

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

Docket Number: NRC-2012-0246

Location: Carlsbad, California

Date: Monday, November 18, 2013

Work Order No.: NRC-412

Pages 1-103

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

WASTE CONFIDENCE PROPOSED RULE AND DRAFT GENERIC
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY

NOVEMBER 18, 2013

+ + + + +

The Waste Confidence Public Meeting
convened at the Sheraton Carlsbad Resort and Spa,
5840 Grand Pacific Drive, Carlsbad, California at
7:00 p.m., Chip Cameron, Co-Facilitator, presiding.

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 PRESENT

2 CHIP CAMERON, Co-Facilitator

3 MIRIAM JUCKETT, Co-Facilitator

4 SHELDON CLARK, Office of General Counsel

5 VICTOR DRICKS, Office of Public Affairs

6 CATHY HANEY, Director, Office of Nuclear Material
7 Safety and Safeguards

8 ANDY IMBODEN, Chief of Communications, Planning, and
9 Rulemaking Branch, Waste Confidence
10 Directorate

11 LISA LONDON, Office of General Counsel

12 KEITH MCCONNELL, Director of the Waste Confidence
13 Directorate

14 PAUL MICHALAK, Chief of Environmental Impact
15 Statement
16 Branch, Waste Confidence Directorate

17 T.R. ROWE, Waste Confidence Directorate Staff

18 GREG WARNICK, Resident Inspector, SONGS

19 SUSAN WITTICK, Waste Confidence Directorate Staff

20

21

22

23

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

A G E N D A

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MEETING WELCOME AND GROUND RULES 4

OPENING REMARKS 10

NCR STAFF PRESENTATION 14

PUBLIC COMMENTS 21

CLOSING STATEMENTS 101

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

P R O C E E D I N G S

(7:03 p.m.)

1
2
3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Good evening,
4 everyone. My name is Chip Cameron, and it's really a
5 pleasure to see all of you again, and I want to thank
6 you for coming out to be with us tonight.

7 The meeting tonight, the topic is the
8 Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Draft Environmental
9 Impact Statement and Proposed Rule on Waste
10 Confidence. And the NRC staff is here tonight with
11 all of you in person to listen to your comments and
12 recommendations on the Draft Environmental Impact
13 Statement and the Proposed Rule.

14 And my colleague and I, Miriam Juckett,
15 who is right here, are going to serve as your
16 facilitators for the meeting tonight, and we'll try
17 to help you to have a constructive meeting. Miriam
18 and I have been co-facilitating the series of
19 meetings across the country that the NRC has held on
20 this particular subject.

21 We're going to be using a different
22 format tonight than we've used for the last several
23 meetings that we've had in the community out here
24 that were specific to the SONGS facility, the restart
25 initially, now decommissioning.

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 format we're going to be using
2 tonight rather than the sort of free-wheeling going
3 out in the audience and hearing questions and
4 comments from people, this meeting tonight is going
5 to focus on comments from all of you who have signed
6 up to give us comments on the Draft EIS, and I'm
7 going to be calling your name and asking you to come
8 up to the podium to address us tonight. So, it's
9 going to be a much different format. And, of course,
10 this Draft EIS, as the NRC staff will tell you is a
11 Generic Environmental Impact Statement, so it covers
12 a wide range of plants and facilities. And it's not
13 on the San Onofre facility. That's another difference
14 in this meeting from the meetings that we have had in
15 the past.

16 The NRC is taking written comments also
17 on this issue, but I just want to assure you that
18 anything that you say tonight is going to carry the
19 same weight as a written comment.

20 Now, just some ground rules to help us
21 to have a productive meeting tonight. I'm going to
22 ask that only one person speak at a time tonight. Two
23 important reasons for that, one is so that we can
24 give our complete attention to whomever has the floor
25 at the moment, and the second reason is that we want

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to get what I call a clean transcript. In other
2 words, we're taking a transcript, and Lee Miller is
3 over there. He's our stenographer tonight. And if
4 there's more than one person speaking at a time, Lee
5 is not going to know who to attribute the comment to,
6 so I would ask you to please follow that ground rule
7 for us.

8 Secondly, I'm going to have to ask you
9 to be brief in your comments tonight so that we can
10 hear from everyone who signed up to speak. And we
11 have a large number of people who have signed up, so
12 I'm going to ask you to follow a three-minute time
13 limit tonight. And there's some flexibility there,
14 nothing untoward is going to happen to you if you go
15 three minutes and one second, but we are going to ask
16 you to follow that three-minute plus ground rule. And
17 John Stamatkos is right here, and John, like Miriam,
18 are colleagues with me from the Center for Nuclear
19 Waste Regulatory Analyses in San Antonio, Texas who
20 assists the NRC on various projects. And John has
21 this sign that says one minute left remaining, and
22 that's just meant to help you, to let you know when
23 you're going to have to start to wrap up. And then at
24 three minutes I'll ask you to finish your thought for
25 us.

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 guess the final thing, and I would
2 just ask everybody to be courteous to one another
3 tonight. You're going to hear different opinions from
4 the people who speak and I would just ask you to
5 respect the person who's giving that opinion even if
6 you disagree with the opinion.

7 And the NRC staff, they're going to be
8 listening carefully to what you're saying tonight,
9 but they're not going to be responding to you.
10 They're not going to be answering questions that
11 people pose from the lectern. I found out tonight
12 that I always call this a podium but it's actually a
13 lectern. That's one of the facts that I found out
14 tonight, but when you're up here at the lectern, the
15 NRC staff is not going to be responding to those
16 comments, but they are going to be listening
17 carefully. And they will consider and evaluate
18 everything they hear tonight when they prepare the
19 Final Environmental Impact Statement. And that's
20 something to note.

21 This is the Draft Environmental Impact
22 Statement, and it's a draft because they haven't
23 heard from all of you yet on what you think of this
24 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. And that's why
25 they're here with you in person, and that's why

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 they're asking for written comments.

2 There's other ways to amplify on your
3 comments if you can't get everything in in three
4 minutes. The written comments can be as long as you
5 want. There is something called a feedback form that
6 are on the chairs, and that's one of these forms that
7 the NRC uses to help evaluate the public meetings
8 that it does. But if you want to write a comment on
9 this rather than submitting a written comment, you
10 can write that comment on here and either leave it
11 here with the NRC staff, or it's already what they
12 call franked, you can just put it in the mail and it
13 will get to the NRC.

14 And, lastly, in terms of expanding on
15 your comments, there's one more NRC meeting at
16 headquarters, NRC headquarters in Rockville, Maryland
17 and that's going to be a call-in only meeting. So, if
18 you wanted to give additional comments you can call
19 in on December 9th. And I'm going to ask the staff to
20 just give the details on that particular meeting.

21 So, let me introduce the NRC staff. And
22 one other thing that's important is that the focus of
23 the meeting is on hearing from you in terms of
24 comments, so we're not going to be going out for
25 questions on technical or legal issues. We will 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 a short period of time after the NRC presentations to
2 make sure that you understand what the process is for
3 sending comments to the NRC, and to make sure that
4 you understand what's going to be happening tonight.

5 We do have various staff, NRC staff
6 experts out in the hall. They're going to stay there
7 for the entire meeting in case you have a question
8 that you want to have answered, so you can go out
9 there and ask those technical and legal questions.
10 But those discussions out there are not going to be
11 on the record, so if you want to get something on the
12 record you'll have to put that in your formal
13 presentation, your formal comment that you give us
14 tonight.

15 We're going to have two short
16 presentations and we're fortunate enough to have the
17 Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and
18 Safeguards here with us tonight, Mrs. Cathy Haney.
19 And Cathy is going to open it up for us. And then
20 we're going to go to Paul Michalak who's right here.
21 And Paul is the Chief of the Environmental Impact
22 Statement Branch in the Waste Confidence Directorate.
23 The Waste Confidence Directorate is housed in the
24 Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

25 And let me introduce some other people,

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 Director of the Waste Confidence Directorate,
2 Keith McConnell, who's right here. And we have two
3 attorneys from the NRC's Office of General Counsel,
4 Lisa London and right here is Sheldon Clark. Andy
5 Imboden is standing in the back of the room and he's
6 going to be out in the hall to answer any questions.
7 Andy is the Chief, the Branch Chief of the
8 Communications, Planning, and Rulemaking Branch in
9 the Waste Confidence Directorate. And we have various
10 other people here from our Region IV office, the
11 Resident Inspector at the SONGS facility to be able
12 to answer any of your questions, and this is Greg
13 Warnick, Resident Inspector. I'm sure you met him
14 before. And Victor Dricks is from our Office of
15 Public Affairs. Susan Wittick, right down here, and
16 TR Rowe who is at the table, the registration table.
17 Susan and TR take care of all of the logistics for
18 these particular meetings and everything that goes on
19 in the Waste Confidence Directorate.

20 So with that, Cathy, would you like to
21 talk to the people? Cathy Haney. Well, we can be sort
22 of casual about whether you want to call it a podium
23 or a lectern, but the lectern.

24 MS. HANEY: Okay. I'm at the lectern. But
25 thank you and good evening.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 As Chip said, my name is Cathy Haney.
2 I'm the Office Director in the Office of Nuclear
3 Material Safety and Safeguards. In my office I have
4 responsibilities for numerous things. One of them is
5 this effort that we're doing on the Waste Confidence.
6 Also, spent fuel storage and transportation, and fuel
7 cycle facilities, as well as a few other things that
8 fall into those areas.

9 But as Chip said, the purpose of today's
10 meeting is to get public comment on the Proposed Rule
11 and Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement on
12 the continued storage of spent fuel. And these
13 documents were published on September 13th for
14 comment, and we're very interested in getting these
15 comments from you during these meetings, as well as
16 any written comments that come in, or comments that
17 come in over the phone, which many of you have
18 participated in phone calls with us.

19 These two documents are the cumulation
20 of our activities to date to address the Court of
21 Appeals decision to vacate the 2010 version of the
22 Waste Confidence Rule. And given the purpose of
23 today's meeting is to gain comments on these draft
24 documents, and because of that, as Chip said, we're
25 going to limit our presentations on the Rule. I'll

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 just speak for a few minutes and then turn it over to
2 Paul to make a few comments. But really, we want to
3 maximize any time that's available for you to make
4 public comment.

5 And I would also encourage you to take
6 advantage of the technical staff that we have brought
7 with us today out to California. Many of you had the
8 opportunity to meet with them before the conference
9 started, before this meeting started, but also if you
10 get the opportunity to step out and talk with them.
11 These are the individuals that wrote the draft
12 statement, and actually will be working to prepare
13 the final statement, so they're really very
14 knowledgeable on this document.

15 And I want to just start out with a
16 couple of general comments on the rulemaking efforts.
17 And really, when you go to what's NRC's mission of
18 protecting the public and the environment, one of the
19 ways that's very important to us and is very
20 fundamental to us in carrying out that mission is our
21 rulemaking efforts. And this is a vehicle for
22 implementing national policy and standards, and our
23 mechanism for achieving the NRC's goal of maintaining
24 the public health and safety, and security and
25 protection of the environment. And one of the most

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 important things of the rulemaking process follows
2 after my staff does work on the rulemaking, and
3 that's hearing from the public and the people that
4 are affected by this rulemaking. And that's why it's
5 so important to us that we have this opportunity to
6 hear from you.

7 And I do want to note that this meeting
8 today is just one of several efforts we've tried to
9 make this rulemaking process open and transparent.
10 And with that regard, I want to thank all of you that
11 took the time to participate in past meetings on the
12 Scoping document that was prepared, to participate on
13 phone calls. We were having calls monthly to get
14 comment, engage during the scoping process, and also
15 to hear from you and keep you informed.

16 We really do want your perspective and
17 input. And there are a few areas besides just the
18 entire document, there are a few areas that our
19 Commissioners, which are the heads of our Agency,
20 have asked us to get specific public comment. And out
21 at the table right outside this door and to the
22 right, there's a document there that actually has
23 pulled those specific areas that we're seeking
24 comment from the *Federal Register* Notice in case you
25 would like to grab a copy of that on your way 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 So, if you do provide written comments to us, you
2 might want to comment on those few particular areas.

3 And then, lastly, what I'd like to do
4 is, again, to just really thank you for coming, thank
5 you for taking the time to come and chat with us
6 tonight. I know you all have busy schedules, have
7 things to do in the evenings, but it's very important
8 that we do hear from you. And I'm very interested in
9 -- I, as well as my staff, is very interested in
10 hearing any insights that you have on this
11 rulemaking.

12 And with that, I'd like to turn the
13 podium over to Paul Michalak, who will address more
14 of the specifics of the documents.

15 MR. MICHALAK: Thanks. My name is Paul
16 Michalak, and I'm the Branch Chief of the
17 Environmental Impact Statement Branch in the Waste
18 Confidence Directorate.

19 At today's meeting, I'll give a brief
20 history of Waste Confidence, outline key aspects of
21 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed
22 Waste Confidence Rule, and explain how you can
23 comment on these documents. Then we'll get to the
24 public comment portion, which is the heart of the
25 meeting.

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 accomplishes two
2 things. It generically addresses the environmental
3 impacts of continued storage, and makes a
4 determination about the feasibility of safe storage
5 and the time frame for repository availability. The
6 Draft Environmental Impact Statement satisfies part
7 of the Commission's National Environmental Policy Act
8 obligations for reactor licensing and relicensing,
9 and the licensing and relicensing of spent fuel
10 storage facilities. The Draft Environmental Impact
11 Statement also serves as the regulatory basis to
12 support the Proposed Waste Confidence Rule.

13 The Environmental Impact Statement and
14 the Proposed Rule only cover the time frame after the
15 licensed life for reactor operation. However, it is
16 important to note that the Proposed Rule on Waste
17 Confidence does not license any particular site or
18 facility, nor does it allow for long-term storage of
19 spent fuel at any site.

20 The NRC's history with Waste Confidence
21 started when the Commission issued the Rule back in
22 1984. Since then, the Rule has been updated, most
23 recently in 2010. In 2012 the Rule was challenged,
24 and the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit vacated
25 the 2010 Rule. The Court identified three

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 deficiencies with the Commission's environmental
2 analysis to support the 2010 Waste Confidence Rule.

3 The Court found that the analysis did
4 not evaluate the environmental effects of failing to
5 secure permanent disposal of the spent nuclear fuel.
6 It also directed the Commission to provide a forward-
7 looking analysis of spent fuel pool leaks, and the
8 environmental consequences of spent fuel pool fires.

9 The Court did conclude that a generic
10 approach either with an Environmental Assessment or
11 an Environmental Impact Statement would appropriately
12 address the issues associated with Waste Confidence.
13 Following the Court's decision, the Commission
14 directed staff to prepare an Environmental Impact
15 Statement evaluating the issues, with the possibility
16 of issuing an updated Waste Confidence Rule.

17 There are two things that I would like
18 you to remember. The first is that Waste Confidence
19 is just a small part of the overall environmental
20 analysis for reactor or spent fuel storage licensing
21 and relicensing. Secondly, the Waste Confidence Rule
22 does not license any facility or authorize storage
23 after the expiration of a facility's license.

24 The Draft Statement describes the
25 impacts of continuing to store spent nuclear fuel

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 beyond the licensed life for operation of a reactor,
2 whether in a spent fuel pool or at independent spent
3 fuel storage installations, located at both reactor
4 and away from reactor sites.

5 The Draft Statement describes why we're
6 revisiting Waste Confidence. It discusses the
7 alternatives considered. It describes how
8 environmental impacts were evaluated. It describes
9 what facilities are covered, and the environmental
10 impacts of continued storage at reactor sites and
11 away from reactor sites. It also contains information
12 on the cost of the alternatives considered. It
13 describes the cumulative environmental impacts of
14 continued storage, and it contains information on the
15 feasibility of a repository and the feasibility of
16 safe storage of spent fuel.

17 The Draft Statement assessed impacts of
18 continued spent storage for three time frames based
19 on when a repository would become available. There
20 was a short-term time frame for 60 years beyond the
21 license life for operation of a reactor. There's a
22 long-term, or 100 years beyond the short term, or 160
23 years. And an indefinite storage scenario where no
24 repository becomes available.

25 The Draft Statement serves as 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 regulatory basis for the Proposed Rule. The Proposed
2 Rule would generically address the environmental
3 impacts of continued storage. These impacts would not
4 be revisited in future site-specific licensing
5 procedures unless the NRC discovers something about
6 the site that would make the application of the
7 conclusions in the Environmental Impact Statement
8 inappropriate.

9 The Proposed Rule would revise the
10 Nuclear Regulatory Commission's regulations.
11 Specifically, the citation is Title 10 of the Code of
12 Federal Regulations, Section 51.23. The Proposed Rule
13 also states that the analysis supports the
14 Commission's determination that it is feasible to
15 safely store spent nuclear fuel following license
16 life for operation of a reactor. It also states that
17 it is feasible to have a mined geologic repository
18 within 60 years following the license life for
19 operation of a reactor. We are specifically seeking
20 comment on whether the final Rule should contain
21 these last two statements.

22 To insure that your comments are
23 considered they must be received by December 20,
24 2013. Mailed comments must be postmarked by December
25 20th. All comments, whether submitted in writing or

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 provided orally, are considered equally.

2 Of course, we're here tonight so you can
3 tell us your comments on the Generic Environmental
4 Impact Statement and the Proposed Rule. Tonight's
5 comments are being transcribed and will be considered
6 part of the record, but you may also leave written
7 comments with the NRC staff located at the
8 registration table and we will make sure those
9 comments are added to the docket. You may also email,
10 fax, or mail your comments to the NRC. You may also
11 provide comments using a Federal eRulemaking site
12 which is www.regulations.gov.

13 That concludes the presentation, and
14 I'll turn the meeting back over to Chip.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Cathy.
16 Thank you, Paul. Let me make sure that everybody is
17 clear on how you submit comments to the NRC. See if
18 there's any questions on that before we go out to
19 people for comment.

20 And one thing I might ask Paul in terms
21 of the call-in meeting on December 9th, how will
22 people find out about what the call-in number is and
23 all of that?

24 MR. MICHALAK: This is Paul, again. There
25 is a meeting notice on our Waste Confidence website

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 which would be a good place to find that information
2 in terms of the time of the call and calling the
3 line.

4 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. And
5 one of my favorite questioners back here. Yes?

6 MS. MAGDA: Hi, Paul. Marni Magda, and
7 I'm just now reading this, I'm very sorry. So, with
8 your comment my question is, am I understanding that
9 the State of California will be under a generic rule
10 of all of the reactors if we pass this the way it is
11 now saying that it's okay to leave the spent fuel for
12 60 years in the short term, and it's okay here in
13 California with all of our problems, Southern
14 California, to leave it if we do go to a long-term
15 decision on it for 100 to 140 years. Is that what I'm
16 understanding we're deciding in this draft?

17 MR. CAMERON: Fire that back and just to
18 underline something there. Paul, if you could just
19 address the question, but also tell people a little
20 bit about if there are issues with a particular site,
21 whether it's in California or somewhere else, that
22 there are other parts of the NRC staff that are
23 addressing those site-specific issues.

24 MR. MICHALAK: Continued storage of spent
25 nuclear fuel is an important concern. I understand

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 your concern. Waste Confidence, as I mentioned
2 earlier, is really just a small part of the
3 environmental safety review that would go on for the
4 Commission to get a license to store spent nuclear
5 fuel. So, in a sense, no one gets permission to store
6 fuel 60 years, or 160 years, or indefinitely based
7 solely on this Waste Confidence effort. Any licensing
8 act, which Waste Confidence would be part of, would
9 have a site-specific analysis, would have the safety
10 analysis under our Atomic Energy Act obligations, and
11 then it would also have either an Environmental
12 Impact Statement or an Environmental Assessment to
13 meet our obligations under the National Environmental
14 Policy.

15 So, to answer your question, no, Waste
16 Confidence in and of itself does not give permission
17 to store fuel for 60 years or 160 years.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Very good
19 question, and thank you for that answer, Paul. We're
20 going to go to comment now.

21 Before we do that, I just want to
22 recognize that there is someone here from Senator
23 Feinstein's office. Senator Feinstein. Sorry, there's
24 someone here, a staff person from Senator Feinstein's
25 office who's not going to speak, but it's Bill Kratz,

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 who's right here. And many of you probably know Bill,
2 but thank the Senator for sending you down to be with
3 us tonight.

4 Our first speaker is going to be Gary
5 Headrick, and then we're going to go to Donna
6 Gilmore, and then Rochelle Becker. And, Gary, if you
7 could come up to talk to us, please.

8 MR. HEADRICK: Well, I think I feel like
9 I'm in a really important position here that I didn't
10 expect to be in, just because San Clemente Green
11 represents over 5,000 people that are concerned about
12 living next to a nuclear waste site. And I feel so
13 under qualified to really talk about the subject, but
14 we've done a lot of research. We have a group, a
15 coalition, that submitted a lot of our ideas in
16 writing, but I'd rather just talk to the NRC from the
17 heart because that's how we got started.

18 This is a ground up movement and we have
19 real legitimate concerns about the way this waste
20 problem has been handled. And the more we find out,
21 the more concerned we become. So, the fact that I
22 feel perhaps less informed than I wish I was to
23 discuss such an important topic, I find that even the
24 experts that we've hired, and talked to, and
25 presented at our symposiums, I find they don't 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 the answers. And this is a really serious problem--
2 that we've found ourselves in a situation where it's
3 not really safe to store the waste onsite and it's
4 not really safe to transport it. And we're left in
5 this quandary where a difficult situation has to be
6 addressed as openly and transparently as possible.

7 I think we're all a little bit under
8 qualified and searching for answers, and it's no
9 longer acceptable to just have the easy answer of
10 okay, well, we have that waste but it'll be okay
11 someday. When we get there, don't worry about it.
12 We're working on it. That's just not a responsible
13 response. It's reckless. And we need to come together
14 over this issue, and it's not adversarial at all.

15 We have good people like Greg Warnick. I
16 have a good relationship with our onsite inspector.
17 And I know his heart is in the right place, but the
18 system is not working the way it should. And there's
19 no reason we should have waste stored onsite any
20 longer than possible.

21 We're here to basically say you've got
22 to move that stuff off the site away from these
23 people, away from the earthquake hazards, tsunamis,
24 human error, you name it, terrorism. There are so
25 many problems that could really destroy Southern

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 California and beyond that we have to take this
2 problem seriously, take it urgently, get real answers
3 to the questions, and I think transparency is going
4 to be key.

5 And I'm glad we're having this meeting
6 tonight, but we wouldn't have had it if it wasn't
7 ordered by the Court. And I think it's really
8 important that we do this more often and with real
9 expertise, and with a determination to solve this
10 problem. Somewhere between unsafe storage and unsafe
11 transportation, we're going to have to do something,
12 and it's got to be the best answer we can come up
13 with.

14 We all have to put our minds together,
15 work together, and do the right thing. So, there's a
16 lot of details, there's a lot of good thinking going
17 on to resolve this issue, but it's not going to be
18 resolved by kicking the problem down the road. We
19 have a limited time before our dry cask storage or
20 pools are vulnerable to disastrous result, and we've
21 got to move on this fast. So, you're going to hear a
22 lot of other good comments from people in the
23 coalition and the audience, and I appreciate the time
24 to address this.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank 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 Gary. That's a very good start for our comment
2 period.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. CAMERON: And, Donna, would you like
5 to come up. And if everybody could -- that was Gary
6 Headrick, and if everybody could just introduce
7 themselves. This is Donna Gilmore.

8 MS. GILMORE: I'm Donna Gilmore. I manage
9 the San Onofre Safety.org website, where I've
10 collected information about nuclear waste. And what
11 I've learned is a scandal. The nuclear -- the NRC has
12 allowed the nuclear plants to run much more dangerous
13 fuel without having a solution for storing it, even
14 short term. They call it high-burnup fuel and Dr.
15 Einzinger in March said they're not going to license
16 this fuel for more than 20 years because they don't
17 have the data to show its safe in dry cask for over
18 20 years. And then I find out that there's no
19 transportation approved for this fuel, and we have
20 tons of it at San Onofre.

21 Apparently, the protective cladding
22 becomes brittle and it's subject to shattering and
23 could eventually lead to radiation release. You know,
24 we're talking short-term problems.

25 How can -- if the NRC doesn't 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 confidence short-term in this fuel, how can this plan
2 possibly say it has confidence for hundreds of years?
3 I mean, this is outlandish. And to call it a generic
4 plan. Sitting by the ocean, we've got metal corrosion
5 going on here with the facility. We're in the ring of
6 fire just like Fukushima, and if we have problems
7 here we're talking national security, we're talking
8 national, international economy, we're talking the
9 food supply for the nation.

10 This is totally unacceptable. The NRC
11 needs to complete their research on extended storage
12 before it completes the EIS, because the research
13 that they've already done shows there's no
14 confidence. And there's -- and the high-burnup issue
15 that I'm talking about, it's not covered -- the
16 research that went into this information is not
17 covered in this document. All the research the NRC
18 has should be evaluated and included in there, and
19 what the DOE has should be part of that. So, there's
20 no confidence here. This is just a bunch of BS, as
21 far as I'm concerned. Thank you.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Donna. And
24 we're going to bring the microphone to Rochelle
25 Becker who is our next speaker, and Miriam is

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 bringing the mic.

2 MS. BECKER: I rarely read my comments,
3 but tonight I am not really confident enough to stand
4 up and give them.

5 Confidence is generally described as a
6 state of being. Certain either that a hypothesis or a
7 prediction is correct, or that a chosen course of
8 action is the best and most effective. Arrogance in
9 this comparison is having unmerited confidence,
10 believing something or someone is capable or correct
11 when they are not. Time will determine whether the
12 NRC's proposed waste plan is confident or arrogant.

13 Tonight the NRC has explained why they
14 wish Californians to be confident in their proposed
15 waste policy, but even the NRC's hypothesis and
16 prediction is uncertain. We will leave highly
17 radioactive waste fuel assemblies, whether in pool or
18 casks, on a seismically vulnerable coast for your
19 defined short period of 60 years, long-term period of
20 160 years, or your indefinite term when we'll all be
21 dead.

22 In 2011, the Blue Ribbon Commission on
23 Nuclear Waste recommended a new single-purpose
24 organization to develop a focused integrated program
25 for transportation, storage, and disposal 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 waste, yet the NRC appears ready to decide each of
2 those issues in isolation; a decision that could only
3 result in additional cost to California and utility
4 rate payers.

5 At SONGS, the NRC assured the state that
6 they followed their 50.59 process to the letter, and
7 yet steam generators were dysfunctional and will be
8 subject to years of litigation and unanticipated rate
9 payer and utility costs. At Diablo Canyon, the NRC is
10 assuring the State that although Diablo Canyon does
11 not meet its safe shutdown earthquake requirements,
12 we should trust the NRC's Probabilistic Risk
13 Assessment process that they will eventually
14 determine that we need not be concerned.

15 I'd like to mention that the evaluation
16 released today uses the word "seismic" more than 100
17 times. California can have no confidence that waste
18 can safely remain on our vulnerable coast. The NRC
19 itself has been able to find a solution, yet the
20 NRC's decisions will eventually be paid for
21 generations that will never receive a kilowatt of
22 benefit from SCE's or PG&E's aging reactors.

23 Last week, the Alliance for Nuclear
24 Responsibility met with the NRC Chairman and the
25 Office of Inspector General, and we asked will 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 NRC stand in California's way if we choose to invest
2 in expedited transfer of spent fuel into a dry cask
3 system? Yes, even the NRC admits it's marginally
4 safer.

5 SCE stands ready to expedite, and as
6 PG&E begins to realize that license renewal will be
7 unprofitable, we expect they will follow suit. We ask
8 the NRC, work on the process for safe transfer and
9 storage and get out of California's way.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you
12 very much, Rochelle. And we're going to go to Ted
13 Quinn next, and then Stratton Kirton, Robert
14 Deshotels, and then Ace Hoffman. This is Ted Quinn.

15 MR. QUINN: My name is Ted Quinn. I'm
16 with Technology Resources and a past president of the
17 American Nuclear Society, a society of 11,000
18 professionals, in nuclear science and technology. I'm
19 a local Dana Point resident for the past 32 years.

20 I appreciate the opportunity to provide
21 my comments. My view is that nuclear energy is an
22 important part of the national energy strategy in
23 California, as well as in the East Coast.

24 I was with the Secretary of Energy last
25 week in a meeting and his speech was that all forms

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 energy are required to solve our energy security
2 issues in the United States, and nuclear is certainly
3 one of them. It provides 20 percent of the energy for
4 the U.S. now.

5 I call on the Federal government to
6 follow through on its obligations to provide a
7 national solution to the permanent storage of spent
8 nuclear fuel, including high-burnup fuel, including
9 mixed oxide fuel. And under Federal law, this was to
10 have started 15 years ago, but so far the Federal
11 government has not moved a single fuel rod.

12 I'm very pleased to hear today that the
13 Federal government charged the NRC with proceeding
14 with review of licensing for Yucca Mountain. That's
15 an important step forward. That licensing process
16 will come up with the engineer's review of what is
17 needed for the licensing process. The rest of the
18 licensing will need to go through Congress. One of
19 the companies I work with worked on the Blue Ribbon
20 Commission, and I'm real pleased with the results of
21 the Blue Ribbon Commission.

22 I urge the NRC to enhance its priority
23 on the oversight role for the management,
24 transportation, and disposal of used nuclear fuel.
25 This work must be done in an expedited manner. It'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 critical the NRC press on with transparency, while
2 staying true to the 24-month schedule for its current
3 Waste Confidence proceedings.

4 Staying on track and staying on schedule
5 will help ensure that plant licensing and used fuel
6 management efforts can continue while allowing people
7 like those in this room to have their voices heard.
8 The NRC mission is safety. We need to have safe,
9 reliable nuclear energy to produce carbon-free
10 energy. Thank you.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you
12 very much, Ted. Stratton, this is Stratton Kirton.

13 MR. KIRTON: Hi, good evening. My name is
14 Stratton Kirton. I'm here today on behalf of the
15 CASEnergy Coalition, Clean and Safe Energy Coalition,
16 The coalition is a nationwide grassroots organization
17 united across business, environmental, academic,
18 consumer, and labor communities, and our members
19 support the use of nuclear energy to insure
20 environmentally clean and reliable supply of
21 electricity.

22 I want to start by thanking everybody
23 here tonight, including the NRC, for both coming out
24 to this meeting and hosting this meeting. We think
25 it's important to make sure that 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 facilities across the country are allowed to keep
2 doing what they have been doing best, which is
3 producing clean, reliable electricity.

4 Now, I'm here to express my support and
5 confidence in the storage of spent fuel onsite at
6 nuclear facilities. The industry has shown over
7 decades that it has the ability and the technology to
8 safely store spent fuel onsite. Now, we all know that
9 permanent onsite storage is not what was ever
10 intended, and it's not a long-term solution, but we
11 should not punish the nation's largest source of
12 clean air electricity because of that.

13 These structures have met rigorous
14 standards that have been set out by the NRC and the
15 industry has invested billions of dollars and
16 thousands of man hours in improving these facilities
17 and structures.

18 Now, I want to diverge just very briefly
19 to talk about an issue that's personal to me, and
20 that is climate change. I grew up on the coast. My
21 family has seen storms, my family has seen storm
22 surges at our house, and we understand very
23 personally what climate change and angry sea level
24 rises will mean.

25 Now, I'm sure I'm speaking for a lot 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 people who already know this but the IEA released a
2 World Energy Outlook, their annual World Energy
3 Outlook report last week that found the world -- the
4 globe was just on track to completely blow through
5 the threshold, the ceiling that we need to keep
6 temperatures below.

7 And similar to that, the
8 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change also found
9 with 95 percent certainty that climate change is both
10 manmade and that, again, we are on track to blow
11 through that ceiling.

12 Nuclear energy provides 19 percent of
13 our electricity, but it provides 64 percent of our
14 clean air carbon-free electricity. That's more than
15 every other source of electricity in the United
16 States combined right now. And, yes, that's measured
17 over lifetime cycle analysis, as well.

18 We should continue to invest in
19 renewables like wind and solar, but if we're serious
20 about climate change we shouldn't be so eager to
21 attack our country's largest source of clean air
22 electricity. We shouldn't cut off our nose to spite
23 our face.

24 As the NRC continues these public
25 meetings, I would just like to reiterate my support

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 an industry that has shown it can and has safely
2 stored spent fuel onsite. And during its rulemaking
3 process I would encourage the NRC to support a
4 process that continues to strengthen our nation's
5 commitment to clean air technologies and improving
6 nuclear energy. Thank you for your time.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,
8 Stratton. Robert Deshotels. And please introduce
9 yourself so that we can get the correct pronunciation
10 of your name.

11 MR. DESHOTELS: The correct Louisiana
12 pronunciation is Deshotels. I'm a retired Risk
13 Assessment Engineer, and I want to thank everybody
14 that contributed for me to have the opportunity to
15 stand behind this speaker's stand.

16 I'm concerned about tsunami damage to
17 the pool that contains the fuel, and for two reasons.
18 One is that the tsunami that struck Fukushima showed
19 that we don't have the technology, even with the
20 brilliant minds working on the problem, to really do
21 a good estimate of tsunami magnitude.

22 The second concern I have is that back
23 in 1812, the earthquake that knocked down the mission
24 at San Luis Obispo was accompanied by a tsunami that
25 was estimated and recorded by the friars there 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 35 to 50 feet high above sea level, depending what
2 Indian village you were at at the time. And this makes
3 me worry that modern scientists, knowing that these
4 friars were not ISO 9000 certified, and knowing that
5 they're not calibrated against other tsunamis, might
6 discount and say that their reporting was not
7 believable.

8 On the other hand, scientists have a
9 poor record of not believing things unless there's a
10 good explanation for what happened. I would like the
11 NRC and other people to give some credibility, maybe
12 not 100 percent to the friars, and consider an
13 earthquake that might happen not 200 years ago, and a
14 tsunami that might occur on the basis of maybe a
15 1,000 year interval, in other words, a one in
16 thousand chance of occurring while the fuel is in the
17 cooling pool. So, that is my message, and that's it.

18 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. CAMERON: Thank you for that comment.
21 And we're going to go to Ace, Ace Hoffman, and then
22 to Grace Von Thillo, and then to Myla. This is Ace
23 Hoffman.

24 MR. HOFFMAN: Good evening. My name is
25 Ace Hoffman. After fighting San Onofre for 20 years,

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 had to put up with an awful lot of people telling
2 me the waste solution is going to be Yucca Mountain.
3 Of course, right now they've just today reopened some
4 of the Yucca Mountain plan, but it's not very likely,
5 and there are a lot of scientific problems. Science.
6 It wasn't politics, it was science that is stopping
7 Yucca Mountain.

8 We heard from a number of pro-nuclear
9 people here today. I didn't hear them discussing
10 solutions to the waste problem. I heard them trying
11 to discuss, for example, solutions to the climate
12 change problem which, of course, is wind, and wave,
13 and solar, and things like that; offshore, space-
14 based solar power with large mirrors. These things
15 exist. They can be built. There's no problem with it,
16 thin film technology, et cetera, et cetera; lots of
17 fancy words that will describe things that are
18 effective now. So, we need to get rid of this waste,
19 and until we closed San Onofre, I don't think anyone
20 here was really very good at thinking about what to
21 do with the waste, but now we've got a room full of
22 people who are very concerned about it.

23 We had a seminar last month where we had
24 our own experts come in. One of them told us that a
25 shaped charge missile or weapon can go through three

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 feet of steel. A dry cask is three feet of concrete
2 and maybe two inches of steel. These are vulnerable.
3 A 747 is a very large airplane. If you put one next
4 to a dry cask, it will dwarf it. The turbine shafts
5 on those four jets are going to go right through
6 those dry casks.

7 The tsunamis we talked about. We didn't
8 even talk about what happens if there's an offshore
9 landslide like what happened in 2004 in Banda Aceh,
10 causing a tsunami that is way, way bigger than any of
11 these estimates that they have for a long far-away
12 tsunami wave finally getting to us. We can have a
13 thousand-foot wave right here. So, we've got airplane
14 strikes, we've got terrorists, we've got 8 million
15 people here in this county who have no benefit
16 whatsoever from this nuclear waste and yet we've got
17 it sitting here. And then what do they want to do?
18 They want to make a generic, a Generic Environmental
19 Impact Statement which means that anything unique
20 about our situation, such as that we don't even have
21 a reactor running, is going to be ignored. And not
22 only that, but because it's generic, anything that
23 doesn't get said now is going to be ignored. You're
24 not going to be able to change anything.

25 This is no way to run a country. This is

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 way to run a problem that is the biggest problem
2 this country has ever faced. It's bigger than World
3 War II. We have to get rid of this waste. And, of
4 course, there's nowhere to put it, so we have to
5 think really hard about what we're going to do. And
6 the first thing we have to do is shut down Diablo
7 Canyon. Thank you very much.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you
10 very much, Ace. And, Grace. And Grace will introduce
11 herself, and then we're going to go to Myla, and then
12 we're going to go to Fred Chambers.

13 MS. VON THILLO: Hello, I'm Grace Von
14 Thillo, San Clemente resident.

15 Through the years, all of our concerns
16 and our research about the defective and the now
17 closed San Onofre plant continuously spotlights new
18 revelations that actually continually bring us less
19 confidence. The nuclear industry switched to high-
20 burnup fuel because it burns longer in the reactor
21 and increases industry profits. This has further
22 reduced our safety here and across the nation.

23 It turns out that the NRC and the
24 nuclear industry have no safe storage solution for
25 high-burnup fuel, used fuel, even short term, 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 there's no solution for transporting this waste
2 offsite. So, we're asking the NRC to include in your
3 Generic Environmental Statement and in your document
4 to solve these unsolved problems.

5 It shouldn't be a generic report at all.
6 It should be a site and issue-specific. If the NRC
7 won't even approve short-term storage or transport of
8 high-burnup used fuel because you don't have the
9 confidence, then you must stop wasting and making
10 this waste. Your demonstration project with the DOE
11 is still experimenting on the technology and the
12 materials. We want this extremely vulnerable fuel
13 moved away from San Onofre as soon as it is
14 reasonably safe to do so, and storing it longer in
15 this sensitive area where you've heard again we are
16 prone to tsunami, earthquake, our coastal and marine
17 environments, next to California's critical
18 transportation, economic, and military arteries and
19 surrounded by 8.5 million people, increase our
20 concerns and lessen our confidence daily. Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Grace. And Myla.

23 MS. RESON: Hi, everyone. Well, I've got
24 to tell you, I have absolutely no confidence in a
25 regulatory agency that even allows the 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 industry to continually increase the level of burnup
2 for its fuel. I think that I was going to explain a
3 little bit about it, and Grace did it really well.
4 But, essentially, the nuclear power industry wanted
5 to increase profits and be allowed to keep the fuel
6 in the reactors longer, and the NRC gave them the go
7 ahead. And they have been creating an inventory of
8 high-burnup fuel and creating an intractable problem,
9 and that has to end because it amounts to nothing
10 less than the reckless endangerment of the American
11 people.

12 We have nuclear waste that can't be
13 stored safely, and can't be moved safely. We have no
14 solutions for it. How can we possibly have any
15 confidence in the waste-- nuclear waste policy that
16 this agency proposes?

17 Years ago, the eminent scientist, John
18 Gofman, led 40 health physicists under him at
19 Lawrence Livermore Labs and they were asked to
20 disprove the work of Dr. Ernest Sternglass, who said
21 that there was no safe level of radiation, that even
22 the lowest dose was harmful to human health. But what
23 Gofman came up with when he worked on this problem
24 was he found that, in fact, there is no safe dose,
25 and that Sternglass was right. So, Gofman famously

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 said that licensing a nuclear power plant is de facto
2 licensing premeditated murder, because we know that
3 the doses that are regularly released from nuclear
4 power plants do, in fact, kill people, especially the
5 most vulnerable members of our society, the children
6 and pregnant women are the most vulnerable. And even
7 if they don't develop cancer and die, they suffer
8 serious health consequences.

9 So, we've got to stop making this
10 nuclear waste, and we have to stop allowing this
11 high-burnup practice to continue because it's nothing
12 short of the reckless endangerment of the American
13 people. So, let's stop the nuclear waste con job and
14 let's stop the high-burnup waste experiment.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Myla.
17 Thank you very much. And, Fred, could you come up and
18 join us at the podium. And Fred is bringing Churchill
19 with him. He wants to speak from the podium. We asked
20 him if he wanted the microphone brought to him but he
21 wants to address you from right there.

22 MR. CHAMBERS: Hi, I'm Fred Chambers and
23 after hearing what Gary, Donna, Grace, and so many of
24 us have already said, I've got very little to add.
25 But I do want to -- several people not here tonight

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have asked me whether there are -- this is for their
2 own feelings of public safety. They're very concerned
3 about food safety, and they've been asking -- three
4 people separately have asked me-- if I know where
5 they could find a calibrated Geiger counter that they
6 could take to a supermarket or grain purchase or fish
7 to the center. Some of them with a Geiger counter,
8 and they've got some idea of how hot their tuna or
9 salmon is. So, that is one thing that I would like to
10 add. If you're talking about how confident you can
11 be, maybe we should include something about just
12 making the local public feel safer in the future when
13 more and more of these nuclear plants are shut down.

14 And back on the whole seismic topic, we
15 only have to go back to 1930 here in California where
16 off the coast of Redondo Beach was a rock slide
17 triggered by a fairly small on land earthquake, that
18 triggered a 9-foot tsunami, that went right ashore
19 within about two minutes of the onshore 3.0
20 earthquake. This huge tsunami just sprang up, swept
21 inward to places which are now LAX and downtown LA,
22 Orange County were all inundated, so we really have
23 no advance warning. We never know when that wave will
24 come. So with that, I yield back my time. Thank you.

25 (Applause.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Fred, and
2 watch your step. Okay. Thank you very much. We're
3 going to go to Patricia Borchmann, Marni Magda.
4 Patricia is gathering her -- this is Patricia, and
5 then Marni. Okay. And then Tonja.

6 MS. BORCHMANN: Good evening. My name is
7 Patricia Borchmann. I'm a resident in Escondido in
8 San Diego County.

9 I have already electronically submitted
10 comments to the NRC staff member earlier, so I'm
11 hoping that they will have already been entered
12 electronically into the record. If not, I have extra
13 copies. I'll make sure that copies are left with you.

14 Anyway, as a resident in Escondido, I'm
15 among at least 8.4 million other highly vulnerable
16 citizens located within 50 miles of San Onofre
17 reactors who will realistically be exposed to far
18 greater public safety risks, as well as being
19 unwilling victims of a much more probable
20 catastrophic scenario than the extent which has been
21 projected and analyzed in this Generic Environmental
22 Impact Statement.

23 The Draft Generic EIS has used as their
24 basis of risks of storing nuclear waste in
25 communities in Southern California and for NRC'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 proposed rulemaking. It's extremely important for NRC
2 to recognize that there are conditions in reactor
3 communities surrounding San Onofre that are extremely
4 unlike those conditions that were assessed at the two
5 nuclear reactor sites in rural and low population
6 areas, where impacts of spent fuel pool fires, or a
7 series of other potential safety risks were either
8 analyzed generically, or where impacts were
9 unanalyzed, or impacts were under-estimated.

10 In contrast, the population density here
11 in communities surrounding San Onofre, Southern
12 California are much more similar to high population
13 areas surrounding New York's Indian Point reactors.
14 In 2012, New York's Attorney General successfully
15 argued and led to a challenge on NRC's Rule which led
16 to this Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

17 The Federal Circuit Court agreed with
18 the New York Attorney General, required NRC to
19 provide a thorough analysis of public health, safety,
20 and environmental impacts about storage-- the impacts
21 that storage would pose before allowing long-term
22 storage to occur.

23 I think that's all I have time for. I'm
24 going to be leaving another copy of my comments.
25 Thank 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 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Patricia.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. And
4 this is Marni, and we're going to go to Tonja next,
5 then Jay Rojo, and Gary Sallis. And if you're back in
6 the back and you want to come up here and sit in the
7 front row and wait to talk, that's fine also. Marni.

8 MS. MAGDA: Thank you. Marni Magda from
9 Laguna Beach. I haven't read this. I didn't know the
10 format for tonight. I've only barely looked at this,
11 but what's frightening to me in this summary is to
12 see small, small, small under environmental impacts
13 at reactor's continued storage. Seeing in here that
14 it's fine to stay 60 years. They will change the
15 casks after 100 to 140 years.

16 I know I'm doing this with a 10-minute
17 read, so that's not fair. What frightens me is the
18 hours and hours of human beings putting this together
19 when what we need is solid answers for San Onofre
20 right now, not two years from now, not Southern
21 California Edison making the decisions, but please,
22 Diane Feinstein, Senator Feinstein, Congresswoman
23 Loretta Sanchez, Congressman Dana Rohrbacher, Senator
24 Barbara Boxer, we must have you with Jerry Brown,
25 Governor Jerry Brown. We must have a political

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 solution beginning immediately that takes this
2 responsibility away from a company that has two years
3 where they get our taxpayer's money, taxpayer's money
4 to keep the fuel for 60 years where it is. We keep
5 paying the fine.

6 We need to get that fuel moved, it is
7 deadly. And to say that it's a moderate risk is
8 insane. People have talked about the kind of risk. I
9 was in the Laguna fire in 1993. I watched the
10 absolute -- you couldn't get six miles out of town
11 with only 30,000 of us trying to get out, not 8.4
12 million. Thirty-thousand, we had one road going in to
13 town, and every lane on Pacific Coast Highway going
14 out and it took six hours to go four miles to get to
15 Crown Valley Parkway.

16 We have firestorms every year that are
17 deadly. They've come up to the doorstep of San
18 Onofre. We cannot be waiting for a solution. We must
19 -- and here's what I'm asking. According to the Blue
20 Ribbon report of the President in 2012, the U.S. Navy
21 has final geologic disposal casks that it is using
22 right now, 50 of them have already been used because
23 -- and they're transportable because they have to
24 have all of the nuclear waste out of Idaho by 2035.
25 It will have 350 more by that date. We need those

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. I don't know what they cost. I don't care what
2 they cost. They have to be final deposit. They have
3 to be able to take whatever is this high-burnup fuel,
4 whatever is the real truth about that here, we have
5 to have all these great minds together now creating a
6 solution to get the casks that we need right now
7 today to begin putting that storage in casks that can
8 be moved as soon as we have a place for it. We need
9 Camp Pendleton involved.

10 We need to have thermal nuclear base in
11 California, away from the 8.4 million people, where
12 we are away from the ocean, the rising tides. We
13 don't have 60 years to leave this here. We know that,
14 it's like we're sitting here like foolish children.
15 We know we must move it. We've got to put all of our
16 best minds together and put the money -- if it costs
17 \$10 million per cask, we've got to find it and do it
18 now. Please stop wasting our time and energy and your
19 great minds on something that's generic. Generic
20 won't work anywhere in this country. We have 104
21 reactors, we have to have a special solution for each
22 place. Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Marni. And we
25 have Tonja Wicks coming up, and Jay Rojo is here, I

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 think, and Gary Sallis. This is Tonja.

2 MS. WICKS: Good evening. My name is
3 Tonja Wicks, and I am the President and CEO of TLW
4 Legal and Government Support Services, a minority and
5 women-owned business located in Long Beach,
6 California, and Washington, D.C. It specializes in
7 environmental and energy consulting.

8 I appreciate the opportunity to provide
9 oral comment here tonight on the important topic of
10 Waste Confidence and its relationship to the
11 continued nuclear plant licensing and operations. I
12 strongly believe that nuclear energy is an integral
13 part of the national energy plan, and must continue
14 to generate an essential share of our nation's clean,
15 non-emitting, zero carbon baseload electricity.

16 Nuclear energy generates approximately
17 26.5 percent of the carbon-free electricity reduced
18 in our state according to the Energy Information
19 Administration, and nearly 21 percent of our nation's
20 electric output.

21 As a former electric utility executive,
22 I have held several positions throughout my career
23 and participated and led teams on a variety of issues
24 including energy resource planning. And the one
25 conclusion I have come to, our country, our state,

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 our cities, they need a diverse portfolio of energy
2 resources to meet our current and future energy
3 needs, and to insure our energy security.

4 It is imperative that we do not repeat
5 the issues of the past and over-rely on a single
6 source of generation resources which could lead to
7 over-reliance, reliability issues, and price
8 volatility. As a result, nuclear energy must, it must
9 remain a vital part of a diverse energy resource mix.

10 I believe we need to continue to find
11 ways to utilize these resources and meet our energy
12 needs, and also keep our local communities viable and
13 our residents employed. Our nuclear energy facilities
14 provide substantial economic benefits to the state
15 and local communities, including high-paying jobs,
16 and tax revenues that help keep our town services
17 funded and our property taxes lower than they
18 otherwise would be. On average, a nuclear
19 facility generates nearly \$500 million in annual
20 economic output including more than \$35 million in
21 labor income. Each year it pays approximately \$67
22 million in Federal taxes, and over \$16 million in
23 local and state taxes alone.

24 While nuclear energy is a vital part of
25 our state's electricity energy portfolio and 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 economy, we do recognize that there is a need to
2 address the transportation, storage, and disposal of
3 used energy nuclear fuel. It is the Federal
4 government's statutory responsibility to remove the
5 used fuel from nuclear energy facilities.

6 Under Federal law this has gone on for
7 over a decade, but so far we have not seen the
8 Federal government act. I urge the Nuclear Regulatory
9 Commission to continue their strong independent
10 oversight of commercial nuclear energy facilities,
11 the operation of existing plants, licensing of new
12 reactors, renewing the licensing of existing
13 reactors, and the management, transportation, and
14 disposal of our used nuclear fuel.

15 I believe it's important for the NRC to
16 continue its practice of conducting regulatory,
17 licensing, and oversight activities in an open and
18 transparent manner. Equally important is the need for
19 the NRC to maintain its 24-month schedule for the
20 current Waste Confidence proceedings to properly
21 inform the process leading to the development of a
22 Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement and
23 Proposed Rule so that the progress on both nuclear
24 plant licensing and used fuel management can
25 continue.

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 would like to thank the NRC for
2 hosting this public meeting and providing the
3 opportunity for public comments. Thank you.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Tonja.
5 Thank you very much.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. CAMERON: Is Jay Rojo? How about Gary
8 Sallis? Where's Gary?

9 MR. SALLIS: Good evening, everyone. My
10 name is Gary Sallis. I'm from the United Association
11 of Plumbers and Pipefitters here in Southern
12 California representing Council 16 in San Diego. I
13 was also a worker on this plant for nine years. This
14 plant is very safe, I'm telling you, it's a quality
15 built place.

16 I've listened to a lot of people talk
17 tonight. I've heard a lot of things that really
18 aren't true that you've said. Okay? Really tough to
19 get into some of these places you're talking about
20 and different things.

21 Under the nuclear fuel, it's safe in the
22 pool over there. Dry storage works in this country.
23 It's worked for years. Over the past 30 years, the
24 nuclear industry has safely loaded more than 1,700
25 dry storage caskets. There's been no problems with

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 any of them, no disaster of any kind, any kind has
2 ever bothered any of these caskets. There's no reason
3 not to continue to go on and use this way.

4 These pools are safe. This pool over
5 here across the street has got backup system after
6 backup system. That plant has so many backup systems
7 in it you can't believe it.

8 In 1993, we did cross-ties to make it
9 even more efficient than it is today, so that if
10 something goes over here, it can go over here. What
11 just happened over there recently had nothing to do
12 with who built the plant, how we built the plant, or
13 nothing. Okay? That was something they had somewhere
14 else and they brought it here. They tried to do
15 something, but it worked for 27 years and was not a
16 problem. And we didn't have any of these meetings at
17 all, did we? We didn't have all this stuff going on.

18 Does the NRC need to do things? Of
19 course they do. Do they try to do it? All the time
20 they try to do it; every day they try to move forward
21 and make things better. Don't think they're not.

22 These people down here don't want to
23 die. Think about that. They're not just blowing this
24 stuff up to play games. Okay? They're here to make it
25 happen, and to make it work. Okay?

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 fuel pool over here is over 40-feet
2 deep. It's almost 120-feet long. If you walked in--
3 you ever been inside there? You'd want to jump in
4 that water. I'm telling you, it's the most beautiful
5 water you've ever seen, I swear. I'm telling you,
6 it's the most beautiful color you've ever seen. All
7 lined with stainless steel and everything else, you
8 know. Yes, it sounds crazy but I'm telling you, once
9 you're in there and you look at it, it's really
10 refreshing looking. Okay?

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Gary, go ahead and
12 finish up for us. Thank you.

13 MR. SALLIS: Okay. There's so many
14 already redundant systems to ensure cooling and fuel
15 assemblies in the pools, and the industries have
16 backed it up with more. The NRC made more rules after
17 the thing that happened in Japan. They made more
18 rules to make it even better and better. They do this
19 all the time.

20 Don't condemn them. Continue to let them
21 work, and work with them. Thank you.

22 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Gary.
23 Okay, I'm going to call five names and after that we
24 may take a short break. But we're going to go to Eric
25 Robinson, Savannah Bailey, Jeremy Pearson, Tom

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 Lemmon, and Ray Lutz. And, Eric, oh good, please join
2 us and talk to the people.

3 MR. ROBINSON: Good evening. My name is
4 Eric Robinson, and I'm an engineer and I own a
5 business in San Diego. Under my leadership, my
6 company's technology has helped to reduce the risk in
7 semiconductor process equipment, NASA spacecraft, and
8 a fusion reactor at Livermore Labs, Livermore,
9 California.

10 As a concerned citizen and professional
11 engineer, I believe the best solution to the problems
12 posed by the 1,600 metric tons of spent fuel in San
13 Onofre resides in the MSR, Molten Salt Reactor
14 technology. This technology is safe, it's proven, and
15 cost-effective means of reducing the volume in
16 radioactive waste by 99 percent, and a half-life from
17 10,000 years to a manageable 100 years while
18 generating affordable electricity.

19 Moreover, this non-pressurized Molten
20 Salt Reactor has the capability to mitigate the San
21 Onofre pressurized water reactor-style risks of high-
22 pressure radioactive release and core meltdown. The
23 MSR can be fueled by spent uranium or by thorium.
24 Thorium is an element that has 500 times the
25 abundance of uranium-235. A gram of thorium has as

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 much energy potential as 7,500 barrels of oil with no
2 fracking or CO2 emissions.

3 Energy from thorium in the MSR at 3
4 cents a kilowatt is cheaper than coal, at 5 cents a
5 kilowatt. This Molten Salt Reactor technology was
6 recommended by the superstars responsible for the
7 birth of the nuclear age. These were Glen Seaborg,
8 the President of the Atomic Energy Commission and
9 Nobel Prize winner who discovered ten of the elements
10 and held over 50 honorary degrees. Alvin Weinberg,
11 Manhattan Project. He actually owns the patent on the
12 pressurized water reactor up here at San Onofre. And
13 he ran Oak Ridge National Labs where he developed the
14 Molten Salt Reactor technology. And Eugene Wigner,
15 who was the founder of the Atomic Theory and also a
16 Nobel Prize winner.

17 The Civilian Nuclear Power Report was
18 submitted to President John F. Kennedy in 1962. This
19 report contained the vision of these superstars of
20 safety, inexpensive, nearly limitless civilian power
21 by transitioning to Molten Salt Reactors with energy
22 from thorium.

23 Unfortunately, John F. Kennedy was
24 killed 50 years ago on the 22nd of this month. His
25 vision was never brought to -- was never implemented.

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, I think following the advice of the most inspired
2 and brilliant nuclear experts, the Nuclear Regulatory
3 Commission should immediately begin to advocate and
4 lobby for MSR development.

5 The response will probably be that R&D
6 of new reactors is not their job, but their charter
7 in the NRC was charged with overseeing the reactor
8 safety and spent fuel management. The Union of
9 Concerned Scientists has accused the NRC of doing an
10 inadequate job. This is, obviously, a demanding and
11 funding -- there is obviously a demand for funding
12 for spent fuel abatement as evidenced by the \$18
13 billion spent preparing Yucca Mountain to be a waste
14 repository before the program was cancelled.

15 The current nuclear regulatory structure
16 must stop stifling innovation and not license any new
17 type of reactor for commercial use since they
18 inherited the pressurized water reactor. The NRC
19 needs to be re-tasked with a mission that's worthy of
20 its charter. They have an annual budget over \$1
21 billion and a staff of 3,800. They need to initiate a
22 creative entrepreneurial research incubator that
23 incentivizes the rapid prototyping and development of
24 Molten Salt Reactors to solve the domestic and global
25 energy crisis for the next 1,000 years.

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 In the semiconductor industry there is
2 something called Moore's Law. Every 18 months a new
3 generation of faster, smaller, less expensive
4 processors are developed. If the NRC can establish a
5 new Moore's Law paradigm for the development of
6 continuous dense power production systems we can get
7 down to realistically solving the global problems of
8 pollution, poverty, and population.

9 What really ended slavery was not the
10 Civil War, but the invention of the internal
11 combustion engine. It made human labor obsolete. This
12 technology allows the increased freedom and the
13 largest growth of the standard of living in history.
14 Engines run by petroleum products have run their
15 course.

16 Molten Salt Reactors are a source of
17 clean, green, continuous dense power that can take us
18 to a new level of humanity by producing a millionth
19 the pollution of energy powered by fossil fuels.
20 Instead of endless resource wars, the U.S. can
21 finally solve the global problems of poverty,
22 pollution, and population.

23 And if you want to join me, I've got a
24 lot of information here that shows how this reactor
25 works, and we also have a bill going through Congress

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 needs attention right now, so if you can swing
2 by I'll give you a sheet who to call. There's
3 important legislation going on right now.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,
5 Eric. And this is Savannah coming up to talk to us,
6 and please introduce yourself to us, Savannah. Thank
7 you.

8 MS. BAILEY: Hello. My name is Savannah
9 Bailey and I am here tonight on behalf of the Clean
10 and Safe Energy Coalition or CASEnergy Coalition, a
11 national grassroots organization uniting over 3,000
12 individuals and organizations across the business,
13 environmental, academic, consumer, and labor
14 communities. Our members support the expanded use of
15 clean air nuclear energy to insure an affordable and
16 reliable supply of electricity for America that also
17 plays an active role in our fight against climate
18 change, which stands as one of the most important
19 issues of my generation.

20 As a supplier of nearly two-thirds of
21 our country's emission-free electricity, the use of
22 clean nuclear energy has and must continue to play a
23 role in reducing emission levels across the country.

24 Moving to the topic of tonight's
25 discussion, spent nuclear fuel is currently stored

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 onsite at facilities across the country in well
2 designed, well protected facilities and storage
3 casks. Both facilities and storage casks are robust
4 structures made out of steel linings and reinforced
5 concrete walls that are several feet thick.

6 Spent fuel pools are often 40-feet deep
7 and seal lined with reinforced concrete walls.
8 Further, the structures protecting these pools are
9 built to seismic standards. The dry storage casks
10 where the fuel is moved are also strong structures
11 made of concrete and steel. For every 10 tons of
12 spent fuel, facilities use 100 tons of concrete and
13 steel to form a structure designed for the highest
14 level of protection.

15 Over the last 30 years, nuclear energy
16 facilities have proven that they can safely and
17 securely store spent fuel onsite at facilities in
18 these structures. Beyond that, the NRC is committed
19 to insuring American nuclear facilities adhere to its
20 strict regulations and operate in the best interest
21 of the public. As such, operating facilities are
22 subject to onsite inspections by NRC staff 24 hours a
23 day, seven days a week, 365 days a year.

24 Nuclear energy has shown that it is a
25 responsible source of electricity and a valuable

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 community partner. Safe, clean, and reliable nuclear
2 energy provides nearly 20 percent of our country's
3 electric power and supports more than 100,000 high-
4 paying jobs that contribute to our growing economy.

5 Because of nuclear energy's position as
6 a producer of affordable clean power, its commitment
7 to safely and securely storing spent fuel, and its
8 role as an economic powerhouse at the local, state,
9 and national level, it is no wonder why communities
10 near nuclear facilities strongly support nuclear
11 energy.

12 The timely resolution of this rulemaking
13 is important for the long-term planning of our
14 nation's electricity infrastructure. This issue
15 directly impacts the relicensing of nuclear plants
16 and approval of pending construction applications for
17 new reactors, both of which are vital if we are
18 serious about our commitment to fighting climate
19 change and insuring a reliable, affordable source of
20 electricity for all Americans.

21 In closing, I would like to thank the
22 Commission for holding these public hearings to
23 discuss such an important issue, and reiterate that
24 nuclear energy facilities across the country have
25 continued to show the utmost commitment to safely 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 securely storing spent nuclear fuel. Thank you for
2 your time tonight.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,
4 Savannah. We're going to go to Jeremy Pearson, and
5 then to Tom Lemmon, and to Ray Lutz. This is Jeremy.

6 MR. PEARSON: Good evening, everyone.
7 Jeremy Pearson from University of California Irvine.
8 It's a pleasure for me to be here with you tonight,
9 my first time at such an event. And I'm representing
10 a student group at UCI in engineering which is
11 recently in the process of applying for official
12 recognition as a student chapter for the American
13 Nuclear Society.

14 We have reviewed the Waste Confidence
15 Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement and
16 conclude that the NRC is interpreting well the
17 professional consensus in preparing a more thorough
18 Environmental Impact Statement as requested by the
19 U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in
20 order to satisfy the NRC's NEPA obligations.

21 Of particular interest to our chapter
22 were the environmental impacts of postulated
23 accidents and of potential acts of sabotage or
24 terrorism to spent fuel pools and dry casks, ranging
25 from short-term to indefinite storage, all of which

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 found by the NRC to have small impact, small
2 being defined as effects are not detectible or are so
3 minor that they will neither destabilize nor
4 noticeably alter any important attributes of the
5 resource.

6 These findings are in agreement with
7 findings of the United States Nuclear Waste Technical
8 Review Board in their evaluation of the technical
9 basis for extended dry storage and transportation of
10 used nuclear fuel in December 2010, which noted that
11 reinforced concrete structures for dry storage
12 systems can be designed with a life over 100 years
13 and longer. And the American Physical Society in
14 their consolidated interim storage of commercial
15 spent nuclear fuel in February 2007, which concludes
16 that there are no technical barriers to the safe and
17 secure interim storage of spent fuel as long as
18 adequate resources and attention are devoted to
19 maintaining storage facilities.

20 This is mirrored, as well, by the stance
21 of Senator Feinstein's office communicated in person
22 during a student delegation last July with Matthew
23 Nelson and Mr. Platz. Give me any corrections
24 afterwards, but where Matt stated, "The remaining
25 hurdles to managing waste are political rather than

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 technical. Senator Feinstein's office has been deeply
2 informed and involved in the management of used
3 nuclear fuel through the process of drafting the
4 Nuclear Waste Administration Act."

5 Our student group applauds the NRC's
6 handling of San Onofre, both locally and through in-
7 person discussions, which I've had with Chairman
8 McFarland during the student delegation. The student
9 group believes that the NRC now has the resources and
10 will at its disposal to properly address used nuclear
11 fuel, that the pace and diligence of scientific
12 rigor, which the NRC has been addressing used fuel,
13 has been commendable and in the best interest of
14 local affected communities and the people of the
15 United States alike.

16 The student group also believes that any
17 inflation, beyond that which the NRC has concluded in
18 its Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement or
19 political hastening of the movement of used fuel,
20 together with enactment of the NWAA or similar
21 legislation founded on such assertions prior to a
22 consent base and scientific approach being properly
23 and duly followed, may result in future less-than-
24 effective solution scenarios, similar to that of
25 Yucca Mountain, and may serve to erode and undermine

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 public confidence in communities that are interested
2 in hosting used nuclear fuel and nuclear waste in
3 interim storage or final repository facilities, as
4 well as instill irrational and non-productive fear in
5 those communities that now have used nuclear fuel.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very
8 much, Jeremy.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. CAMERON: Now we have Tom Lemmon
11 coming up to join us, and then we'll go to Ray Lutz.

12 MR. LEMMON: Thanks, Chip. Tom Lemmon,
13 San Diego Building and Construction Trades Council.

14 I, too, have spent many years working at
15 San Onofre, and I would agree with Gary's comment
16 about the cobalt blue water, maybe some of the
17 prettiest water you've ever seen, but that's not what
18 I'm here to talk about. I want to talk about some
19 fun-filled facts.

20 First, dry storage, dry cask storage.
21 Dry cask storage systems have withstood severe
22 earthquakes, hurricanes, and other natural disasters.
23 Nine of these systems were in place in Fukushima,
24 were shaken by the earthquake and over-washed by the
25 tsunami and suffered no damage.

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 Another fun-filled fact about spent fuel
2 pool safety. In the 2011 Fukushima event in Japan,
3 there were seven spent fuel pools. All endured the
4 earthquake and tsunami, three of the pools were in
5 the reactor building also suffered catastrophic
6 hydrogen explosions. Active cooling capacity was lost
7 for several days, yet all the fuel was safely
8 protected.

9 And then I want to lastly, because I
10 want to be the one guy that stuck to the three
11 minutes. How am I doing? Okay. Lastly, safety of
12 transportation. Over 3,000 spent fuel shipments
13 covering more than 1.7 million miles have been safely
14 completed in the U.S. Those are facts. I think, and
15 this is personal feeling, I think the NRC has done a
16 wonderful job protecting workers at the San Onofre
17 plant, the workers that I represent, 35,000 strong
18 who have lost their jobs due to the shutdown of the
19 nuclear plant. But I think that we've had confidence,
20 and we have confidence in their Draft EIS for future
21 storage.

22 Chip, thanks, good seeing you again.

23 MR. CAMERON: Nice seeing you, Tom, and
24 thank you very much. And this is Ray Lutz. And after
25 Ray is done we're going to take a short break for 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 while and then come back to the rest of you who have
2 signed up. Ray.

3 MR. LUTZ: Well, thank you. Ray Lutz with
4 Citizens Oversight and the Coalition to Decommission
5 San Onofre. Thank you, Chip, for having a podium or a
6 lectern up here for us to speak at instead of running
7 around the room.

8 First of all, I want to tell you that
9 there are three things that are really disappointing
10 about human beings, lies, damn lies, and Generic
11 Environmental Impact Statements. This is how --

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. LUTZ: This is how human beings have
14 learned to lie to themselves. Somehow you put enough
15 words in a document, you say that things are small,
16 and now we're confident that we're okay. Let me tell
17 you how this lying is done.

18 Risks are under-estimated, consequences
19 are very large, though. The consequences are huge. We
20 don't even know how bad these consequences are. We'd
21 have to all move out of the area. The probability is
22 real, real low but not zero, so that will happen
23 somewhere. Over thousands of years, it's going to
24 happen. Accidents happen, this is what Gregory Jaczko
25 said, the former NRC Chair, I guess he is. He said

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 all the nuclear reactors in the United States should
2 be shut down.

3 This was the former Chair of the NRC.
4 Nuclear energy is not clean even though you hear that
5 here from people. Fuels that come in from the
6 industry. It is not reliable, the thing has been shut
7 down. They go out all the time. We had a blackout in
8 San Diego partly because of San Onofre. It is not
9 needed in California. We have 156 percent of the
10 energy that we need, and 20 percent is nuclear. You
11 can just get rid of it, and we're fine.

12 All plants should be shut down, so we
13 need to get -- the confidence that we need is to get
14 rid of operating nuclear plants, number one, because
15 we have a big problem. We have to lie about the fact
16 that all these problems are small.

17 The fuel pools at Fukushima, there is
18 one that's just about to go down that they're
19 desperately trying to save. Part of what this talk is
20 about is fuel pools, that they're safe in seismic
21 conditions. Bullshit. Okay? This is what this whole
22 document is talking about. That's in there.

23 They are not hardened. The roof of the
24 fuel pool, a plane can go right through it, and then
25 splash the water out, it would be a disaster.

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 Seismic concerns. We don't know how big
2 the earthquake is going to be. We just don't. We've
3 only been around for so long. They keep going up,
4 what's possible. Mexico just had a 7.5. This is only
5 designed for 7.0. It can happen, way over.

6 Just because NRC says a plant shows --
7 is supposed to be designed to withstand a maximum
8 quake doesn't mean it's designed that way. It doesn't
9 mean it would withstand it. Just because it says it -
10 - this is what this says. And, you know, the problem
11 with this is they're putting this out, we're supposed
12 to be confident, and that means that all of these
13 plants will have permanent nuclear waste dumps next
14 to them that we can't stop, because it's already
15 there. SONGS already has it.

16 This is just a piece of crap that we're
17 supposed to feel good about because it's already over
18 there and we can't stop it. And this is supposed to
19 make us feel confident for some reason. What does it
20 do? Why does it make us feel -- doesn't at all. And
21 we know, the word is out. NRC is lying, and we're not
22 going to believe it any more. This has to go. We have
23 to move the fuel out of this sensitive area. Thank
24 you.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

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 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. We're
3 going to take a short break, and when we come back
4 we're going to go to Mr. Kernahan, Ms. Kernahan after
5 the break. We're going to take a short break now.

6 (Off the record comments.)

7 MR. CAMERON: I guess it depends on where
8 you live, but we're going to get to you next. Okay,
9 let's take 10 minutes.

10 (Whereupon, the proceedings went off the
11 record at 8:37 p.m., and went back on the record at
12 8:49 p.m.)

13 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. This
14 is Martha Sullivan, then we'll go to Cathy, then
15 we're going to go the Kernahans, Mrs. Kernahan first.
16 Okay.

17 MS. SULLIVAN: I'm Martha Sullivan. I'm
18 with the Coalition to Decommission San Onofre, and
19 also Women Occupy San Diego. I worked for the State
20 Public Utilities Commission here in California for 20
21 years, and for the last several years managed their
22 Environmental Impact Review process, so I was
23 responsible for the preparation of several major
24 environmental impact reports and did them jointly
25 with the Federal government, including the U.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 Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management.

2 I just want to say that the concept that
3 you can reasonably assess the environmental impacts
4 of 104 nuclear reactors across this country in a
5 Generic EIS is laughable on its face. It's ludicrous.

6 How can you possibly, possibly consider
7 that the impacts at San Onofre on an eroding seashore
8 adjacent to two known earthquake faults, adjacent to
9 the major transportation artery between Los Angeles
10 and San Diego, adjacent to one of the largest
11 military installations on the West Coast, which also
12 happens to be a military target, how can you possibly
13 consider the impact that you generically identify for
14 all nuclear reactors can adequately assess the impact
15 at that location versus an impact in the middle of
16 Nebraska?

17 It's absolutely ludicrous, and I'm sorry
18 but the NRC should be ashamed of itself. I certainly
19 would be if I was a professional.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And this is Cathy
22 Iwane.

23 MS. IWANE: Hi, thanks for allowing me to
24 have a couple of minutes here tonight. At first I
25 thought well, what I have to say is probably not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 appropriate, but the more I sit here, and the more I
2 listen to having confidence in our storage of waste
3 and how what a wonderful job the NRC has done, and
4 this stuff never leaks. Today I'm speaking -- I'm a
5 member of several groups, the one closest to my heart
6 at this moment is a group called Fukushima Fallout
7 Awareness Network. And I came from Japan, I lived
8 there for 25 years, and I'm speaking from the
9 position of being a mom. I'm responsible for feeding
10 my children, and I'd like to address -- just bring us
11 some key issues that we might not be connecting the
12 dots to.

13 When we talk about nuclear waste,
14 obviously we have Hanford Reservation leaking into
15 the Columbia River. We've had several issues with
16 Indian Point leaking into -- tritium into the Hudson
17 River. We've got all sorts of issues, aboveground
18 nuclear testing that went on all over this country in
19 several sites until 1963. We have a history of
20 accidents reported, unreported, and we always have
21 our regulatory agencies coming in and saying there is
22 no immediate problem. The public is not at risk.
23 There is no problem with public health.

24 I'd like to address one thing that we
25 might not know. In Japan, there is an ongoing triple

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 meltdown, and they have standards for the
2 contamination in their food. It is the lowest and
3 strictest in the world, being 100 becquerels per
4 kilogram. This is for food that we eat, 100
5 becquerels per kilogram. It's a standard of tangible
6 waste. I'm going to finish really, really quickly.

7 In the United States, we allow -- the
8 FDA made the standard of 1,200 becquerels per
9 kilogram. Where do we think this radioactive waste,
10 cesium-134, cesium-137, strontium-90 is allowed in
11 our food system. This is all coming from leaking
12 waste. I have no confidence in our waste management
13 system at all. We need to understand that internal
14 contamination affects the weakest in our society, the
15 babies. We feed our children the food that is -- have
16 you heard of tritium in the water? These are some
17 issues that we really, really need to think about.

18 So, go to the FDA website and you will
19 notice when these limits were set, and it's all about
20 the leaking radioactivity in our environment. It's
21 showing up in our food. This is something that we
22 need to pay attention to and tonight, in my opinion,
23 is a dog and pony dance because it has nothing to do
24 with establishing any confidence. Thank you very
25 much.

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 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,
3 Cathy. Let me just check and see if any of the
4 following people are here that signed up to speak but
5 we're not sure if they are actually here now. Jill
6 Richardson, Libby Halvey, Charles Divona, Kevin
7 Higgins, and Richard Morgal. Any of those? Come on
8 up, and just introduce yourself, please. Thank you.

9 MR. MORGAL: Good evening. My name is
10 Richard Morgal, and I live in Ramona, California.
11 It's kind of a long drive, but I feel as though I'm
12 kind of in the forefront or on the front line of
13 potential radiation fallout if something bad were to
14 occur in the spent fuel ponds or pools at San
15 Onofre's facility.

16 I'm deeply concerned about the
17 possibility of someone deciding it would be
18 interesting to see what would happen if a large
19 airplane were flown into a nuclear facility. I don't
20 believe it is a matter of if, but more a matter of
21 when. But even more importantly is where does this
22 tragic event occur? San Onofre is my biggest concern.

23 According to a report by Robert Alvarez
24 entitled, it's kind of a long title, "Reducing the
25 Hazards of High-Level Radioactive Waste in Southern

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 California," published by the Friends of the Earth
2 that, "If an airplane was successful in starting a
3 spent fuel pool fire in one of the two cooling pools
4 at San Onofre and only 30 percent of the pool's
5 contents were to burn, the radioactive release from
6 this event would be comparable to 10 Chernobyls."
7 That's what in there right now.

8 I read the Generic Environmental Impact
9 Statement or study and it estimates that the largest
10 number of early -- of fatalities to be 191 people for
11 a spent fuel accident. Latent fatalities are
12 estimated to be 20,000 to 27,000 people.

13 These data points have been taken from
14 the NRC document NUREG-1738 and put into this
15 Environmental Impact Statement. That Nuclear
16 Regulatory 1738 was published in January 2001 before
17 September 11th, 2001. Repeatedly, people have
18 challenged this, including the Attorney General of
19 California, and the Attorney General of
20 Massachusetts. And the NRC states that this report,
21 1738, is valid, 191 people.

22 Crazy. Clearly, there's a huge
23 difference in opinion on what could happen based on
24 this concept of probability of an event occurring. I
25 believe the NRC is aware of the possibility of 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 catastrophic event occurring from a spent fuel pool
2 fire, but the NRC is unwilling to entertain the fact
3 that this probability is anything but an extremely
4 remote possibility.

5 I don't understand how they can arrive
6 at this conclusion based on the fact that the Draft
7 Environmental Impact Statement contains the following
8 passage. "The NRC has determined that the probability
9 of a successful terrorist attack on a spent fuel
10 pool, although numerically indeterminate, the
11 probability is low." Is low? If it's numerically
12 indeterminate, how can it be low? There's no basis to
13 include the last two words of this passage in the
14 Draft Environmental Impact report. The two words "is
15 low" should be omitted from the Generic Environmental
16 Impact Statement, and the NRC needs to stop using
17 probability risk analysis when addressing the issue
18 of terrorism in the Generic Environmental Impact
19 Statement.

20 MR. CAMERON: Richard, can I get you to
21 wrap up for us, please?

22 MR. MORGAL: Yes. I think that it's a
23 game that's being played, and we're all being
24 subjected to a much larger risk, that when it happens
25 and we see it on television like the 9/11 towers 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 came down, everybody in this room that's saying it's
2 safe, it's not a problem, don't worry about it, is
3 suddenly going to go whoa, wow, this is dangerous
4 stuff. But until then, we're just going to have to
5 wait. Thank you.

6 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Richard.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. CAMERON: Mel Kernahan, and then
9 we'll go to Mr. Kernahan, and then to Delores,
10 Delores Welty.

11 MS. KERNAHAN: Hi, I'm Mel Kernahan. I
12 live about 20 miles from the plant, not lucky enough
13 to live in a beach community, but most of my best
14 friends do.

15 San Onofre is not a generic nuclear
16 power plant. I don't think there is such a thing, but
17 we are not generic. We're graced with three
18 earthquake faults, the plant is on the beach, we have
19 really no real way to evacuate people. And right now
20 with freeway construction coming up, it's going to
21 close down the I-5 for two years due to a widening
22 thing.

23 Our beach communities are more
24 vulnerable than ever for radioactive disasters. This
25 planned major construction on the I-5 will be from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 2014 through 2017. The widening is going to start
2 from San Juan Creek Road and finish just south of
3 Avenida Pico. The I-5 is our lifeline to evacuation.

4 Should, God forbid, any natural or
5 terrorist disaster occur to disrupt the tons of
6 thermonuclear waste stored at San Onofre, we are
7 trapped. It's bad enough when the freeway is open and
8 running, but with it narrowing down, we haven't a
9 chance. That freeway is the only possible way of
10 escape from disasters to our stored nuclear waste, if
11 any is possible, for people living in and visiting
12 our beach communities, so it's up to the locals to
13 stop any further freeway construction that would
14 hinder evacuation from this power plant.

15 And to call our situation generic is
16 ridiculous. It's inhumane. I don't think any other
17 plant has as many earthquake faults to contend with,
18 and the other dangers. We need that waste out of here
19 as soon as possible. We didn't ask for it to be
20 there. We don't want it there. It's endangering all
21 of us. Thank you.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,
24 Mel. All right. And thank you, Gary. Mr. Kernahan.

25 MR. KERNAHAN: One of the things that I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 hope to happen this evening is that the folks that
2 have come here from Washington have learned what our
3 concerns are. The reason I say that is we're here to
4 help with rulemaking and adjudication. Is that what
5 this is about?

6 The thing is, you know, this is the
7 language you folks from Washington -- I used to live
8 back there when I was a kid. We needed a little more
9 money in our house, so we took in roomers, and we had
10 all kinds of people, FBI, whatever. And they had a
11 hard time moving beyond their role, their language,
12 their particular life that they earn money from.

13 We're interested that whatever that
14 means, it conveys for us the significance of facing
15 clearly from our point of view they can see it, how
16 the people in the communities around here are
17 jeopardized, how we are concerned, and it isn't about
18 changing rulemaking or helping giving better clues
19 about adjudication. It's about the fact that that
20 could be a source of not one disaster, but a series
21 of disasters. And people don't seem to be as aware of
22 it as in -- and if you're here just for this and it's
23 a part of your Federal job, I can understand that,
24 but it looks a little different when you live nearby.

25 And when you think particularly -- 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 think, particularly, that you don't understand the
2 setting. Believe me, if you've been to San Onofre, if
3 you walked the beach there, you know how close to the
4 ocean it is. If you've lived in San Clemente, you
5 know it's been a concern just down the road. We're
6 almost next door. We have this concern for people.

7 Now, if we're here to help rewrite some
8 rules or help with adjudication, I'm sorry, I'm not
9 qualified for that. But I am qualified, I think, as a
10 person who's lived here a long time to care about my
11 family, my neighbors, what happens on the freeway,
12 the fact that the toll roads are considering building
13 an extension that would end at the trestles. It was
14 in the paper the other day.

15 I mean, that's our neighbor down there,
16 and it's a very sick neighbor. And to think that
17 there's anything that can be done other than moving
18 it, at least the dangerous stuff, inland where it is
19 not within the reach of the sea, then I'm afraid that
20 I have to differ with them. And it's a personal
21 thing. It isn't theoretical, it isn't about what an
22 agency should do, it's about how we're going to live
23 here. Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Mr.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Kernahan. This is Delores, and after Delores we're
2 going to go to Bill Hannaman, Patti Davis, Mary Beth
3 Branigan and Marsha Patt, I think.

4 MS. WELTY: Oh, I thought I was going to
5 get to wind up the meeting. I'm Delores Welty from
6 Leucadia, and it's always interesting to comment on
7 Draft EIRs. I think everyone has made it plain that
8 generic is not a word we like. And this one line in
9 your additional issues for public comment, I would
10 like to point out.

11 "The Proposed Rule codifies the
12 conclusions from the Draft Generic Environmental
13 Impact Statement so that those determinations do not
14 need to be made in individual actions." And I think
15 those things need to be looked at very carefully
16 because we do consider ourselves very special and
17 significant.

18 And then I'm going to step away from
19 anything that anybody is talking about tonight. I
20 just got back from Granite Hills, where I was with
21 the Sierra Club, and we were fighting about solar and
22 wind power, and what we're going to do with all these
23 people plowing the desert to put these huge
24 installations out there, which are very dangerous to
25 migration, migrating birds. There are all kinds 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 things to look at in that aspect.

2 So, I also want to tell you that I put
3 solar on my house some time ago. I just got my final
4 bill for the last 12 months. I have not paid anything
5 on this bill, and sometimes it is almost \$300 per
6 year, but this year it's \$4.64.

7 (Applause.)

8 MS. WELTY: And along with that, I would
9 like to say I don't think we have an energy policy.
10 If we had a true energy policy, we would be looking
11 at local solar, we be looking at where our money is
12 going and where we might do best with it. We
13 certainly have heard about retrofit, which helps in
14 every way to save energy, so that probably won't get
15 in this EIR, but I think it's important.

16 Have you read any James Thurber? You
17 remember he had an aunt that said she would go around
18 and put tape over the electric plugins because energy
19 leaks, and she was afraid it would get her. Well, it
20 does leak. You lose about 40 percent of your energy
21 on transmission lines depending how far they go. So,
22 if you have a huge plant here that sends electricity
23 to San Francisco, and LA, and who knows where else,
24 it just leaks.

25 We really need a good energy policy 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 takes some of these things into consideration. Thank
2 you for listening.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,
5 Delores. And Bill.

6 MR. HANNAMAN: Good evening. My name is
7 Bill Hannaman, and I'm a professional engineer in
8 California, and I live in San Diego close to the
9 plant. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in
10 this public meeting and share my thoughts with some
11 of those who are responsible for regulating the
12 nuclear safety here in the United States.

13 Now, the scenario I would like to be in
14 favor of is restart San Onofre because it's a
15 significant economic value. It was a stabilizing
16 source for the power in Southern California, and it
17 operated with a zero carbon footprint. But that
18 decision is past, and now that forced us into looking
19 for the safe storage of spent fuel rods. And that
20 plan must be put in place before a site cleanup plan
21 can be finalized. This is actually a national problem
22 across the United States, not just for San Onofre
23 alone.

24 The U.S. Government, not the NRC, but
25 the U.S. Government's long delayed commitment to take

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 possession and manage the spent fuel rods now becomes
2 the focus. Recently, the National Conference of State
3 Legislators said that it supports Federal action to
4 develop consolidated facilities for interim storage
5 of high-level waste until a permanent repository is
6 ready. I think that satisfies the idea of moving the
7 fuel away from San Onofre to an interim place, but
8 it's really just an extension of the onsite storage
9 facilities, which already takes the fuel bundles in
10 the casks. And there is an issue here of timing.

11 After you've had the fuel in the reactor
12 you need about seven years in the spent fuel before
13 you can safely put it into a cask and keep it sealed
14 with all the thermal analysis and that kind of thing.
15 So, we can't do it just immediately. And I think San
16 Onofre has a plan for roughly 20 years to have that
17 taken care of, so we have to -- the physics of it
18 tell us we're stuck in the -- a minimum seven years
19 before we can even move it out of the spent fuel
20 pool.

21 Well, I'm pleased to note, and I think
22 some other speakers mentioned this, that the NRC
23 Commissioners have directed the NRC staff to finish
24 the Safety Evaluation Report for Yucca Mountain's
25 construction authorization process. If that came 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 before we had the interim facilities ready, well,
2 that would be good news because then there would be a
3 place to put things. So, I think there's a timing
4 here as to whether we actually launch into these
5 interim facilities because now we're on a path to
6 look at and possibly have Yucca Mountain as the place
7 to send the fuel. So, we need to get the NRC to --
8 this strategy, whatever it is, should be done safely
9 and securely. Based on the years of study at Yucca
10 Mountain as a monitored retrievable storage facility,
11 it appears to be a much better alternative to me than
12 leaving the spent fuel rods in the casks located near
13 the plant facility. And the retrievable storage
14 allows for recovery of the valuable isotopes that are
15 in those fuel rods. Thank you.

16 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Bill. Thank you
17 very much.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. CAMERON: Is Patti, Patti Davis. Oh,
20 here comes Patti, and then we're going to go to Mary
21 Beth, then Marsha.

22 MS. DAVIS: Hi. Thank you, Chip. I'm
23 Patti Davis. I'm a mother of three children. My
24 husband and I live in San Clemente, and have been for
25 almost 14 years.

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 am very troubled by the use of this
2 high-burnup fuel at San Onofre. It puts my children
3 at a much higher risk, and it puts them at a higher
4 risk for a longer time. Wasn't nuclear waste bad
5 enough to begin with? Did they have to go and find a
6 way to make it worse? And what about the roof that is
7 on that spent fuel pool? Certainly, yes, you have
8 hardened sides and a concrete bottom, and that sounds
9 very good, but the roof? Not much help there.

10 If you were to go back in time to when
11 that plant was being designed and to when it was
12 being proposed, I wonder if you could have gotten
13 anyone in the community, anywhere in this state,
14 anyone to say yes, we will be happy to have an atomic
15 waste dump on our beautiful shore of California for
16 60 years, 100 years, 300 years, we don't know. And,
17 also, we're going to give you a generic plan when we
18 get to that point.

19 Well, we're not a generic community. My
20 kids are not generic, my family is not generic. And I
21 just have to say, you know, climate change is a very
22 big concern, but I think using nuclear as a way to
23 solve that is the most expensive, and the most
24 reckless path we could go and follow.

25 When my children were young and they

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 would play outside or inside, wherever, often
2 wherever they would go a big mess would follow. They
3 would have a great time having friends over. We often
4 had a big crew of kids, and they would come up to me,
5 "Mom, mom, we're going to go play outside now." And I
6 would go over and take a look at the family room. Oh,
7 no, you're not. You're not going anywhere until you
8 clean that up. Okay, well, that's what I challenge
9 nuclear industry, the NRC, clean it up. Don't spend
10 any more money on promotion, on new nuclear stuff
11 that is not proven. Clean up what we have now, the
12 stuff that is threatening and putting risk at our
13 community and to my children.

14 I just want to say that yes, we do need
15 a diversified energy portfolio, and highly recommend
16 wind, hydro, and a very wonderful nuclear reactor
17 that we can all depend upon that's safely located 93
18 million miles away. It's called our sun. Thank you.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Patti. Is Mary
21 Beth still here? Mary Beth? Oh, here comes Mary Beth,
22 and then Marsha.

23 MS. BRANIGAN: I'm Mary Beth Branigan
24 from the Ecological Options Network, and actually
25 we're from northern California, but I identify with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the whole state. I love this state, and I love it so
2 much, and it's heartbreaking what the nuclear
3 industry has done to our state, not only from this
4 side of the Pacific, but the General Electric plant
5 that is seeping and flowing to our shores from
6 Fukushima.

7 This is a time of increasingly severe
8 storms, sea rise, and increasing frequency of major
9 earthquakes on the Ring of Fire. Catastrophic events
10 at nuclear power stations have happened much more
11 frequently than the NRC and the nuclear industry have
12 assumed would ever happen. We had Three Mile Island,
13 we had Chernobyl, we had Fukushima, we've had
14 Rocketdyne, and there are many, many more.

15 The nuclear industry has had a very good
16 PR program that has allowed a lot of people to be
17 totally confused and lied to. Storm surges and
18 climate changes mean more risk for vulnerable,
19 intensely radioactive waste sitting only 13 feet
20 above high tide. And we don't need to choose between
21 climate change and radioactive waste releases. That's
22 a false choice.

23 We have a surplus of energy supply here
24 in California without our nuclear reactors putting us
25 even more at risk. And high-burnup fuel has changed

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 everything, and has made a terrible challenge a
2 horrendous one.

3 Everything in this process about Waste
4 Confidence needs to stop until there is enough data
5 to reliably manage and monitor the high-burnup fuel.
6 According to NRC's own documents, their assumptions
7 about how high-burnup fuel would react and perform
8 have not proven correct. How can we honestly talk
9 about any plans for storing and managing this waste
10 when the high-burnup fuel problem is not even fully
11 acknowledged and addressed?

12 Intense radiation, as you know, breaks
13 down concrete, salt water breaks down metal, no
14 containment will even reliably last for 50 years,
15 much less the hundreds and thousands of years needed
16 to isolate this deadly waste from the environment.
17 And it's everywhere, it's everywhere in our country.

18 The nuclear industry has destroyed our
19 DNA, of not only the humans but the whole planet, all
20 the creatures. I am so upset with the nuclear
21 industry and the NRC for its cooperation with them.
22 Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,
25 Mary Beth. Is Marsha here? I'm not sure how to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pronounce the last name. Marsha Patt. Okay. Let's go
2 to Jösan Feathers, and then we'll go to Charles
3 Cleveland, Roger Johnson, and Stephen Lord.

4 MS. FEATHERS: Hello. My name is Jösan
5 Feathers, and I'm a registered civil engineer. I
6 believe that as long as San Onofre's high-level
7 nuclear waste remains onsite it should be stored as
8 safely as possible until it be safely moved, if ever.

9 Spent fuel pools at nuclear power plants
10 are intended to house nuclear waste only until it's
11 cool enough to be transferred to permanent storage.
12 In the U.S., overcrowded cooling pools can contain up
13 to 40 times more nuclear material than the reactor
14 cores. Furthermore, they lack equivalent containment
15 buildings and safety systems for protection. These
16 pools have now become nuclear waste storage sites.

17 Unlike some of the other nuclear power
18 plants to be covered by this Generic EIS, there are
19 known offshore earthquake faults capable of up to an
20 8.0 magnitude earthquake here. In the event of an
21 earthquake of this size and potential tsunamis,
22 failure similar to Fukushima, Japan are possible.

23 In contrast to spent fuel pools,
24 concrete and steel dry casks are not vulnerable to
25 the loss of the coolant if electricity is disrupted

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 by an earthquake or other natural disaster because
2 they are passively cooled by natural air flow.

3 Rather than invest in dry casks, plant
4 owners continue to fill cooling pools well beyond
5 what they were designed for. Today around 80 percent
6 of U.S. nuclear waste currently is stored in pools.
7 Let me say that again. Today around 80 percent of
8 U.S. nuclear waste currently in pools could be moved
9 to onsite dry casks until permanent storage is
10 available. However, in the case of high-burnup fuel
11 like we have here at San Onofre unbeknownst to us,
12 it's back to the drawing board.

13 At a minimum, the NRC should not approve
14 higher density of fuel assemblies in dry cask
15 systems, and they should stop approving the use of
16 high-burnup fuel in existing plants.

17 (Applause.)

18 MS. FEATHERS: Independent experts of the
19 Union of Concerned Scientists and elsewhere agree
20 that the dangerous radioactive waste from spent fuel
21 pools that has cooled sufficiently should be required
22 to be transferred to safer onsite dry cask storage.
23 Dry casks are economically viable and provide a
24 storage alternative for 20 years for high-burnup fuel
25 until an offsite storage facility becomes available.

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 earth where it came from in the first place. So, I
2 would urge that we take a serious look at this
3 approach because, again, we really need to get rid of
4 this stuff. Thank you.

5 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Charles. And,
6 Roger, Roger Johnson. And then we're going to go to
7 Steven Lord. This is Roger.

8 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you and good evening.
9 There's two words tonight that stand out. The first
10 one is confidence, and there's one thing about this
11 meeting which gives me confidence, and that's the
12 fact that someone from Senator Feinstein's office is
13 here tonight. Thank you for that. And I would like to
14 know is there a representative --

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. JOHNSON: -- from Congressman's
17 Issa's office here tonight? Please raise your hand.
18 Is the NRC in touch with Congressman Issa? It's under
19 his jurisdiction, this area. To my knowledge, he has
20 not had any impact at all on this whole process. Have
21 you people been meeting with him? Why not? What is
22 his position? Why hasn't he said anything?

23 The other word I'd like to speak about
24 is the very first word we got stuck on at the first
25 question, that's generic. The lady asked a question

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 about this to the NRC and it was not answered, so
2 we're stuck on the first part.

3 So, here's a report which makes no
4 distinction between storing nuclear waste in the
5 middle of a metropolitan area, and storing it in the
6 middle of an Arizona desert. It's a report that makes
7 no distinction between storing nuclear waste on top
8 of an earthquake fault, and one someplace that never
9 has any earthquakes, same with tsunamis. So, this
10 report is automatically suspect. It's not a serious
11 report. This report is a whitewash. It's not
12 considering the true facts, and as long as it's a
13 generic report, this report is worthless.

14 I think you better start all over and
15 get rid of all the generic stuff. I think that's the
16 message you should take home with you, revise the
17 whole report and get rid of any generic analysis.

18 Now, here's a couple of other things.
19 The low-level waste problem is not really dealt with.
20 It's whitewashed, also. If you -- the NRC website
21 says -- adopts the linear no threshold idea that
22 there is no such thing as a safe level of radiation.
23 This also comes from the BEIR 7 reports of the
24 biological effects of ionizing radiation, and the
25 BEIR 7 report says that all radiation is potentially

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 dangerous, and there's no such thing as a safe
2 threshold. So, low-level doesn't mean it's safe.

3 And one thing I read in the first few
4 pages, in fact, why aren't the pages numbered here?
5 They're all in Roman -- so on page Roman III.1.19
6 section, it says it's not going to consider at all
7 anything to do with Class C radioactive waste or
8 greater. That's the most dangerous, that's the most
9 highly contaminated stuff. All of that stuff, all
10 that rubble is going to go to Andrews, Texas. How are
11 you going to get it there? It's going to go through
12 four or five states, hundreds of towns, and this is
13 not dangerous? So, all that rubble that you blow up
14 and destroy, and all those pipes and valves and
15 everything else that's radioactive is -- what about
16 that? It's not really addressed in here. What about
17 Class A and B low-level waste? Low-level waste is not
18 dangerous according to the NRC for the adult male,
19 but it is dangerous to babies and children, and the
20 human fetus, so I'd like to see more about that.

21 One thing that I would like to see is
22 radioactive monitoring. There is no real-time
23 radioactive monitoring available to the public, so
24 when you have a dirty day and you blow up something
25 and a contaminant gets into the ocean and into 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 air, I think people who live in San Clemente or
2 inland ought to know about it.

3 I'd like to propose that you build real-
4 time publicly available radioactive monitors in every
5 town and city within 20 miles.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. JOHNSON: And here's another quick
8 suggestion. Why don't you put the dry cask storage
9 inside the domes instead of blowing them up? Why
10 don't you put them inside the domes, leave the -- so
11 when it gets hit with a missile, we know that the
12 whole place is not protected against high explosives.
13 We know bunker buster bombs go through 20 feet of
14 reinforced steel. This place is not safe. It was
15 never designed to be safe from terrorist attack. And
16 there's a million ways terrorists could attack this
17 plant. So, that is not dealt with in this report
18 either.

19 MR. CAMERON: Can I ask you to finish up
20 for us, please?

21 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. One thing we've
22 learned from Fukushima, Chernobyl, and the other
23 disasters is that the people in the nuclear industry
24 and the NRC are professional risk takers. The fact
25 that they switched to high-burnup fuel, that was 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 big risky venture. We're hearing risk taking all the
2 time. It's run by bankers. Bankers are risk takers.
3 So, please clean up this report. There's a lot of
4 improvement that's needed.

5 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Roger. Stephen,
8 Stephen Lord. And while Stephen is coming up, next
9 we're going to go William Bibb, Randy Ziglar, Viviane
10 Waller, and Jim Haney. And this is Stephen.

11 MR. LORD: Hi, Stephen Lord. I'm a
12 professional engineer, chemical engineer by training,
13 worked in uranium mining, worked in treatment of
14 radioactive waste from nuclear reactors, and
15 currently I work in the solar industry. So, I'm here
16 really as a well-trained engineer who's primarily a
17 taxpayer and a rate payer. And what I hear is
18 everybody wants something, but who's going to pay for
19 it? And I tell you who's going to pay for it, the
20 people sitting here and the rest of the country
21 because it's not going to be Sempra, and it's not
22 going to be SDG&E or Pacific Gas and Electric, it's
23 going to be us. And it's going to be us either
24 through electrical rates or through taxes, because
25 Sempra is going to sue the government for failing 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 build their underground depository. And who's going
2 to pay? Well, the taxpayer is going to pay, or the
3 rate payer is going to pay.

4 So, what we've got to think about is how
5 risky is this really in the big scheme of things. How
6 much money do you want to spend? And if you spend all
7 that money on this, you don't have that money to
8 spend on something else. I mean, people talk about
9 Fukushima, and the truth of the matter is that after
10 Fukushima, the emperor went on TV in Japan and he
11 asked everybody in Japan to conserve energy because
12 they were going to shut down these dangerous nuclear
13 plants. And lot of people in Japan are very --
14 particularly the elderly people who are very
15 trusting in the emperor, did what he asked. They
16 turned off the heat, they conserved electricity, and
17 they died. Who dies in these sort of energy
18 conservation situations? Elderly. So, more people in
19 Japan that actually died from energy conservation
20 than from the radiation.

21 Now, that's not to say that it wasn't a
22 disaster, it wasn't a big problem and all these other
23 things. All I'm trying to say is that we've got to
24 look at the costs, and you've got to look at the
25 tradeoffs. It's just like, you know, in my house my

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 wife wants to put a new sink in the kitchen. Okay.
2 Well, if we put that in, we don't do something else.
3 And here we are, if we put all these safety
4 precautions that aren't really needed, then we don't
5 do something else.

6 So, what I would like to encourage the
7 NRC to think about is as it puts these things
8 together, it thinks about what the cost is going to
9 be. And I would like to say, just briefly, that they
10 asked us to comment on the four issues in here, and I
11 think what they've done in terms of putting together
12 a generic program is a good idea. It takes away 80
13 percent of the issues. So, when we get to San Onofre
14 and what to do with that fuel, then a lot of the
15 other issues have already been solved. And we can
16 look at the specifics of this. We don't have to
17 reinvent the wheel all the time. So, thank you for
18 listening. I appreciate it. It's nice to listen to
19 everybody else, but someone has got to pay the piper,
20 and it's going to be us.

21 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Stephen.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. CAMERON: And William Bibb? How about
24 Randy Ziglar?

25 MR. ZIGLAR: Hi, my name is Randy Ziglar

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 from Carlsbad, California. It all started with the
2 Manhattan Project. We had a lot of money to develop
3 this kind of technology, and the Japanese got an
4 experience of what it was like. And then we started
5 developing hydrogen bombs and we had all this
6 radiation floating around because we did it all above
7 ground, and we showed off all these mushrooms. And
8 all the radiation went around, and people started
9 having cancer. And we started to learn that from
10 Hiroshima, and we learned from the radioactive
11 fallout that it's not a healthy thing, radioactive
12 materials.

13 Now we're stuck with a whole lot of
14 nuclear power plants with a whole lot of waste stuff
15 that we don't know what to do with it. There's no
16 answer to safe storage, and the safe transport of
17 this material. It's right here in our backyard. It's
18 threatening us at all times. We don't have a way to
19 deal with it.

20 When we were doing the aboveground
21 testing we knew it was bad, and they found it
22 necessary to put it under the ground and not have it
23 spread around.

24 My question for the Nuclear Regulatory
25 Commission is when will it be necessary 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 Nuclear Regulatory Commission to act with authority
2 and provide adequate force towards a serious
3 decommissioning of San Onofre? That's my first
4 question. When will it be necessary for them to act
5 seriously and not just come up with words and paper,
6 on paper that's highly questionable?

7 My second question is, is there any
8 possibility whatsoever of making harmless the
9 radioactive waste that we have produced in such
10 massive quantity? Is there any possibility at all for
11 making this waste harmless? Is it possible?

12 The system is not working. It's not
13 either/or, we're going to have global warming or
14 we're going to have nuclear energy. That's a false
15 question. I'm for jobs, but we should have jobs doing
16 the right thing, making energy that is safe and that
17 doesn't cause harm to the next seven generations.

18 Global warming is serious. There's no
19 denying. Nobody that's against radioactive waste is
20 for global warming. It's a very serious thing, but so
21 is nuclear radioactive poisoning. It's very serious.
22 We cannot just live by hope and faith.

23 You know, a friend of mine says well,
24 let's get some lawyers and then the lawyers will
25 force the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to do 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 right thing. Well, it's not the Nuclear Regulatory
2 Commission that's going to do the right thing. It's
3 not the lawyers. They can't figure out a way to make
4 nuclear waste safe. Lawyers can't do it.
5 Administrators can't do it. Politicians can't do it.

6 I'm proposing that we have a new
7 Manhattan Project, a project that's going to take
8 care of nuclear waste, and at the same time deal with
9 global warming, some kind of way that we can work
10 towards life on this planet, and not towards more.
11 Let's liberate our energies, and our politicians, and
12 our money towards survival for the next seventh
13 generation.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. And Viviane.

16 MS. WALLER: I'm Viviane Waller. I live
17 in Encinitas, California, and I despise public
18 speaking. The fact that I'm up here is that this
19 situation is absolutely intolerable, and I am not
20 sure that I could live with myself if I let this
21 opportunity pass by. But am I prepared for this? Not
22 at all.

23 I'd like you to know that in the
24 Proposed Rule back in 1979 the NRC states that they
25 would not continue to license reactors if they didn'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 have reasonable confidence that the waste can and
2 will in due course be disposed of safely. 1984 same
3 Proposed Rule, it says the Commission finds
4 reasonable assurance that one -- I'm sorry. It says
5 that yes, they find reasonable assurance that one or
6 more mined geologic repositories for commercial high-
7 level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel will
8 be available by the years 2007 to 2009. We're at
9 2013, almost 2014 and neither of those statements
10 have even come close to fruition.

11 The Draft EIS evaluates environmental
12 topics and issues if all goes according to plan. It
13 would be virtually pointless if unexpected stochastic
14 events take place. And we live in a day and age now
15 where, unfortunately, the norm is no longer what one
16 needs to expect. I've been living in fear, as my
17 neighbors have, since 2001 of San Onofre in general.
18 I'm even more horrified knowing that the spent
19 nuclear fuel is going to be standing there for even
20 seven years, let alone the 60, 160, and indeterminate
21 time that is being considered in this generic
22 document. Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Is Jim Haber
25 here? Jim. Okay, that's the last speaker I have, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I want to check and make sure, did I miss anybody?
2 Does anybody else want to speak tonight? Okay. Well,
3 I'm going to ask Cathy Haney to close the meeting out
4 for us. And I just would like to thank you all for
5 the courtesy that you've shown everybody tonight.
6 It's very impressive. Thank you for that from a
7 facilitator's perspective. And, Cathy?

8 MS. HANEY: Thank you, Chip. I'd just
9 like to close by thanking everyone for taking the
10 time to come tonight to provide us comments, for
11 taking the time to read that document. I know there's
12 a lot of information there. It's a very thick
13 document.

14 I do believe that it's very worthwhile
15 for the NRC as well as any of the Federal agencies to
16 get out into the environment and talk to the people
17 that are affected by the rules and the actions that
18 we're taking. And I think by doing that it makes us
19 more effective at what we're doing. So, from here we
20 have several more public meetings. We will hear from
21 other individuals like yourselves about their
22 comments on the Rule, and the Draft Generic
23 Environmental Impact Statement.

24 We really do encourage you to -- we'll
25 use the comments that you provided today, but if

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 are additional comments that you have, please
2 send them in to us through the written documents that
3 you see up there. We'll take all of those comments
4 into consideration as we prepare the final document,
5 and then the final document will be provided from my
6 staff up to our Commission, where the Commission will
7 review the comments. And one of the things that I
8 know from having dealt with many of our Commissioners
9 on a one-on-one basis, they're very interested in how
10 we are resolving public comments. They don't just
11 take what we provide to them and go forward. They
12 actually look at what the comments were, and how
13 staff responded to those comments in preparing the
14 final document.

15 So, we have heard your comments. The
16 Commissioners in their making final determination
17 about the final documents of what comes out of the
18 agency for being the final rulemaking will also
19 consider those. And, again, I thank you for your
20 frankness, for taking the time to be here, and we'll
21 be around for a few minutes if you want to engage
22 anyone out in the open house, or any of us up in the
23 front row that have been listening to all the
24 comments.

25 So I want to again thank you, Chip, for

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 excellent facilitation. We really appreciate your
2 help, also.

3 MR. CAMERON: Well goodnight, everybody.
4 Thank you.

5 (Whereupon, the proceedings went off the
6 record at 9:47 p.m.)

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701