero release of their radioactive contents.
3 I personally have worked near dry casks and I feel
4 confident in their design and safety.

5 Throughout my career, I have learned
6 that Exelon Nuclear values the health and safety of
7 the public above all else. Safety is infused in
8 everything that we do. I would like to end on a more
9 personal note.

10 I have been an Illinois resident my
11 entire life. Everyone I know and love, including all
12 of my family and my friends, live here in the
13 Chicagoland area. My husband and I live near these
14 plants and this is where we plan to raise our family.
15 If this technology was not safe, I would not be here.
16 That is all. Thank you very much.

17 (Applause.)

18 MS. JUCKETT: Next we'll go to Douglas
19 Ower.

20 MR. OWER: Good evening. My name is
21 Douglas Ower and I'm a resident of Zion, Illinois.

22 MS. JUCKETT: Talk into it.

23 MR. OWER: I'm a resident of Zion,
24 Illinois and it was mentioned earlier that Zion
25 Nuclear Plant is permitting the decommission and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 actually fuel transfer should be starting at any
2 time. So, Zion is going to have 65 casks of high-
3 level waste sitting there for a total amount of at
4 least a minimum 35 years. That's if they can open a
5 storage facility now, it would be 35 years from now
6 for that fuel to be moved out of Zion. So, that's
7 the best-case scenario.

8 It just to me makes no sense to continue
9 producing more waste when we don't have storage
10 facilities. So, I don't think there should be any
11 licenses or license renewals until a permanent
12 repository is established. This GEIS has one
13 scenario where there is no repository at all becoming
14 available. Again, why do we generate more waste when
15 we're not going to have storage facility as one
16 possibility? And changing out these casks every
17 hundred years, I mean a thousand years from now, what
18 kind of shape are these casks going to be in if we
19 have to change them all, you know, every hundred
20 years? Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you.

23 MR. ROSSO: Hi, my name is Chris Rosso.
24 I'm a construction engineer out of Iowa State and I
25 work at the Braidwood Station Nuclear Power Plant

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 down southwest of Illinois. The comments that I want
2 to bring forth here are just based on my experience
3 with the safety culture at nuclear power. I know a
4 lot of the criticism we've had has been based on
5 some, to put it pointedly, lack of morality of some
6 of the people in the nuclear industry. And I just
7 really don't think that's true.

8 Again, a lot of the folks sitting here
9 can call us young and naive but I do represent part
10 of the young generation in nuclear and actually NAYGN
11 is exactly what it means, the North American Young
12 Generation in Nuclear. And really, my perspective is
13 just a shocking safety culture, especially
14 considering what industry I was planning on going
15 into, which was in construction industry.

16 I understand that all the talk here is,
17 in part, borne from the events in the past, but again
18 I'd like to talk about the recent performance based
19 on my experience of the nuclear industry. And I
20 believe that it's safe to say that thinking that
21 workers would value their own personal safety is
22 really indicative of workers who also value safety
23 culture and their perspective of the effect that it
24 normally has on themselves while they're working, but
25 the public when they meet that work environment.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 So, something I haven't heard a lot of
2 is to throw out some actual facts and statistics.
3 So, I'll try to give a little bit of that right now.
4 So, earlier this year, I gave a speech to some high
5 school kids who are looking at going into trades.
6 And one of the things I tried to advertise to them
7 when they were looking at what trades they wanted to
8 pursue is to look into the nuclear industry because
9 really what they want to do is contribute to
10 longevity and in order to do that you want to work in
11 a safe environment.

12 So, just pulling straight from the
13 Bureau of Labor Statistics, looking at injuries per
14 100 full-time workers, the nuclear industry is, it's
15 actually pretty shocking how much better we are as
16 far as just personnel safety. Per 100 full-time
17 workers, we get 0.3 injuries. To compare that to
18 other generation really don't, the only next closest
19 generation activity you can compare that to is fossil
20 fuel and that's 2.1 injuries per 100 full-time
21 workers. So, several times higher.

22 The industry that I thought I was going
23 to into, construction, 3.7, so even higher. And
24 stepping up to another industry which is the
25 industrial sector, manufacturing, at 4.3 injuries per

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 100 full-time workers. So, I really think anybody
2 that, I really think that people who would value
3 their own personal safety, it's just a cultural norm
4 that they're going to also value the safety of the
5 public.

6 So, one thing I did want to respond to
7 that I saw and I heard mentioned a couple of times
8 was in response to criticisms of casks falling
9 through to the bottom of the spent fuel pool. That's
10 a great challenge. So, the question is why the heck
11 would we lift these heavy structures over a spent
12 fuel pool, and the answer is we don't. They're
13 designed so that we don't lift heavy structures near
14 these safety critical systems. And I've actually
15 went over that several times when development plans
16 because we have to keep these, anything over 2,000
17 pounds, you know, a set distance away from safety
18 critical things such as spent fuel pools. So, again
19 get educated and find some facts before you jump up
20 here and thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MS. JUCKETT: Our next speakers are
23 Marilyn Shineflug, Gail Snyder, and Tracy Fox.

24 MS. SHINEFLUG: Is this okay? Louder?
25 Is this okay? Okay. My name is Marilyn Shineflug

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and I'm a former mayor of a small town in Northern
2 Illinois. And I'm also one of the original
3 interveners when the Byron Plant was built in the
4 1970s. So, I've been concerned about nuclear issues
5 for many years.

6 Briefly, I'll respond very specifically
7 to the issues tonight. It's not that I'm in favor of
8 these things but I'm supportive of these
9 alternatives. The first one is to implement dry
10 spent fuel storage in hardened onsite casks, which
11 was mentioned earlier. Immediate efforts should be
12 made to transfer spent fuel sufficiently cooled from
13 wet pool storage to onsite at-reactor dry storage and
14 so-called hardened casks. This approach would avoid
15 the need to have additional away-from-reactor interim
16 spent fuel installations.

17 And as recommended by Dr. Arjun
18 Makhijani, the Federal government should purchase
19 land adjacent to reactor sites to accommodate this
20 process. Currently, the Federal government is paying
21 very large fines to utilities because of its failure
22 to accept spent fuel for long-term storage by 1988.
23 In other words, because Yucca Mountain was not
24 finished, the Federal government is, they have to pay
25 fines. Once spent fuel comes under Federal control,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the government no longer will be required to pay
2 these fines.

3 Second thing is limit spent fuel
4 transportation. Onsite storage also would save
5 unnecessary transportation costs and reduce radiation
6 exposure risk to the general population during
7 highway road and barge transit. These risks could be
8 significant because even undamaged transport casks do
9 not have enough shielding to prevent gamma and X-ray
10 radiation from escaping through the vault. Thus, ...
11 I'll skip some of it.

12 The third thing is reduce Illinois'
13 chances of becoming the nation's dump. Illinois
14 already is home to over 9,000 metric tons of used
15 nuclear fuel, more than in any other state. The
16 previous two alternatives would work to minimize
17 Illinois' chances of receiving an even greater
18 proportion of the nation's spent fuel.

19 According to an Oak Ridge National
20 Laboratory report, as a totally separate analysis, a
21 consolidated independent storage site in Illinois is
22 the single optimized site for an independent spent
23 fuel installation and only SNF reactors is considered
24 relative to siting itself. In other words, it's a
25 lot of tech speak in that particular paragraph but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 what it's saying is that Illinois is in a position to
2 become the site of one of these independent spent
3 fuel storage facilities. And, of course, we have a
4 nuclear plant already, a nuclear spent fuel facility
5 at Morris, Illinois.

6 We should locate a geological spent fuel
7 storage repository based on rigid scientific
8 criteria. Maximum efforts should be made to
9 thoroughly investigate the least-damaging location
10 for a permanent repository, and preferably one that
11 allows for retrievable storage. The Blue Ribbon
12 Commission proposed heavy reliance on a consent-based
13 approach, but that reliance may not lead to the
14 safest long-term solution. While local consent is
15 important, that consent should be based on scientific
16 knowledge rather than on improperly perceived
17 opportunity to obtain money, jobs, and other items.

18 In a nutshell, I'll finish up, the Waste
19 Confidence Proposed Rule here tonight lacks any
20 sufficiently thorough scientific analysis with many
21 options, especially considering spent fuel pool and
22 cask fires, leaks, and waste storage. How can long-
23 term, let alone indefinite, waste storage even be
24 considered credible? How disintegrated will spent
25 fuel rods be, particularly those with high-product

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 fuel when the need for transfer to new casks arises
2 every many years or so? One last sentence.

3 Lack of assurance exists that
4 institutional controls will be in place 240,000 years
5 or more in the future, the half life of plutonium is
6 only 40,000 years, to oversee continued safe storage.
7 Nuclear power needs to be phased out. Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Next, we're
10 going to go to Gail Snyder followed by Tracy Fox.

11 MS. SNYDER: Good evening. Can you hear
12 me back there? My name is Gail Snyder and I'm on the
13 board of Nuclear Energy and Information Service. And
14 I'm a resident of Illinois living in the southwest
15 suburbs of Chicago. I'm circled by nuclear
16 facilities in Illinois all the way to Michigan.

17 The residents of Illinois do not agree
18 to become the nation's nuclear waste dump. But
19 slowly and ever so quietly over time, the residents
20 of Illinois have come to live with the largest amount
21 of high-level radioactive nuclear energy waste of any
22 state in the country. If the NRC's draft Generic
23 Environmental Impact Statement and Rule are adopted,
24 all nuclear facilities will officially become
25 permanent nuclear waste dumps.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Discovering that no real individual
2 environmental impact study has been done as to how 30
3 plus years of nuclear waste will impact an area makes
4 the current situation even more unacceptable. Even
5 more shocking is the government and nuclear
6 industry's current plan to plan that the waste may
7 end up staying onsite forever. I, of course, realize
8 NRC's - and I would add DOE's - unrealistic handling
9 of the nation's nuclear energy waste and are forcing
10 them to face reality which unfortunately is not
11 accomplished in the NRC's draft GEIS and Rule.

12 In the movie Pandora's Promise, what I
13 believe to be the most important statement in the
14 movie is made by pro-nuclear Mark Lynas, while
15 turning to the nuclear disaster in the area of
16 Fukushima, Japan, he says, "this was not supposed to
17 happen to a reactor." All the things that are not
18 supposed to happen are exactly the problems with
19 storing nuclear waste. In fact, this is something
20 that nuclear industry operators, investors,
21 governments, and their agencies that facilitate
22 nuclear energy as well as companies that build
23 nuclear reactors are concerned about. They know
24 things that aren't supposed to happen do happen.
25 They also know this risk creates a great liability.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 So, just like stockpiling the nuclear
2 energy waste so quietly, stockpiling risk and
3 liability has happened equally as quietly, and has
4 put upon the public unbeknownst to them a burden.
5 The public is carrying a portion of the liability and
6 risk for the nuclear industry. This is happening on
7 a global scale.

8 Last week, the U.S. Department of Energy
9 Secretary Munoz went to Japan to offer to Fukushima -
10 - as long as Japan signs on to the convention of
11 supplementary compensation for nuclear energy - -
12 removing the liability for nuclear construction
13 companies and other nuclear vendors from nuclear
14 accidents. If you think the same will not apply here
15 in the U.S., think again.

16 As all those involved in facilitating
17 nuclear power seek to extend the time that nuclear
18 waste stays in our communities, they also seek to
19 reduce their own liability and responsibility to the
20 public. Worse yet is they seek to silence us by
21 including this Generic Environmental Impact Statement
22 into the reactor licensing and effectively preventing
23 the public from raising concern and being able to
24 question the storage of nuclear waste forever onsite
25 at individual nuclear reactor facilities in our home

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 communities. Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Next we'll go
4 to Tracy Fox followed by Rod McCullum, Kathleen Rude
5 and Samantha Schussele. I apologize if I'm
6 mispronouncing it.

7 MS. FOX: My name is Tracy Fox, I work
8 as a volunteer with Peoria Families Against Toxic
9 Waste. We normally work with hazardous waste on
10 heavy metals and PCBs and other things that stick
11 around for a long time, but, boy, all of that pales
12 in comparison with nuclear. When I reviewed the
13 draft EIS, the first thing that I was taken aback by
14 was the fact that it was a generic EIS and at some
15 point we authorized that we can have one EIS that
16 would cover what really is a relatively small number
17 of nuclear plants, a discrete hundred or so.

18 And so, I thought, all right, I'll give
19 you the benefit of the doubt and I opened up the big
20 document and started to page through it. And I
21 expected to see tables and charts that might tell me
22 here is where we're at as far as filling up these
23 spent fuel pools, here is where we are using dry
24 casks, and here are some guidelines for best
25 practices. And I didn't find any of that. I found

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that kind of quirky.

2 And then I thought, well, we're going to
3 have certainly some best practices and some
4 guidelines that are going to underlie these
5 assumptions. But I didn't find any of that. I had
6 been to some information sessions by NEIS and I
7 learned about hardened onsite storage and I expected
8 that would be included in the document, but again, I
9 didn't find any of that.

10 Instead, I just got some things that are
11 echoed in the executive summary tonight categorizing
12 everything as small risk, small risk, small risk.
13 And I've done quite a bit of technical writing in my
14 life and I was a little bit concerned as to how is
15 that risk laid out and how are they analyzing it?
16 And I didn't really find any metrics they gave me to
17 my confidence. I didn't see that they had looked
18 beyond just stating, hmm, infinitesimal possibility
19 of this happening, therefore, we should dismiss it.

20 To me, when we're looking at risk, we
21 need to look at what's the probability that it's
22 going to occur, how severe will it be if it occurs,
23 and how likely is it that we can detect it early and
24 put a stop to it? But I didn't see any of that kind
25 of analysis done at all. And that's the kind of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 analysis that should underlie engineering. And it
2 was painfully absent.

3 I'm also interested in the issue of
4 climate change and I looked in a little bit more
5 detail as to what they did in that section. And I
6 saw that they had forecasted temperature range of
7 about 5.5 degrees Celsius, and they were considering
8 all up to that. So, I expected to see, okay, I've
9 read the book Six Degrees and I know that when you
10 get up to six degrees it gets pretty gripping.

11 But I didn't see any analysis of water
12 usage. I didn't see anything about the increasing
13 water temperatures and how those would affect
14 cooling. I didn't see anything about the push
15 between climate change and water availability.
16 Again, all of that seemed to underline the fact that
17 I don't believe there was any scientific basis
18 whatsoever for the risk analysis in this document.

19 And to me, in order to have any kind of
20 waste confidence, confidence in any kind of
21 exclusion, you have to have an underlying risk-
22 management system that makes sense. This doesn't
23 seem to have a system at all. Instead, I think they
24 want to conflate waste confidence with, as my husband
25 terms it, waste arrogance, and that's really all this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 is, the belief that we can just say, whoosh, we've
2 got a solution, we will continue doing as we are and
3 it will work great and everyone will be happy.

4 Instead, I think about the very real
5 engineering nitpicky details, things like fatigues,
6 stresses on metals that begin to fail, the impacts of
7 corrosion. When things are designed for a 30-year-
8 life or even a 60-year-life, they do not last for 100
9 years. Otherwise, then they are over-designed and
10 that doesn't serve shareholders so it never, ever
11 happens.

12 I believe that we are making a lot of
13 choices here that are not only endangering us but
14 also putting off better choices that we could be
15 making. For every dollar that a taxpayer has to sink
16 into nuclear power in dealing with its waste and
17 dealing with its risks is a dollar that we can be
18 spending on renewables and things that will really
19 move us forward.

20 (Applause.)

21 MS. JUCKETT: Next we'll go to Kathleen
22 Rude.

23 MS. RUDE: Good evening. I'm Kathleen
24 Rude and I'm here speaking on behalf of my nieces and
25 nephews and for future generation in all walks of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 life. As I was thinking about what I wanted to say
2 here in response to this hearing tonight, I was
3 reminded of a story of a young person with clothes.
4 It's a story of a vain emperor who cares about
5 nothing except wearing and displaying clothes. He
6 hires two swindlers who promised some of the finest
7 best clothes with a fabric invisible to anyone who is
8 unfit for his position or hopelessly stupid. The
9 emperor's ministers could not see the clothing
10 themselves but they pretend that they can for fear of
11 appearing unfit for their positions, and the emperor
12 does the same.

13 Finally, the swindlers report that the
14 suit is finished and they mime dressing the emperor
15 and he marches in procession before his subjects.
16 And the townsfolk played along with the pretense not
17 wanting to appear unfit for their positions or
18 stupid. But then there's a child in the crowd and
19 he's too young to understand the desirability of
20 keeping up this pretense and he blurts out that the
21 emperor is wearing nothing at all. And he frees
22 everyone else in the crowd who start realizing that
23 the emperor is naked.

24 This is a fable that is an apt
25 description of the nuclear industry and the issue

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 before us tonight. It's the feasibility of safely
2 storing nuclear waste. The nuclear industry has
3 dressed this operation in a sham of safety, claiming
4 that nuclear power is safe, and spent fuel rods can
5 be contained, and so posing no threat to life on the
6 planet.

7 But that simply isn't true. The emperor
8 has no clothes. Nuclear power plants produce the
9 most deadly waste imaginable. We have already
10 created enough radioactive waste to destroy life on
11 Earth. And the hard truth is we don't know what to
12 do about it.

13 Fukushima is not hypothetical. It is
14 not theoretical. It is not science fiction or a
15 made-up story. It's real. And it is proof of the
16 fallibility of nuclear power and protection of spent
17 fuel rods. The experts don't know how to keep us
18 safe from it. And yet the NRC and the nuclear
19 industry is acting as if we do. We're looking at the
20 naked emperor and praising his imaginary outfit.

21 Why? I believe it's because when we
22 look at the truth, the real truth of what we've
23 created, we are terrified. Terrified of the
24 magnitude of dumping radioactive waste that we have
25 created and are continuing to create. We are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 terrified of the certainty of contamination that's
2 already happening and the destruction of life. The
3 USGS is already finding polar bears and seals with
4 skin rashes and diseases and open sores. Our fish
5 are contaminated with nuclear radiation from
6 Fukushima.

7 And so, we need to face the scary and
8 embrace it, because then you can take off the
9 blinders that are keeping us in denial of the truth.
10 We need to pay attention to the boy in the stable.
11 He speaks the truth we are afraid to see. The
12 emperor has no clothes. We do not know how to
13 protect ourselves from radioactive waste. We need to
14 stop making it now.

15 Germany has already done this two years
16 ago. They are now supporting energy generated from
17 solar power and other sources. So, we need to stop
18 pretending that this is safe and that we know what we
19 are doing. Knowing when we embrace this difficult
20 truth we can really start to have an honest
21 discussion that will find some solutions. The
22 emperor has no clothes. Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MS. SCHUSSELE: Good evening, everyone.
25 My name is Samantha Schussele. I am in the reactor

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 engineering department at LaSalle Station. And I am
2 responsible for providing technical guidance for a
3 nuclear power reactor and also managing and tracking
4 fuel and all the other nuclear waste and the nuclear
5 material that's onsite.

6 And as a fairly new face to the nuclear
7 power industry, I would just like to take a moment to
8 speak the issue of culture shock that I had when I
9 arrived. A shock at, you know, the seriousness that
10 we take with every decision that we make, and at the
11 attention that we continuously give to safety. The
12 safety culture that's established at our plant and
13 all the Exelon plants and all of the nuclear plants,
14 at least in the U.S. and across the world, it's held
15 to the highest standard. So, it is always on top of
16 our mind in every decision we make and I never ever
17 question my personal safety when I'm at work.

18 This safety one hundred percent
19 translates to our nuclear waste program. I
20 personally work with the dry cask storage campaign at
21 LaSalle and I can testify that those casks are far
22 more robust than you can imagine. Over a hundred
23 tons of steel and concrete form a precisely
24 engineered structure to protect the fuel that we
25 place inside. And I have walked past those loaded

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 casks many times, and I assure you that I get way
2 more radiation from the sun that's shining down on me
3 than from those casks.

4 They've been proven to survive severe
5 hurricanes and earthquakes, aircraft crashes. They
6 have flown planes into those concrete cask storage
7 and the plane was disintegrated with the cask
8 remaining intact. And we've also tested missiles 30
9 times more powerful than a typical antitank weapon.
10 And all this has been done to keep the casks intact.

11 I currently live within 50 miles of
12 three nuclear power plants as I'm sure many of you
13 do. I plan on remaining there. I plan to get
14 married there. I plan to raise my family there. And
15 I have the utmost confidence that my future family
16 and I will live in a safe and happy community even
17 with these nuclear power plants, enhanced by these
18 nuclear power plants.

19 I have confidence in the draft GEIS and
20 I would urge the NRC to adopt the Rule. Thank you
21 all for your time.

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Next is Rod
24 McCullum, and after Rod, we'll go to Tina Seastrom.

25 MR. McCULLUM: My name is Rod McCullum

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and I work at the Nuclear Energy Institute, the
2 industry--

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can't hear you.

4 MR. McCULLUM: My name is Rod McCullum
5 and I work at the Nuclear Energy Institute based out
6 of Washington, D.C. where I have spent the last 15
7 years of my career working on these issues including
8 the Yucca Mountain, and more specifically the Yucca
9 Mountain repository.

10 But today I can say it's good to be back
11 in Chicago, because before I went to Washington to
12 work on this issue, because I believe it's important,
13 I spent a good portion of my life in this area
14 working in Argonne National Laboratory, working at
15 the Department of Energy, working at a couple of
16 Exelon's nuclear plants. I'm very familiar with what
17 Illinois is capable of in the area of nuclear spent
18 fuel management. I'm very familiar with the world-
19 class expertise that exists in this area.

20 Illinois has 50 years of experience
21 managing spent nuclear fuel and has done so safely.
22 And I believe that's only going to get better.
23 Illinois has loaded 120 casks, safely stored in pools
24 for 50 years including the only independent spent
25 fuel storage installation - that is the Morris

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 facility - which was recently relicensed, a very
2 tough, highly specific process like all NRC process
3 just to use an example.

4 Illinois leads the nation and has a
5 chance to lead the world in reaping the benefits of
6 this experience. 50 percent of your electricity,
7 5,000 jobs, \$400 million in annual payroll, and \$170
8 million in taxes. Most importantly though, the
9 nitrogen oxide pollutions that are avoided by using
10 all this nuclear energy is the equivalent of 4.3
11 million cars. A lot has been said here tonight, a
12 lot of speculation, a lot of them are flat out
13 untrue. But 4.3 million tons of nitrogen oxide in
14 the air, we know what that does. A very real health
15 situation about air pollution.

16 I want to talk about two things
17 specifically that's been mentioned a lot, the safety
18 culture and climate change. I see these things
19 becoming intertwined. Safety culture is not about
20 rhetoric. It's not about anecdotes. It's not about
21 speculation.

22 It's about facts. It's about analysis.
23 It's about questioning the facts and doing more
24 analysis. This is what nuclear engineers do. This
25 is why the young people who got up here are so

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 confident. This is why we have achieved the safety
2 record we have.

3 A lot of young people today are looking
4 into facts about climate change. They are asking the
5 hard questions. They're deciding to become nuclear
6 engineers. If we were to turn our backs on nuclear
7 energy, it is the best weapon we have against climate
8 change. Yes, solar should play a role. Yes --
9 should play a role -- based on large-scale
10 electricity generation.

11 If we were to turn our backs on our
12 biggest weapon against climate change, I would
13 question the safety culture of our nation. But I
14 know we won't do that. I'm heartened to see, when I
15 come to Illinois, so many young people getting into
16 this business and letting their safety culture drive
17 our nation in the right direction.

18 Now, I could get up here and tell you
19 how Chernobyl or even Fukushima could happen in this
20 country, but I won't do that because safety culture,
21 my safety culture won't let it.

22 For all we have achieved, for all the
23 record of safety, I believe it's going to get better.
24 I believe young people are going to be better. \$26
25 billion on the nuclear waste fund, the courts have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 asked NRC to do this. I would also ask the NRC to
2 restart the Yucca Mountain licensing process. And
3 they're also looking at what the Department of Energy
4 is doing with that money.

5 Our government works and I really am
6 gratified not by just hearing my friends and
7 supporters out here, but all the commentary, all the
8 discussion. This is our process at work. This is us
9 asking questions. I'm confident NRC will come up
10 with the answers. I look forward and I support this
11 process. Thank you.

12 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Rod.

13 (Applause.)

14 MS. JUCKETT: Next we'll go to Tina.
15 And after Tina, we'll go to Shari Katz.

16 MS. SEASTROM: I'm Tina Seastrom, I'm
17 here representing myself and -- Nuclear Energy
18 Information Service. We know that you represent the
19 industry and not the consumer or the people of the
20 Earth. We feel -- don't need or want to be at great
21 risk due to the ways of the Nuclear Regulatory
22 Commission. Please change your ways. Nuclear is not
23 the way to go while we have geothermal, solar, and
24 wind, and who knows what else? Waste confidence, I
25 have no waste confidence.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 MS. JUCKETT: Is Sheri Katz here?
4 Sheri? She had to leave, thanks. I just want to
5 remind you all that you can still submit comments
6 online. I know we're having to cut them short, I'm
7 very sorry we have to do that to get through
8 everybody, but you can still submit comments online
9 or by e-mail or in writing. There's many other ways
10 to comment. And also, if everyone could, please
11 check your cell phones real quick and make sure that
12 they're off?

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: How many more?

14 MS. JUCKETT: 15 left. For our next
15 speakers, let's go to Liane Casten, Stephenie
16 Bilenko, and Lisa Donovan. I'm sorry. This is
17 Liane.

18 MS. CASTEN: Can you hear me? Yes. My
19 name is Liane Casten. I am a journalist and author.
20 I'm going to tell you for a second about my breast
21 cancer book. Two elements - nuclear and treating
22 breast cancer. I won't go into the first, the second
23 is nuclear radiation.

24 I can only quickly tell you that after
25 ten years, the women in Nagasaki developed a mass of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 breast cancer. It's a long-term effect. It doesn't
2 immediately pop up. You will see it eventually if
3 you have been exposed over a period of time.
4 Therefore, I'm going to start out by telling you this
5 is an issue of madness dealing with a dangerous
6 technology, dangerous, notwithstanding the word safe,
7 it isn't.

8 It's a dangerous technology that costs
9 way too much; that threatens the lives of thousands
10 of people; that generates poisons even in low-level
11 emissions; that generates lies and false statements
12 to lull the public into their sense of safety, as a
13 clean technology and nuclear power is not; that we
14 lull ourselves into denial to justify our cool homes,
15 while corporate executives take home their salaries,
16 and while millions and millions of dollars are
17 invested in this technology, while PR firms promote
18 this technology and frankly it's become a mad world.
19 Any time we think it's okay to allow some exposure to
20 radiation through accidents, which are many, or any
21 releases, and any time someone is harmed, that's
22 evil.

23 Let's deal with facts. After Chernobyl,
24 I heard the Russian equivalent of the EPA come to
25 America to warn us about the dangers of nuclear

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 radiation. He talked about the thousands of people
2 who were harmed and died, thousands. He finally
3 actually admitted that there were millions, and he
4 also admitted the Russian government lied. They
5 didn't want to admit this, they were avoiding it, and
6 he died two years later. He was involved with the
7 cleanup.

8 No human life is expendable or
9 collateral damage. No one. Accidents will happen.
10 No one must deny this. How can anyone justify
11 harming just one human being when less toxic and more
12 sustainable technology is available?

13 This whole mindset is morally
14 indefensible. If I take a gun and randomly shoot
15 bullets into a crowd, I'd be called insane, criminal,
16 and evil. This technology is no less. Let's just
17 stop making the waste.

18 (Applause.)

19 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Next we'll go
20 to Stephanie Bilenko.

21 MS. BILENKO: My name is Stephanie
22 Bilenko. And I am part of the Near West Citizens for
23 Peace and Justice. That group is part of a larger
24 group of the Illinois Coalition of Peace, Justice,
25 and Environment.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Illinois is not a waste dump. We don't
2 want any more high-level radioactive waste coming to,
3 or through, Illinois. Nuclear waste is still a
4 problem without a solution. No technology has been
5 proven capable of containing radioactive waste for
6 the hundreds of thousands of years necessary to
7 protect the environment. Debates continue over
8 whether it is even possible to do so. And
9 unfortunately, the United States has failed even to
10 identify the vital site for nuclear waste repository
11 despite millions of dollars and the Federal mandate
12 to do so.

13 Mass transportation of nuclear waste is
14 insane. The sheer volume of nuclear waste will
15 require thousands of shipments on our roads, rails,
16 and waterways. Nationwide, there is well over 80,000
17 tons of spent nuclear fuel, with plutonium that will
18 remain toxic for 240,000 years. Other elements in
19 the radiated fuel will be dangerously radioactive for
20 even longer. No storage facility has been designed
21 that can contain radioactive waste for such periods
22 since spent nuclear fuel contains large quantities of
23 fissile fuel or -- material that can be used to make
24 nuclear weapons. So, they also must be safeguarded
25 to prevent theft.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Proponents of nuclear power treat the
2 radioactive waste as a minor matter. It is not. A
3 nuclear fusion reactor produces waste so lethal that
4 it has to be isolated from the rest of existence for
5 a quarter of a million years. In theory, containing
6 high-level waste is possible. In practice, Murphy's
7 Law is the safer god. In the real world, it is
8 certain that sooner or later things go wrong. By
9 accident or passiveness of nature, that waste is
10 going to leak into the biosphere. And once that
11 happens, anyone and anything that comes into contact
12 with even a few milligrams of it will suffer a
13 miserable death.

14 The more nuclear power we generate now,
15 the more of this ghastly 'gift' will be stockpiling
16 for the people of the far future. A basic concept of
17 morality is that each of us ought to leave the world
18 a better place for those who come after us. If we
19 know better, we ought to do that. One of the
20 essential boundaries of appropriate tech is the
21 boundary between the kinds of matter you can change
22 with tools you have on hand and the kinds you can't.
23 And if you can't change it into something safe, it's
24 a bad idea to produce it in the first place.

25 It really is that simple. If you can't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 transform it, don't produce it. Radioactivity from
2 atomic power will pose a threat to life on the Earth
3 for the next million years. We are confident that
4 NRC and the waste generators can never contain this
5 waste for as long as it poses a hazard. But to
6 continue making more of it is not just insane, it is
7 irresponsible and should be illegal. NRC must
8 abandon its waste confidence policy and stop using it
9 to license nuclear power plants. There is no safe
10 dose of radiation and to pursue licensing it on the
11 basis of waste confidence is immoral.

12 And now, I'm speaking as a citizen now.
13 For my children's future, no more nuclear power.
14 These are my grandchildren. Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Our next
17 speakers, we'll go to Joyce Good, Clare Tobin, and
18 Robert Schwartz. Is Joyce still here?

19 MS. GOOD: Yes, I'm still -- can you
20 hear me? Okay, hi, everybody. Thank you so much for
21 coming, everyone. And I thank you so much for your
22 talking.

23 I just want to clarify a few things that
24 came up about safety concerns and the facts. Well,
25 one of the facts that are to safety concerns is Three

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Mile Island. And I have a very conservative
2 accountant who in every way is very conservative.
3 But when it comes to Three Mile Island, he shakes his
4 head and he hates nuclear. Why? Because his
5 relatives are there and they're dying. That is a
6 fact. That is not safety concern, that's fact.
7 Please say it as it is. My next-door neighbor,
8 who gets sick constantly, a beautiful young man and
9 at most he's in his early 30's, he was a victim of
10 Chernobyl. He lived in Poland. He constantly gets
11 ill. He does not know how to solve it. That is not
12 a safety feature. That's a fact, and that's a fact
13 we have to look at and we have to look now.

14 Now, the young lady who came up from
15 Exelon, all the people from Exelon, thank you.
16 You're very nice. I like you. I'm sorry you work
17 for Exelon and I'm glad your organization and company
18 provides you with experiences that you feel make
19 things safe. Exelon gets cited many times for doing
20 wrong things. So, don't forget that. But they have
21 never put you in a situation with a tornado or a
22 typhoon or an earthquake. How about that for pools
23 of radioactive waste? You've never experienced that.
24 So, you really can't stand up and say confidently
25 they have done everything and I do feel safe.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 government, once it starts on one direction, it's so
2 difficult to change it. And all the subsidies that
3 you're getting for it, why can't we put those
4 subsidies into good, renewable energy? All that
5 money, we could be free and we could be healthy and
6 we could be safe, and so would our children.

7 And for you young people there working,
8 I would implore you to read this book, "Full Body
9 Burden" by Kristen Iversen who worked in the 60s and
10 70s in Rocky Mountain Flats or whatever you call that
11 dump. And the number of commissions and the secrecy
12 and the illnesses and the coverup, and all of the
13 hearings that were heard and that went nowhere, and
14 her life is a testimony. And all the people who are
15 sick and who got ill, you've got to wake up and read
16 those.

17 And let us be courageous and do what we
18 need to do, and it's move away from nuclear forever.
19 It's dead.

20 (Applause.)

21 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Clare. Next
22 speaker is Robert Schwartz followed by Fran Celle, I
23 apologize if I mispronounced that. I'm having a hard
24 time reading some of the writing. And also Bridget
25 Rorem.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SCHWARTZ: I'm Robert Schwartz. And
2 I do have confidence in the NRC's rulemaking and
3 policies and procedures. I reside at, well, with
4 this crowd, I don't think I'm going to tell you where
5 I reside it. But, as the crow flies, I live eight
6 miles downwind of Dresden Nuclear Power Plant. And
7 there are nuclear spent fuel storage casks there that
8 have been there for years. And my -- isn't wired
9 shut and I haven't lost any teeth either.

10 I feel safe that the fuel is stored
11 safely and not a threat to my safety or my family's.
12 And I live downwind of the casks. And I represent
13 one of the neighbors and we know the casks.

14 I have witnessed the fuel being put into
15 the casks. I have witnessed the welding of the
16 casks. And I have witnessed the inner cask being put
17 in the outer cask, and I have witnessed the two feet
18 of concrete, the new product concrete poured around
19 the inner casks and the outer lid welded on. I have
20 all the confidence that the NRC's design and
21 engineering will keep the fuel safely stored with all
22 the criteria and the most stringent standards. Each
23 inch is reviewed. The casks are made of neutron
24 material.

25 I have confidence in the NRC's expertise

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in continuing to develop policies and procedures to
2 protect us as they have done in the past. And I'm
3 not moving. And I challenge the previous speaker who
4 contested the safety of the casks and the building of
5 the casks in the parking lot after this meeting.
6 Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MS. JUCKETT: Next we'll go to Fran.

9 MS. CELLA: I'm Dr. Francine Cella, and
10 I'm a member of the League of Women Voters of the
11 Elgin area, and I'm also the issue specialist on
12 fracking for the League of Women Voters of Illinois.
13 The League, although the League opposes increasing
14 reliance on nuclear fission, it recognizes its place
15 in the nation's energy.

16 And the speech that I came here to give
17 I'm not going to give, partly because a lot of the
18 points have already been covered, but also because
19 I'm realizing that really the issue here is that what
20 we're looking at is confidence in the NRC. And
21 regardless of that, I am so happy to hear about the
22 culture of safety that is in place in the existing
23 plants, but regardless of what efforts are being made
24 within the plants by all you people who are working
25 there and doing such a fine job, and I trust that you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 are all very capable, if the structural integrity of
2 the plant is not sound and the only ones that can
3 solve that are NRC. They are the agency that is
4 responsible for addressing safety problems,

5 So, global and safety -- identify
6 problems, but the NRC is basically designated by the
7 Federal government as the responsible agent for
8 correcting the problems or seeing the problems are
9 corrected. And there has been some history that they
10 have always done that.

11 Several decades ago, the government
12 determined that nuclear plants in seismic zones
13 presented specific increased risks. So, in 1996, the
14 NRC required that new reactors built in seismic areas
15 be designed with protections against earthquakes. It
16 took almost nine years, however, for the NRC to begin
17 assessing the potential risk and existing reactors
18 that were already operating in seismic areas. In
19 2005, NRC identified its 27 most vulnerable reactors,
20 two of these are in Illinois, the two Dresden units,
21 and eight years later there still has not been any
22 corrective action on those.

23 You know, in this world where, you know
24 what, and I don't think anybody in the world
25 disagrees that there is a high risk of nuclear

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 fission. It's like every conceivable effort has to
2 be made to ensure that absolutely nothing goes wrong.
3 The Feds have designated the authority for the safety
4 of our nation's nuclear plants exclusively to the
5 NRC. There are some questions about their track
6 record with that.

7 So, regardless of how hard you're
8 working in these plants, there's questions, there are
9 serious questions. So, the League does not have
10 confidence in the NRC's waste confidence and draft
11 Generic Environmental Impact Statement, and the
12 document should be thoroughly revised on the basis of
13 objective or review of scientific data which includes
14 NRC's own performance data. And I have been
15 observing, and differentially are kind of - - - - I
16 know we're at the end of the evening now.

17 (Applause.)

18 MS. JUCKETT: Our next speaker is
19 Bridget Rorem followed by William Jones.

20 MS. ROREM: Hi, I'm Bridget Rorem. The
21 nuclear industry and the Nuclear Regulatory
22 Commission, formerly the Atomic Energy Commission,
23 have had nearly 60 years to come up with a permanent
24 solution for nuclear waste, especially spent nuclear
25 fuel generated by nuclear power plants. I've been

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 involved in nuclear issues to a greater or lesser
2 extent for more than half that time.

3 Some 34 or 35 years ago, I was in a
4 meeting similar to this one. But whether it was
5 called by Commonwealth Edison or an agency set up to
6 oversee and regulate it, I cannot remember. One
7 person commented, made mention of all the methods he
8 knew under consideration for long-term disposal of
9 high-level nuclear waste: shoot it into space, bury
10 it in salt mines, et cetera. Someone from either the
11 NRC or ComEd responded that we have high hopes
12 currently for the VDH concept.

13 A year or so later, I received from the
14 NRC a large book addressing the concerns about high-
15 level nuclear waste. This was in the wake of the
16 accident at Three Mile Island, and I assume that
17 every citizen intervening in a licensing procedure or
18 otherwise involved in the nuclear issue received such
19 a copy. Therein I discovered exactly what VDH meant,
20 a very deep hole.

21 The industry and its watchdog have tried
22 to convince the public for half a century that a
23 solution is on the horizon. They have used jargon
24 and acronyms to sound more authoritative and
25 knowledgeable on the subject than they really are.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 And nuclear waste continues building up, so nuclear
2 spent fuel is now stored in dry casks at nuclear
3 plants while they work on the problem.

4 It is as simple as this. Everything
5 leaks eventually. Everything leaks. And nuclear
6 matter, when it leaks, contaminates that which
7 contains it and everything far, far beyond. Leakage
8 cannot be controlled or contained. Enough! Stop
9 making nuclear waste! There are better, safer,
10 cheaper ways to supply our energy needs. How much
11 will it cost to contain, watch over, move, clean up
12 leakage for hundreds of thousands of years? Enough!
13 Everything, everything leaks.

14 (Applause.)

15 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. William Jones?

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, he went home.

17 MS. JUCKETT: Let's next go to Debra
18 Michaud, followed by Jeffrey Schramek and Terry
19 Gallagher.

20 MS. MICHAUD: My name is Debra Michaud.
21 I'm a citizen and a business owner. And thank you
22 for this opportunity to speak, yet for the record I
23 want to mention that the only way I found about this
24 meeting was just I have friends who are in
25 environmental organizations. So, I don't believe

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that this was widely announced. And the fact that
2 there is no mainstream media here is evidence of
3 that.

4 At this time, there are no facilities
5 for permanent storage of high-level radioactive
6 waste. Since the only way radioactive wastes finally
7 become harmless is through decay, which for some
8 isotopes containing high-level waste can take
9 hundreds and thousands of years. The waste must be
10 stored when we have adequate protection for various
11 point in times, but at this time there are no
12 facilities for permanent storage. That actually
13 comes from the NRC website.

14 So, the industry folks and the
15 politicians who spoke tonight and who stand to
16 personally gain from nuclear power through their
17 paychecks and other issues are talking about the next
18 50 to 100 years. And even that they cannot predict
19 what is the future as Fukushima has taught us.

20 So, my question, based on the NRC's own
21 figure, I have a bunch of them actually, does the NRC
22 have a plan for the next 250,000 years of nuclear
23 waste storage and disaster response? Does the NRC
24 have a financial plan to manage nuclear waste for
25 250,000 years? Is the NRC prepared to consider

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 potential disasters for the next 250,000 years? Does
2 the NRC feel confident that factors of climate
3 change, change into its 250,000-year plan which would
4 include predicting water shortages, super storms,
5 increased flooding and droughts? Has the NRC planned
6 for the likely population explosion over the next few
7 hundred years?

8 Considering how fracking has been proven
9 by the USGS to produce earthquakes in previously
10 inactive faults, has the NRC figured a way to predict
11 that future generations won't be fracking within a
12 region of nuclear waste storage? Can the NRC prove
13 that humans will be in existence in 50,000, 100,000,
14 200,000 years to manage this waste?

15 "The problem with nuclear," says Hubert
16 Reeves, an astrophysicist, "is that it mortgages the
17 future." Between the time you launch a reactor and
18 the time you dismantle it, more than a century can go
19 by. As a political -- more than a century, there are
20 very few of them in history. We can't talk about
21 political stability on the scale of a thousand years.
22 Imagine the Egyptians had stored nuclear waste, who
23 would manage it today? It's outrageous to think we
24 can manage the future at such times as these. When
25 we look at the history of mankind and all its in our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 peoples, it's totally outrageous.

2 Can the NRC morally defend its position
3 of bequeathing the problem of radioactive waste for
4 thousands of years? The hubris we have as humans, to
5 leave this legacy of waste for 6,000 human
6 generations for a single generation's comfort, it is
7 immoral and arrogant. And I have no confidence that
8 the NRC represents the interests of the future and
9 life on this planet. Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Next we'll go
12 to Jeffrey Schramek. Is Jeffrey here? We'll go to
13 Terry Gallagher.

14 REV. GALLAGHER: Good evening. I'm
15 Reverend Dr. Terry Gallagher, I'm a public theologian
16 with a Ministry for a Sustainable Earth. And first
17 of all, I want to express my gratitude that you all
18 stuck through this this long, to have this kind of
19 conversation to kind of explore where we're at and
20 where we're going. I appreciate the NRC offering and
21 inviting us to discuss.

22 As a theologian, I often remark it's
23 interesting that every major world religion has some
24 form of the golden rule. Every single major world
25 group has some form of "don't do unto others that you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 wouldn't want done unto you." There is something
2 about that that just resonates with our humanity.
3 That we're called to care for others. That we're
4 called to care beyond short-term economics. That
5 we're called to care for our future.

6 So, I'm here to speak for our future.
7 And I'm here to tell you it's unethical to require
8 future generations to handle the waste that we're
9 generating. It's unethical to put this burden on the
10 future generations. We wouldn't have wanted it done
11 to us. Where do we get off thinking that we have the
12 right to do it to others?

13 So, the short-term approach to handling
14 nuclear waste is unethical. If we're going to have
15 nuclear power, then we need to be honest and face it
16 and handle it within our generation. The answer is
17 we haven't found a way to do that here. So, until we
18 do, we need to stop. It's unethical to put our
19 generation to the future generation. It's in our
20 humanity.

21 We're addicted to cheap fossil fuel and
22 cheap power. We need to look beyond short-term
23 economics. We need to think about what is truly
24 human and what we would want future generations to
25 have to bear because we wanted the lights on.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 There's other ways. Thanks for having me.

2 (Applause.)

3 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Next we have
4 Margaret Aguilar to be followed by Evan Craig.

5 MS. AGUILAR: Some people have not been
6 able to channel their inner Tina Turner here but I'm
7 going to give it a shot. My name is Margaret
8 Aguilar. I've been in Chicago since 1981. I come
9 from Denver where we had gone and dealt with --
10 plants, or didn't deal with it.

11 And I just want to give some numbers and
12 some people did give already, and one is the 240,000
13 years that we're talking about when plutonium
14 generates to the point that it doesn't pose a
15 significant threat. And the other is how old is the
16 homo sapiens as a species. And that's probably --
17 that was jacked up from 150 million to about 200
18 million. And it may go a little higher, but in fact
19 this stuff is going to be around and be very
20 dangerous longer than we've been a species on this
21 Earth.

22 The second number I would like to tell
23 you is the sample size. The engineer that was here
24 that said that she was a sample of one and she had
25 three daughters, that makes it a sample of four.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 That's not considered scientific evidence to any real
2 scientist who is doing any real research on the
3 effects of nuclear energy.

4 People have put in pieces and bits and
5 kind of thrown away things like Yucca Mountain. I
6 suspect many people here realize that Yucca Mountain
7 was chosen for political rather than scientific
8 reasons. The site has been subject to two
9 earthquakes in the last 15 years, one of which
10 partially destroyed the building that was built on
11 there. So, it's really not a seismically stable area
12 to be a real resource to store or be a real storage
13 thing.

14 I guess I'm obviously demonstrating the
15 fact that I have no confidence in the waste
16 confidence, and that as a person who has lived in
17 this kind of nuclear necklace of 11 nuclear power
18 plant sites, I am feeling, I really feel trapped by
19 the planned releases of nuclear gases, by the
20 millions of gallons of tritium-contaminated water
21 that was released to the Kankakee River and then to
22 groundwater on Kankakee from the Braidwood Plant, and
23 for all of the other kinds of oopsies that were not
24 acknowledged by the plants, by Exelon, and by other
25 companies that run nuclear power plants. And the NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 hasn't seemed to have done a real good job of
2 protecting us from this.

3 And so, as a mom and a potential grandma
4 and a person who lives here and pays taxes and just
5 retired working as a nurse for 40 years, you know, I
6 object.

7 (Applause.)

8 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. We'll go to
9 Evan Craig.

10 MR. CRAIG: I thought I had plenty of
11 time to draft my comments. So, my name is Evan
12 Craig. I'm an engineer and a volunteer with the
13 Sierra Club.

14 I remember adults telling me in 4th
15 Grade that I should hide under my desk and to protect
16 myself from nuclear fallout. In 8th Grade, I didn't
17 understand yet and I built a model of a nuclear
18 reactor as a science fair project. It wasn't until I
19 started to build a working model that the dangers of
20 nuclear energy became clear to me.

21 While earning my engineering degree, I
22 worked at no accelerated test without data from a
23 non-accelerated test. I'm concerned that life test
24 data for existing plants in Illinois is not
25 available, and that this data is only now being

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 generated as the licenses for these plants are
2 extended. Without it, we're guessing.

3 In the late 80s, I worked for a company
4 that designed control valves. The valves designed by
5 my older colleagues for the nuclear industry were
6 already antiquated. And the redundancy in the
7 designs struck me as Rube Goldberg embarrassments to
8 satisfy bureaucratic requirements to make a
9 fundamentally dangerous process appear safe.

10 Perhaps the most alarming evidence I
11 have seen convincing me to oppose this GEIS is the
12 excessive confidence demonstrated by the comments of
13 some of the enthusiastic employees here tonight.
14 'None have broken yet' is an unsafe approach to
15 terrestrial nuclear power and it ignores basic
16 engineering discipline. I'd be less concerned if
17 more had a healthy fear.

18 I find the term "generic environmental"
19 an oxymoron. Environment is the essence of site
20 variability. So, I find the proposition absurd and
21 reject any GEIS for nuclear waste. Without a waste
22 solution, like everybody else has said, I oppose the
23 creation of more nuclear waste.

24 I see few in this room who will be
25 around to fulfill the promises to replace casks in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the 60 or 100 years, let alone 250,000 years. I've
2 seen promises to protect the public abandoned in the
3 face of extreme events, like the increasingly extreme
4 weather events we can expect or more frequently --
5 gives me pause. NRC should stop jeopardizing future
6 citizens without their consent and should not be
7 allowed to issue new licenses or extensions. Thank
8 you.

9 (Applause.)

10 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Next we'll go
11 to Carol Stark, Karli Grace, and Saman Shafaie.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Carol Stark had to
13 leave.

14 MS. JUCKETT: Okay, thank you. So,
15 Karli Grace?

16 MS. GRACE: I'm Karli Grace and I live
17 in Tinley Park but I'm a citizen of this planet. And
18 there has been a lot said and the longer I listen the
19 more absurd all of it sounds. I can't believe that
20 we even have this discussion.

21 Why are we even having this discussion?
22 I invite everyone that works at Exelon and any other
23 nuclear regulation commission to go off, plop
24 themselves down right now in Fukushima. I want you
25 to be first responders there right now. I want your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 bill to be paid off so that you can live there. I
2 want your wives who are pregnant to be brought back
3 there so that they can have a free house. I want you
4 all to have a Geiger counter and have all your
5 processed. I want you to start eating the tuna off
6 the West Coast that is now highly radioactive.

7 I want you to be involved because what
8 you do, you do with great care. You take safety to
9 the fact that you've got like plagues into your
10 buildings because what you have, I don't care what
11 the cask looks like, how well it's built, within it
12 is death!

13 Chicago originated this and in 70 years
14 they haven't been able to figure out how to
15 neutralize or put this back into the bottle. I don't
16 need this about facts. I don't need to hear either
17 side's facts. It's true that it's death. And I
18 don't care if someone said, well, people are going to
19 have to do without their TVs. You're darn right we
20 may have to do without some stuff. It's either that
21 or the planet.

22 I don't know about you, I don't have
23 kids. You have kids, you have grandchildren. I have
24 me and I've lived a good life and I'm grateful for
25 that. But we are depriving the future. When the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Pacific is already trashed, it's not a bathtub. Who
2 is going to be drinking that water? Who is going to
3 surf in it? Who is going to fish in it?

4 I want the safety to go right to the
5 heart of it. Go back and live in Chernobyl. Go back
6 in Three Mile Island and see that damage. There is
7 moral integrity that is missing and there shouldn't
8 even be a conversation because this shouldn't even
9 have to be on the forum for a discussion.

10 The water resources that are going to be
11 so very terribly at risk that it takes to keep
12 anything cool, all right, is it going to be let's
13 cool the plant or let's have some water to drink?
14 All you have to do is, look at what happens in the
15 Philippines when you have people without water. And
16 you can be smug and laugh, then I want you to sign up
17 right now and go to Fukushima.

18 Those of you who have been sitting here
19 laughing and just chortling at this need to be doing
20 some soul-searching while you still have a soul left,
21 while there is a planet for us to inhabit. There
22 isn't a plan B, and you can only go underground for
23 so many years if you think you've got that kind of
24 self-repository built with food. You come up and
25 there won't be anything.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I do not support and have absolutely no
2 confidence, and when there was a slight mishap here,
3 I got involved because I called the governors, I
4 called the senators. They didn't know what had
5 happened. I called and they said talk to the DOE.
6 DOE said you got to talk to Emergency Management.
7 They have no clue. I did not like have people, like
8 Tim and I were some stupid idiot. I am not and
9 neither is the rest of this planet.

10 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MS. JUCKETT: Is Saman Shafaie here?
13 Beverly Walter?

14 MS. WALTER: Well, I'm Beverly Walter
15 and I'm a member of groups, some of you are in the
16 same groups I am in, NEIS, Kapow, and West Suburban
17 Coalition for Peace and Justice. All of you, I want
18 to thank for your comments. I hope they are heard,
19 not just pushed aside. I don't want this to be a
20 show. And all of you lovely people who work for the
21 industry, I did appreciate that you would support the
22 industry. But I think it is a statement of where we
23 are at that almost everyone except me, one person,
24 who has testified on behalf of this and on behalf of
25 the NRC are with the industry.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Now, that should tell us something.
2 That should tell us that they are not speaking for
3 the public, and that those people who are here who
4 have spoken before me who are incredibly
5 knowledgeable are the ones that are speaking in
6 facts, not claims but facts. And I think that's what
7 we should listen to.

8 And I want to quote, although there is a
9 lot that could be said, a lot of it has already been
10 said, what it needs to be is taken to heart. And I
11 urge those members of the NRC to remind themselves
12 that they also are people and that their mission is
13 to serve the people of this country and beyond that
14 of the planet and not the business. Let's repeat
15 that, they are there to serve the people. Let us
16 remind them of that. And if they do not serve the
17 people, they are betraying their job, they are
18 betraying their country, and they are betraying their
19 planet. And let us remind ourselves that this
20 technology, which is being so touted by some of the
21 members and so say as demonstrably and too that some
22 say, and in addition to that it's old technology,
23 isn't it? Isn't it time we really look and say, hey,
24 let's move into the 21st century. Let's decrease our
25 consumption. Let's not be pigs about how much energy

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 we use or waste. Let's turn to renewables because we
2 can. And all of the engineers and all of the safety
3 people, you can have a marvelous career, a green
4 career in solar and geothermal and all the kinds of
5 cold fusion, all these kind of incredible discoveries
6 that have been suppressed.

7 We have a future to look for. Let's
8 turn our back on technology that is dangerous and is
9 poisoning people and the planet. And let's move to
10 the future. And nuclear industry has got millions,
11 billions of dollars from the U.S. taxpayers. Let's
12 put that into renewables. Let's look to the future.
13 Thank you.

14 (Applause.)

15 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Beverly. Next
16 we'll go to Jill Paulus.

17 MS. PAULUS: I thank everybody who spoke
18 tonight. It's been a long night. I would rather not
19 be here myself. Can you hear me? No. Can you hear
20 me now?

21 Okay. You know, I'd rather be home
22 doing other things, enjoying my family. I feel for
23 the last year I have been in places where I didn't
24 want to be. I'm involved with -- Green I'd rather
25 not be dealing with energy issues. I guess it would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 be a fairy tale to me if we would proceed with clean
2 green energy, I'm talking about wind, solar,
3 geothermal. For my children, I would be out there
4 every day working for free.

5 These are the words I've heard tonight,
6 stepping stone, that was from Jeff Dunlap, a stepping
7 stone is fair. We wouldn't have a plan or proposal
8 except for college. Well, that's the same thing with
9 fracking. It's a stepping stone and it's --
10 politics, we would have better regulations.

11 Let's talk about regulation. Jerry Peck
12 said, he's from the Illinois Manufacturers
13 Association, and considered the impact of regulations
14 on the economy. Well, I don't know that much about
15 this except it's poison. That's what I know and
16 that's why I'm here tonight.

17 We have very weak regulations for
18 fracking, that I do know. And we call them the best
19 in the country. Well, this is the same. We might
20 have the best in the world but it's still poison.
21 We're dealing with a toxic waste that has to be
22 carefully dealt with. And Mr. Gallagher is right,
23 we're giving it to children. I don't have
24 grandchildren and I may never, I don't really want
25 them. I don't tell my daughters that I don't.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 The last thing I want to say is Tom Wolf
2 said nuclear gives us a quality of life and economic
3 well-being. I would like to think that the quality
4 of my life was not hurting other people, not causing
5 climate change, and that my economic well-being was
6 just part of a world where I live in and we're nice
7 people and we're not at each other's, you know,
8 throats. I mean we're -- we don't need to do this.
9 We just don't. And it's all the same, the same
10 things that we talk about, our food, our water, this
11 is all the same thing, and I'm very sorry for it.

12 (Applause.)

13 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Do we still
14 have Frank Costanza? Frank Costanza and then Hannah
15 Welsh.

16 MS. WELSH: I'm not signed up to speak.

17 MR. COSTANZA: I'm going to be very
18 brief. This is all kind of new to me. I've been
19 reading about energy and nuclear for a while but I'm
20 certainly no authority on it. But I can't give any
21 confidence on this idea NRC has, mainly for the
22 reason that even though people work really hard and
23 do a good job, human means aren't infallible. And it
24 doesn't seem like it's all up to us, we don't have
25 everything under control what we think we have under

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 control. And it's getting less likely to be able to
2 do that in the future.

3 So, I think the only thing this would do
4 is perpetuate something that we can't live with
5 anymore, never could live with it, but I don't want
6 the effects -- have on people who are relying on it
7 but I think there's no other choice. So, that's
8 pretty much all. I think we have to stop doing it
9 and I don't know of a solution to all that. The only
10 non-detrimental source of energy that we have, I
11 think, is photosynthesis and we seem to have moved
12 beyond that for some reason.

13 So, I don't think I should say anything
14 else because I'm tired and I think everyone else is.
15 Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Is Hannah
18 here? That concludes the list of people I had signed
19 up to speak. Is there anyone who didn't already get
20 a chance that wanted to come up and your name wasn't
21 on the list?

22 MS. BLUSTEIN: Hi, my name is Bonnie
23 Blustein and I hope I never get a call to respond to
24 a nuclear accident, a radiological incident. I hope
25 that I will never have to go, I hope that I will

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 never be woken or called at any time to go to talk to
2 people who have been through a disaster. I can only
3 imagine how horrible it is to the people that lived
4 through that experience in Fukushima.

5 My heart goes out to them. I wish there
6 was more I could do for the people living that
7 suffered. And I hope that there is never another
8 incident like this. But I know there is one if we
9 continue to develop this technology, it's going to be
10 a possibility.

11 We have to take responsibility for the
12 mess we already have. I'm sure there are many, many
13 jobs for all you bright young people who are working
14 in the industry to take care of what's already been
15 created. And I ask that we all put our heads
16 together to search for better solutions for the rest
17 of us, for all of us, and for all time. And I hope
18 that God helps us to solve the problems that we've
19 already created and I hope we find better solutions
20 while working together.

21 (Applause.)

22 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Anyone else?

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I didn't use all my
24 time. Can I just make one more comment?

25 MS. JUCKETT: Unfortunately, we can't go

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to seconds, but thank you so much for coming, for
2 making your comments. And we want to go ahead and
3 close the meeting tonight after a brief statement by
4 Dr. Keith McConnell, the Director of the Directorate
5 -- oh, I'm so sorry, please do.

6 MR. KALAS: My name is Mike Kalas and
7 I'm with Chicago Independent Media. I just want to
8 address the fact that there is no mainstream media
9 reporters here covering the story. You would think
10 that this would be on the front page of every
11 newspaper. We're talking about an issue that's going
12 to affect people for perhaps hundreds of thousands of
13 years, things that are happening right now with this
14 conference, and yet almost nobody has known about it.

15 And, on top of that, even though no one
16 is getting the word out, I think it's worth noting
17 that there is an overwhelming majority of support
18 here from people who are against nuclear waste,
19 concerning this nuclear issue. The only people that
20 have really shown up here are representing the
21 industry that they're in favor. They all have a bias
22 because they're getting paid. There's a profit
23 motive there. Pretty much unanimously, all the
24 people who are not getting any money are against this
25 proposition, I think that should be stated for the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 record.

2 I also personally think that the title
3 of this, Waste Confidence, is very misleading.
4 That's kind of an Orwellian title so that nobody
5 really can understand what's happening right here.
6 We're talking about nuclear waste dumping. If you're
7 not putting that in the terms of this, no one is
8 going to know what you're talking about and people
9 aren't going to come out and express themselves.

10 So, I think that just the title itself
11 shows a certain lack of transparency that we need to
12 look at. How can we have confidence in the system
13 when they keep using words like Waste Confidence? We
14 need to have a very descriptive title of what's going
15 on so people can have a real understanding, and then
16 we can have an honest debate.

17 Furthermore, I'd like to say that I
18 think it's a bad idea. We can't put this burden on
19 other generations. We can't put a burden for people
20 250,000 years down the line. That's just totally
21 irresponsible, immoral, unethical, you know, for
22 people to sort of really believe that.

23 You know, for one generation's worth of
24 energy consumption, we're creating a life-long
25 problem for hundreds of thousands of years. Human

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 civilization is not that long. I believe Debra
2 mentioned it, what if the Egyptians were using
3 nuclear waste? Would you want to be responsible for
4 maintaining that waste disposal in modern times and
5 for generations and generations to come?

6 I think if you do the math, you'll
7 realize that it's not economically efficient, it's
8 not safe, it's not wise. We need to take that money
9 and we need to reinvest it into renewable energy,
10 renewable resources. That's the way to go for the
11 future. Thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. Okay. Now,
14 we'll go to Dr. McConnell for his closing remarks.
15 Thanks everybody for coming this evening.

16 DR. McCONNELL: Well, thanks to
17 everyone. Thanks for your participation tonight.
18 Thanks for coming, I know it's an effort to come out,
19 and I also thank you for staying within the three-
20 minute time limit. It totally helps everybody in
21 terms of allowing everybody to speak. So, thanks
22 again and we will close the meeting. Good night.

23 (Applause.)

24 (Whereupon the meeting was concluded at 10:50 p.m.)
25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701