

**Official Transcript of Proceedings**  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: Headquarters Teleconference on Waste Confidence Proposed Rule and Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Docket Number: NRC-2012-0246

Location: Teleconference

Date: Monday, December 9, 2013

Work Order No.: NRC-462

Pages 1-107

**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 TELECONFERENCE

+ + + + +

MONDAY

DECEMBER 9, 2013

+ + + + +

The Teleconference convened at 1:00 p.m.  
Eastern Standard Time, Chip Cameron, Facilitator,  
presiding.

PRESENT

CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator

CARRIE SAFFORD, Deputy Director, Waste

Confidence Directorate

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

1:03 p.m.

FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Jose.  
Good day, everybody. This is Chip Cameron, and I'm speaking to you from NRC Headquarters in Rockville, Maryland. I wanted to welcome you to the final opportunity to present oral comments to the NRC staff on the Draft EIS and Proposed Rule on Waste Confidence.

Today's meeting, as you will, is a call-in-only event. We have no people here with us in Rockville, no public commenters in person. And as Jose will tell you, or already did tell you, if you want to speak today you press star one, and then you will be put in the queue of speakers, and you can do that now so that we know who is going to be on the line.

We've heard from many of you in the regional meetings that we've held around the country and the meetings here in Rockville, and we would just thank you once again for attending those meetings and giving us your comments. We're going to give preference to those people that we haven't heard from at all, and that just means we're going to go to them first, as much as practicable, but we will get to all of you today before we adjourn at 4 p.m. eastern.

I would just ask you to be concise in your

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 comments. And rather than setting a specific time limit  
2 now, I would only say that we'll give you a reasonable  
3 opportunity to talk to us today. But if we do get a lot  
4 of people who want to comment, then we might have to set  
5 some three- to five-minute time limits. But for right  
6 now, we'll just go ahead with the reasonable perspective  
7 on this.

8 There is a transcript being taken. This is  
9 not the audio recording that Jose referred to. This is  
10 a transcript that will be available to you as a record  
11 of this call and also to the NRC staff.

12 We have a short statement by Carrie Safford,  
13 who is the Deputy Director of the Waste Confidence  
14 Directorate. And then we're going to go right to  
15 comment. So Carrie?

16 MS. SAFFORD: Thanks, Chip. Good  
17 afternoon, everyone. As Chip mentioned, my name is  
18 Carrie Safford, and I'm the Deputy Director of the Waste  
19 Confidence Directorate. Before we get started, I want  
20 to thank you all for participating today and for showing  
21 an interest in the Agency's activities regarding waste  
22 confidence. We appreciate your participation and your  
23 input.

24 The purpose of today's call is to obtain  
25 comments from the public on the staff's Draft Generic

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Rule.  
2 Today's teleconference is the final public meeting.

3 We look forward to receiving your input on  
4 the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement and  
5 Proposed Rule today. The comments and information that  
6 you provide to us during the comment period will assist  
7 us in the preparation of the final document. And as a  
8 reminder, the comment period concludes on Friday,  
9 December 20th.

10 Chip?

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: I'm sorry. I'm  
12 going to call three people now, Chris Dorsey, Steven  
13 Mirsky, and Lewis Cuthbert. And, Jose, we're going to  
14 go to Chris Dorsey first, and then we'll go to Steven  
15 Mirsky, and then we'll go to Lewis Cuthbert.

16 OPERATOR: Wonderful. Chris' line is  
17 open.

18 MR. DORSEY: Thank you very much, sir.  
19 Yes, my name is Chris Dorsey. I have been watching, and  
20 watching with dismay, the actions of the Nuclear  
21 Regulatory Commission for a number of years, and I'm just  
22 going to keep it, keep it very simple. This is about  
23 confidence, and I have no confidence in the Nuclear  
24 Regulatory Commission, especially when it comes to  
25 simple facts, simple facts such as, you know, this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 radioactive and dangerous material is seeping into our  
2 water supply. That's a fact. That's a fact that's  
3 proven by the tritium leak at the North Anna Nuclear Power  
4 Plant that hasn't really been addressed by the NRC, who  
5 seems to be covering this up.

6 Another thing I would like to say is that  
7 we are creating this waste or, actually, the NRC, and the  
8 NRC, in my mind, is nothing but a PR arm for the  
9 corporations that run the nuclear energy industry, and  
10 we don't have proper storage for what has already been  
11 created, which will not be resolved in any of our  
12 lifetimes, and we're continually, you are continually or  
13 the corporations, the energy corporations are  
14 continually creating more waste. We don't even have any  
15 proper way to store the waste that has already been  
16 created, and we're creating more.

17 Now, I always ask why is this continual  
18 reckless endangerment of the entire population of the  
19 United States continuing when it's very clear that this  
20 is a danger to all of humanity. I would love to hear  
21 somebody disagree and explain how this is not reckless  
22 endangerment and this is not a high crime against the  
23 American people.

24 I oppose everything you do. I oppose every  
25 aspect of nuclear energy. I think it's too dangerous to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 exist, and I have never heard anyone tell me how it's not  
2 too dangerous to exist. I would love to hear you tell  
3 me how this is not reckless endangerment and how nuclear  
4 energy is not too dangerous to exist. Thank you very  
5 much for your time.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,  
7 Chris. And we're going to go to Steven Mirsky. Steven?

8 MR. MIRSKY: Thank you. Unlike the  
9 previous caller, I've actually worked in the nuclear  
10 industry for 40 years. And my comment is that I am in  
11 complete support of what the NRC has promulgated in its  
12 Waste Confidence Draft Rule. I hear from the previous  
13 commenter, basically, a lot of lack of knowledge and  
14 unappreciation of where we would be in this world today  
15 if we did not have nuclear energy.

16 So I would actually ask people like him to  
17 try to find the actual facts and not read conjecture,  
18 which is widely available on the internet to anyone who  
19 wants to. I have worked at nuclear power plants. I've  
20 worked with nuclear material, and the nuclear industry  
21 is much safer than many other activities that we have in  
22 our daily life. The risk that the previous caller  
23 accepts by getting in his car, flying in an airplane,  
24 taking medications, climbing a ladder, and doing many  
25 other activities are much worse. I also believe that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 people do accept risks of radiation everyday by living,  
2 by subjecting themselves to radiation on flying, and by  
3 medical procedures.

4 So I applaud the NRC for proceeding forward  
5 on this, and I believe that, with sane, logical voices  
6 and people that understand the entire area of nuclear  
7 energy, that this is a positive step and an important  
8 asset in our energy mix that will improve our standard  
9 of living and the future of the world. Thank you.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Steven.  
11 Next, we're going to go to Lewis Cuthbert. And I'm  
12 sorry. Just let me ask this. Just let me remind  
13 everybody if you could just give us your affiliation, if  
14 appropriate, when you talk, that would be helpful to us,  
15 too. And this is Lewis, Lewis Cuthbert. Lewis?

16 DR. CUTHBERT: Good afternoon. Dr. Lewis  
17 Cuthbert. I'm president of the Alliance for a Clean  
18 Environment based in Pottstown, Pennsylvania.

19 For more than a decade now, the Alliance for  
20 a Clean Environment has been researching and  
21 investigating Limerick Nuclear Plant's high-level  
22 radioactive waste fuel pools, storage casks, and risks  
23 associated with transportation of high-level  
24 radioactive waste. A body of compelling evidence is now  
25 posted on the ACE website, which is at [www.acereport.org](http://www.acereport.org).

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 And section number nine specifically addresses  
2 high-level radioactive waste is a ticking time bomb.

3 For purposes of this study, ACE is going to  
4 be submitting a 25-page summary that combines previous  
5 and current findings. And based on the evidence that  
6 we've compiled, we are requesting that the NRC conduct  
7 a site-specific nuclear waste study at Limerick Nuclear  
8 Plant prior to completing the court-ordered nuclear  
9 waste study nationally.

10 Our analysis is that this is about the  
11 public's long-term health and financial risks in terms  
12 of what needs to be considered. We would suggest that  
13 it would be safer to stop producing waste for which there  
14 is no current safe solution and for which financial  
15 responsibility has been passed off largely to the public,  
16 to taxpayers and ratepayers.

17 We're suggesting also that the NRC should  
18 require nuclear waste to be stored safer on sites where  
19 they are produced and to stop the plan for dangerous  
20 nuclear waste transport and interim storage when they  
21 reach their final conclusions. We've identified a  
22 number of transport and interim storage plan problems.  
23 Risks are not eliminated from current sites where waste  
24 would still be stored, and risks are, in fact, increased  
25 with waste spread to more locations throughout the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 nation, resulting in more targets for potential problems  
2 from either natural disasters or terrorist activities.

3 A couple of other thoughts. Simply stated,  
4 transport is too dangerous to become a viable solution  
5 in our analysis. On a personal note, we are continuously  
6 uncomfortable living very close to Limerick Nuclear  
7 Plant's nuclear waste, and evidence suggests that  
8 attempting to transport it would even be worse.

9 It's pretty clear that the NRC nor anyone  
10 else can guarantee safe transport of nuclear waste, and,  
11 based on the inability to provide that kind of surety,  
12 we suggest that it makes much better sense not to  
13 transport high-level radioactive waste on our nation's  
14 highways and railroads. The history of nuclear waste  
15 transport incidents and accidents would tend to refute  
16 both NRC and nuclear industry claims that transport is  
17 safe. There have been numerous incidents and accidents  
18 since the 1950s through literally last week where there  
19 have been problems. One of them occurred in  
20 Pennsylvania in 1981.

21 And a number of things in the state of  
22 Pennsylvania would suggest this is a very bad idea. We  
23 have a severely deteriorating infrastructure problem in  
24 Pennsylvania that would mitigate against attempting to  
25 transport these wastes. Pennsylvania's current

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 governor, Tom Corbett, is on record saying that the roads  
2 and bridges in Pennsylvania are crumbling, and it's also  
3 been reported that two of every five Pennsylvania bridges  
4 are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.  
5 So the safety of transport is a very large hurdle to try  
6 to clear.

7 An additional factor to consider for the NRC  
8 would be increasing extreme weather conditions and  
9 patterns and what the impact would be on transport plans.  
10 Pennsylvania, in 2011, broke all existing records for  
11 snow, ice, heat, and rain problems in terms of weather  
12 conditions.

13 Final thought in terms of a separate topic  
14 is financial injustice. Our analysis suggests and our  
15 research would show and support the fact that a number  
16 of potentially negative financial impacts would occur  
17 from transportation of high-level radioactive waste.  
18 Property values have been documented to decline along  
19 nuclear waste transportation routes in several states  
20 already.

21 Insurance does not cover radiological  
22 incidents or accidents in virtually every case, and  
23 there's a very large open question in terms of who would  
24 reimburse victims of a nuclear waste transport accident.  
25 That is not clear. And there's been an attempt 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Pennsylvania and I'm going to presume in other states as  
2 well that local rights are under attack in terms of the  
3 ability to oppose nuclear waste transport through  
4 communities.

5 So in conclusion I would respectfully  
6 suggest to the NRC that it is extremely important that  
7 you not exclude Limerick Nuclear Plant from the outcome  
8 of the nuclear waste study and new rules, as I believe  
9 is currently planned. And based on our investigation of  
10 Limerick's deteriorating and structurally deficient  
11 fuel pools and questionable casks with numerous design  
12 flaws and unanswered viability questions, it's  
13 imperative that you take a site-specific look and address  
14 a lot of the questions that we've previously put on the  
15 record and will continue to place on record. There is  
16 no safe solution to the problem of high-level radioactive  
17 waste, and we need to have a site-specific nuclear waste  
18 study done on Limerick before any decision is made.

19 So that would conclude my comments for  
20 today, and we will be following up with a written  
21 submission. And I thank you for the opportunity.

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,  
23 Dr. Cuthbert. Let's go to Diane Messer.

24 MS. MESSER: Yes, do I need to press a  
25 button? Hello?

**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 FACILITATOR CAMERON: I think you've  
2 already done that because we hear you.

3 MS. MESSER: Oh, I'm so sorry. I  
4 apologize. I'm not familiar with the method.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Don't worry.

6 MS. MESSER: My name is Diane Messer. I  
7 reside in Maine. I'm speaking as a private citizen and  
8 also as a supporter of the organization Coalition Against  
9 Nukes.

10 We have been very fortunate in Maine to have  
11 shut down Maine Yankee. Back in 2005, the government  
12 committed to an agreement to remove the nuclear waste.  
13 None of it has been removed, no attempt has been made,  
14 no efforts.

15 I would like to rely a lot on the fine  
16 testimony of the scientist that spoke just before me, Dr.  
17 Cuthbert. I'm not a scientist. I'm not going to try and  
18 speak technically. I see the dangers. I've studied in  
19 an academic way. I've become familiar with projects,  
20 the failed project of Yucca Mountain. Nobody wants it.  
21 It's dangerous. There is no safe method to contain the  
22 waste, and we have created a monster for ourselves.

23 We had the dream in the late 50s into the  
24 60s of building this very inexpensive infrastructure,  
25 nuclear power, the choice of the future. But it has cost

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 us a tremendous amount both in money and lives and safety  
2 and security, and I am very much against going further  
3 with any nuclear plants that are either planned or on the  
4 drawing board and in the beginning of construction now.

5 And also we have to put all of our time and  
6 energy and greatest minds to dealing with the waste that  
7 we have now because we have no adequate safe method to  
8 deal with it. Thank you very much for your time.

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Thank  
10 you, Diane. And let's go to, Jose, we're going to go to  
11 Sara Barczak next and Nikohl Vandel and David  
12 Schonberger. So could we have Sara Barczak on the line,  
13 please?

14 MS. BARCZAK: Okay. Thank you. Good  
15 afternoon and thank you for holding today's  
16 teleconference. Thank you to Chip Cameron, too, for  
17 facilitating.

18 My name is Sara Barczak, and I am the  
19 High-Risk Energy Choices Program Director with the  
20 Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, also known as SACE.  
21 We are a regional non-profit organization with members  
22 across the southeastern U.S. and are concerned about the  
23 impacts energy choices have on our health, economy, and  
24 environment. I participated previously and provided  
25 brief comments at the October 1st, 2013 webcast 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 teleconference, and then my SACE colleague, Mandy  
2 Hancock, participated in the public meeting in Orlando,  
3 Florida on November 6th.

4 I would like to reiterate our  
5 disappointment that a public meeting was not held in  
6 Atlanta, Georgia. A meeting in Atlanta was requested by  
7 U.S. Representative Hank Johnson and was supported by  
8 several organizations, including SACE. Despite Atlanta  
9 having 11 nuclear reactors within 170 miles, compared to  
10 the five reactors within 250 miles of Orlando, the NRC  
11 denied the request, citing, in part, a lack of resources.  
12 Yet, Atlanta is NRC's Region II Headquarters.

13 Atlanta is also a major metro area and  
14 serves as a hub for airline and bus transportation for  
15 multiple surrounding states, which would have made it far  
16 more accessible and affordable than Orlando to  
17 organizations and residents from many reactor  
18 communities. People in Atlanta were forced to travel  
19 nearly 6 hours to attend the Charlotte, North Carolina  
20 hearing.

21 And for NRC staff that attending the Orlando  
22 meeting, you are well aware that the participation was  
23 very low in Orlando in comparison to the other public  
24 meeting locations. Just a couple dozen of people  
25 attended.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Members of the public living in the TVA  
2 region, among other utility service territories, were  
3 offered, essentially, no reasonable opportunity to  
4 attend an in-person meeting. The NRC should have held  
5 more meetings in more locations across the country.

6 In addition to the comments we provided the  
7 NRC previously, we have serious concerns about the impact  
8 climate change may have on the long-term storage and  
9 management of spent nuclear fuel. The effects of  
10 climate change and subsequent expected increases in  
11 storm surges and catastrophic weather events puts  
12 reactors that are along the country's coastline and even  
13 low-lying inland locations at great risk.

14 For instance, given Florida Power and  
15 Light's Turkey Point location near Miami next to the  
16 Everglades and Biscayne Bay, storm surges are real  
17 threats that must be considered. We do not believe that  
18 the NRC and its licensees can ensure that spent nuclear  
19 fuel can safely sit at Turkey Point for even 100 years,  
20 let alone indefinitely. This is true of other reactor  
21 locations across the country, as well.

22 The NRC must reevaluate the impact of  
23 climate change, as Section 4.18, Environmental Impact of  
24 Postulated Accidents, appears to be woefully inadequate.  
25 We do not agree with the NRC's conclusions made regarding

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 climate change, specifically for design basis events and  
2 spent fuel pools on page 4-75 and dry casks on page 4-78  
3 and severe accidents in spent fuel pools on page 4-81 and  
4 severe accidents with dry cask systems on page 4-83 and  
5 believes this analysis needs to be more robustly  
6 conducted.

7 We would like to make the NRC aware that,  
8 since the comment period began, a new sophisticated tool  
9 has been released, Surging Seas, a sea level rise  
10 analysis by Climate Central which can be found at  
11 [sealevel.climatecentral.org](http://sealevel.climatecentral.org). From that page, you'll  
12 start from sea level rise and storm surge to the more than  
13 3,000 coastal towns, cities, counties, and states in the  
14 lower 48. Three states in particular, New Jersey, New  
15 York, and Florida now have expanded next generation maps  
16 and analysis available in the Surging Seas risk finder  
17 with more states to follow.

18 Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, thank you.  
20 Thank you, Sara. Nikohl Vandel?

21 MS. VANDEL: All right. Can you hear me?

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes.

23 MS. VANDEL: Right on. Nikki. I'm from  
24 the Palm Springs area right now in Yucca Valley. And I  
25 want to thank the doctor. He really brought in one side

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 of the argument quite well. And I guess I completely --  
2 two things. The transport thing, completely agree with  
3 that. Do not transport nuclear waste until we have a  
4 team that can provide immediate response. What I don't  
5 understand in this whole Fukushima lessons learned thing  
6 is why we don't have a global emergency response team.  
7 Why has Fukushima gotten this far? What's going to  
8 happen when those nuclearized waters meet the  
9 nuclearized waters of the North Sea and what is that  
10 chemical reaction going to be are questions that come to  
11 my mind.

12 On issue number three that we're working on  
13 in this particular focus, according to the documents  
14 anyway, related to the streamlining, I think footnotes  
15 with links so that both are connected in truth. Yes, I  
16 do believe that we need to make this dialogue very  
17 understandable to a first grader because waste  
18 confidence, and this gets to issue four, should not be  
19 the title because, as we all know, all we have right now  
20 is shoulds, coulds. We don't have confidence. And if  
21 we go forward with this rule, with this illusion, lie,  
22 deviance from our reality, one, our NRC is going to look  
23 like a joke in the history book. And we don't need that.  
24 We don't want that. We want to be smart, and we want to  
25 look smart, so let's be smart.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           And PG&E, at the San Luis Obispo hearing,  
2           who couldn't get excited when she was talking about the  
3           recycling of our nuclear waste. As powerful as it is,  
4           of course it's going to create more energy in a different  
5           form. Let's get on it. We can't transport it. Let's  
6           do it where it is, but we've got to do it right. We have  
7           to have citizen oversight for the area. We have to have  
8           the original people involved. They're the only ones  
9           that understand Mother Earth at the innate level, and  
10          that's how we need to be listening to. We can't mine  
11          anymore.

12                 I'll tweet the rest of my comments. I might  
13          put them on paper, but I am going to give you written  
14          comments on issues one and two, maybe some more thoughts  
15          on three and four. But you guys are doing a great job.  
16          Do I have confidence in the NRC? Yes, I do if you guys  
17          make some serious hardcore decisions, put into place  
18          something that we can be confident in, that we've got a  
19          team that can go in in the situation like Fukushima and  
20          they're just handling it. We don't have that, not in the  
21          industry, which I don't understand just on that level.

22                 Anyway, thank you.

23                 FACILITATOR CAMERON:        Thanks, Nikki.  
24          David Schonberger?

25                 MR. SCHONBERGER:    Yes, thank you. Am I on?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes.

2 MR. SCHONBERGER: Thank you. Hello,  
3 everyone. My name is David Schonberger, D-A-V-I-D,  
4 S-C-H-O-N-B-E-R-G-E-R. And I am a resident of Ann  
5 Arbor, Michigan, home of the University of Michigan  
6 Department of Nuclear Energy, which desperately needs a  
7 fundamental shift in consciousness and an existential  
8 redefinition of purpose and mission, as does the NRC.

9 Thank you for this brief opportunity to  
10 speak on the record today. I intend to submit detailed,  
11 extensive written comments to the NRC prior to the  
12 December 20th deadline, and I sincerely hope that the NRC  
13 staff will thoughtfully consider my perspective. The  
14 oral comments which I am providing during today's public  
15 forum are a quick summary curtailed by the time  
16 constraints of this forum. These comments are a  
17 supplement to those which I submitted orally in person  
18 on December 2nd, 2013 at the NRC public meeting in  
19 Perrysburg, Ohio.

20 All of my comments are my own and not  
21 endorsed by any other individual or organization. I am  
22 representing myself and my own point of view as a  
23 concerned individual citizen and am not representing any  
24 particular group or organization with which I may be  
25 affiliated. My comments during this NRC telephone

**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 conference call, December 9th, 2013, pertain  
2 specifically to the U.S. NRC Waste Confidence DGEIS and  
3 Proposed Waste Confidence Rule 10 CFR 51.23.

4 First of all, I do not support the Proposed  
5 NRC Rule that is the subject of this teleconference, and  
6 I emphatically dispute both the premises and the  
7 conclusions of the Waste Confidence DGEIS, which are  
8 codified in the Rule and form the regulatory basis for  
9 promulgating it. I also have serious doubts and  
10 concerns about the integrity and independence of the  
11 NRC's administrative rulemaking process.

12 Perhaps the most insidious and alarming  
13 aspect of the Proposed Rule is its generic structure. If  
14 Michigan is any indication of emerging trends, citizens  
15 should be forewarned to expect generic rules and criteria  
16 coming to a state near you.

17 One unequivocal conclusion from my review  
18 of the NRC's analysis is that the financial cost of  
19 indefinite continued storage of spent nuclear fuel is  
20 unpredictable and unknowable and potentially  
21 astronomical. That is a category of confidence that is  
22 even worse than uncertain and open-ended, thus making the  
23 long-term business model of the nuclear industry  
24 unsustainable and absurd.

25 Therefore, I personally give the NRC 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 no-confidence vote, and I propose instead, in order to  
2 avoid further costly legal action in Federal court, the  
3 NRC should make the current licensing moratorium  
4 permanent or at least indefinitely extended until such  
5 time as a mined geologic repository becomes available.  
6 Anything less would be appallingly irresponsible.

7 Thank you for your attention today.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,  
9 David. And we're going to go to Greg Wilson and then  
10 David Martin and Rod McCullum next. And Greg?

11 MR. WILSON: Good afternoon. My name is  
12 Greg Wilson, G-R-E-G, W-I-L-S-O-N. And I live in  
13 Dunedin, Florida in the Tampa Bay area. I would like to  
14 address the situation that's going on here with the  
15 nuclear power plants and the stored spent fuel rods.

16 The trouble with the east coast of Florida  
17 is there is an island in the Canary Islands that has a  
18 volcano on it called Cumbre Vieja, I believe is how it's  
19 spelled in the Isle of La Palma that has, the western side  
20 of the island is starting to slide off, a ten-mile long  
21 piece of land of volcanic rock. And I was watching a  
22 science show talking about the Hawaiian islands and why  
23 some are round and some are elongated. Apparently, as  
24 the magma comes up, it has iron in it which rusts out,  
25 which allows the island to basically rust out and fall

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 apart, like an onion being peeled apart.

2 The Isle of La Palma could have that  
3 ten-mile long piece of island fall off and create a  
4 tsunami, which they claim that will be about a thousand  
5 feet tall moving at a thousand miles an hour. This will  
6 affect the entire Atlantic Basin, so everything from the  
7 bottom part of the western side of Africa to all the way  
8 up to England and including South America and North  
9 America will be hit by a monster tsunami.

10 As it relates to the U.S. East Coast, we  
11 would be hit in about 5 hours by a tsunami about 600 feet  
12 tall moving at about 600 miles an hour. In Florida,  
13 there is no place to bury the nuclear waste or even secure  
14 it that it would withstand the force of that magnitude  
15 by a monster wave.

16 And, therefore, the spent fuel at Turkey  
17 Point and at St. Lucie needs to be moved to high grounds  
18 either in Florida or somewhere in southern Georgia, some  
19 place that's above and out of the reach of this tsunami.  
20 It would probably be around Wildwood to Ocala or  
21 Gainesville area, which is at the top of the Florida  
22 Turnpike, which is a fairly safe road. It should be  
23 shipped on the toll road because if you ship it on I-95  
24 there's a chance, greater chances of accidents or wrecks  
25 or whatever. I used to drive semis, and the last company

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 I worked for, they said to take all toll roads as often  
2 as possible because they do have fewer wrecks on them.  
3 But to leave the spent fuel rods down in South Florida  
4 would be insane because, if it does ever get hit by a  
5 tsunami from La Palma or even an asteroid strike out in  
6 the Atlantic Ocean and the fuel rods get basically shot  
7 out across the Everglades, there is no way to go pick them  
8 up. Nobody has any type of equipment that could actually  
9 reclaim those fuel rods, and you'd have a massive  
10 environmental disaster on your hands.

11 As far as Crystal River goes, that's on the  
12 Gulf side and who knows what's going to go on out there,  
13 especially with every drilling company in the world  
14 wanting to drill in the Gulf of Mexico. When the Deep  
15 Horizon sank during the BP Oil spill, it caused  
16 earthquakes as far away as in the New Madrid fault line  
17 zone up around Memphis, Tennessee. So we cannot predict  
18 what's going to happen in the Gulf Coast either, and to  
19 leave any waste close to the coastline, basically any  
20 coastline in the country, is not doable. Short-term to  
21 long-term storage units should be set up to where all the  
22 waste is moved away from the coastline to the closest safe  
23 location, such as on the West Coast where the San Onofre  
24 and the El Diablo sites, nuclear power plants, they  
25 should be moved up away from the San Andreas fault line

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 and into elevated hills or mountains in the area, which  
2 would probably be over a thousand feet in elevation from  
3 the Pacific Ocean.

4 The tsunamis that are kicked up by the  
5 Hawaiian earthquakes or tsunamis where the islands are  
6 falling apart as seen from space. One of them actually  
7 did flood the LA Basin, and I haven't seen any further  
8 studies on that so I don't know how bad it flooded it,  
9 but it was a pretty big tsunami that hit.

10 So that being said, even though  
11 transportation is very dangerous, to leave the spent fuel  
12 in areas where it could be basically destroyed or, you  
13 know, scattered about by things that we really don't know  
14 that much about at this time.

15 There was an air blast asteroid that  
16 exploded over Russia that was caught on dashboard cams,  
17 and they say that one was about the size of two school  
18 buses or so. It wasn't very big, but it blew out every  
19 window in the entire city and there was over a thousand  
20 people injured from flying glass. If you ever seen it  
21 on the dashboard cam videos from that explosion, it was  
22 quite amazing to see the amount of damage that happened,  
23 and that was a small one.

24 In the early 1900s, there was the Tunguska  
25 event that it took them about 30 years to figure out 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 something had happened up there. And it was in Siberia,  
2 and it knocked down almost 900 miles, square miles of  
3 trees. So it was a major event, larger than the  
4 Hiroshima blast from World War II.

5 And we should really take a look at what  
6 we're doing with the spent fuel as to what could actually  
7 happen. It should be moved away from earthquake and  
8 fault line zones. And we also have the super volcano in  
9 Yellowstone Park, which, from what I've seen on the  
10 science movies, would basically cover the Yucca Mountain  
11 repository with volcanic ash and rock probably around  
12 2,000 degrees. So that storage place would not be  
13 suitable if Yellowstone was to blow up, and that's 60,000  
14 years past due from blowing up. I just wanted to put that  
15 in there.

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Greg, thank  
17 you for all that information.

18 MR. WILSON: Okay. I just hope it helps.  
19 I'm not for nuclear energy. I hope that they all get shut  
20 down until we figure out what to do with them. There are  
21 hopes of being able to reprocess that fuel at some point.

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

23 MR. WILSON: And it should be stored where  
24 it could be opened up and reprocessed at some point.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. WILSON: Okay. Thank you very much.

2 FACILITATOR CAMERON: You're welcome.

3 David Martin?

4 MR. MARTIN: Hello. This is David Martin.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: We hear you.

6 MR. MARTIN: Okay. I'm David S. Martin of  
7 Martin Industries. I've been covering the conference,  
8 the October 5th first and November 14th in Rockville.  
9 Listening to the comments of people, I've not heard of  
10 any studies of making the waste inert, or making it inert.  
11 That should be looked into.

12 I have little to no confidence in the NRC  
13 in long-term storage. It's not really been looked into  
14 good. And that's the end of my comment.

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thanks,  
16 David. We're going to go to Rod McCullum.

17 MR. MCCULLUM: Hello, Chip. Can you hear  
18 me?

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes, Rod, we can hear  
20 you.

21 MR. MCCULLUM: Okay. Thank you. It's  
22 magic how you don't have to push a button. I want to  
23 thank the NRC for having provided these forums, the 13  
24 public meetings and this call. NEI has had the honor to  
25 be able to speak at many of these, and we certainly will

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 be filing a comprehensive formal comment on or about the  
2 deadline of December 20th.

3 What I want to do today is specifically  
4 address one thing that was said in the November 19th  
5 meeting in Rockville. In that meeting, I was quoted by  
6 a Mr. Mark Lacy, and I wanted to address the issue he  
7 raised. First of all, I want to thank him for being  
8 factual and accurate to a point. He accurately quoted  
9 me, and he did cite two documents, and those documents  
10 were ML021230367 and ML132568086. What he quoted me  
11 saying, which is true, is that I or, in my case, when I  
12 was saying this in a previous public meeting that  
13 preceded the waste confidence meeting in September, we  
14 understand in the industry that we can no longer rely on  
15 boraflex. This is absolutely a true statement. I said  
16 that in the context of explaining what industry was doing  
17 to replace boraflex, which is a neutron absorber, with  
18 more reliable neutron absorbers that will have more  
19 longer-term utility.

20 Mr. Lacy then went on to say that there was  
21 a documented history of degradation of boraflex at the  
22 Indian Point reactor. That's where he cited the two  
23 documents. And he then raised that documented history  
24 of boraflex degradation as a concern for the safety of  
25 that pool. And that's where I do disagree with Mr. Lacy.

**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 two documents he cited are, to me, in  
2 fact, evidence of quite the contrary point. If there was  
3 not a documented history of boraflex degradation in that  
4 pool, then the situation would be that boraflex was  
5 degrading and we were either not doing anything about it  
6 or not aware of it.

7           The two documents he cites, one a 2001 or  
8 2002 license application, license amendment application  
9 which basically removes a lot of credit for the boraflex  
10 and puts in place some compensatory measures, and then  
11 a 2013 meeting submittal where Indian Point proactively  
12 came to NRC and said, okay, here's what we're doing, we're  
13 further tracking the boraflex degradation, and here's  
14 our plan to replace it with new neutron absorbers.

15           In all cases, the licensee, Indian Point,  
16 was within the parameters of their safety analysis. The  
17 plant is safe, and a criticality has been and will be  
18 prevented.

19           The NRC, a couple of times in the Draft  
20 Environmental Impact Statement or Generic Environmental  
21 Impact Statement has cited examples of how issues are  
22 dealt with as being reasons we can have confidence in the  
23 regulatory process working, being high burn-up fuel and  
24 chloride-induced stress corrosion cracking. Since Mr.  
25 Lacy raised it, I'd want to suggest this should be another

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 example. Indeed, we did discover over our experience  
2 with boraflex that it degrades, and that has driven the  
3 market to develop better neutron absorbers. Those are  
4 being deployed throughout industry. And the documented  
5 history that Mr. Lacy cites at Indian Point is but one  
6 example of how we're doing that and how we're assuring  
7 safety while we're doing that.

8 In other words, it is another example of how  
9 the regulatory process assures safety as we go forward  
10 into longer periods of time. And I believe it should be  
11 cited as such. I think nobody is contending here that  
12 whatever pools or casks we design will last forever, we  
13 do think that the assumption that casks need to be  
14 repackaged every hundred years is conservative.

15 But whatever we do, whether it's  
16 repackaging or repairing or replacing materials, as long  
17 as these things are under NRC license, as long as these  
18 things are managed by responsible companies that are held  
19 accountable to their shareholders and the citizens  
20 around them, as well as the regulators, examples of how  
21 we will take the steps to do the things we need to do to  
22 manage the inevitable time-dependent degradation  
23 mechanisms, and boraflex is probably one of the most  
24 extreme examples, those things will continue.

25 So I guess what I've learned from having

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 listened to Mr. Lacy's comment, and I thank him for taking  
2 the trouble to listen to what I said earlier, is that,  
3 indeed, this is something that should be more strongly  
4 emphasized in the Generic Environmental Impact  
5 Statement, the extent to which the processes that we have  
6 in place can address the effects of time.

7 So for now, that's all I have to say. And,  
8 again, I thank the NRC for providing these opportunities.

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thanks, Rod. And I  
10 would just remind everybody who wants to speak to hit star  
11 one if they want to get in the queue to comment. And this  
12 is a little curious from our information that we have  
13 here. It looks like we have someone named Kevin Champs,  
14 and we know Kevin Kamps from Beyond Nuclear very well.  
15 And I don't know whether we just have a mistake here and  
16 it's Kevin Kamps on the phone or whether we do actually  
17 have someone named Kevin Champs. So whoever that is,  
18 could you please join us?

19 MR. KAMPS: Sure. Can you hear me?

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes.

21 MR. KAMPS: Yes, this is Kevin Kamps,  
22 K-A-M-P-S, with Beyond Nuclear.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Hi, Kevin.

24 MR. KAMPS: Thank you. Hi, Chip. Well,  
25 since I've spoken at several of these before, I'll try

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to keep it brief to give others time. But one area I did  
2 want to focus on today, and it kind of picks up right where  
3 Rod McCullum from NEI just left off, was this notion of  
4 contents, I guess. Rod spoke about replacing the dry  
5 cask storage infrastructure once every hundred years,  
6 and he called that a conservative thing to do because I  
7 guess he thinks that the dry casks and supporting  
8 infrastructure are going to last longer than that in most  
9 likelihood.

10 But I'd have to challenge that at its face.  
11 I mean, there have been problems with the dry cask storage  
12 at Surry, for example. There have been leaks of the  
13 inert gas through seals. Supposedly, it has not  
14 completely leaked out, which would introduce air and  
15 oxygen into the dry casks and, combined with the heat,  
16 could corrode the dry casks prematurely.

17 So I think something that a commenter or a  
18 concerned citizen in Chicago at the Oak Park, Illinois  
19 hearing said was right on, which is a false confidence  
20 when it comes to technology is a technological arrogance.  
21 And I think assuming that our societal institutions will  
22 be intact and able to replace these dry casks once per  
23 century, even if it's less often than that, it's a huge  
24 assumption and I think it borders on the absurd to assume  
25 that even our current culture and society will be able

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 to do this indefinitely into the future when, in fact,  
2 Keith McConnell, the director of the Nuclear Waste  
3 Confidence Directorate, did confirm several weeks ago  
4 that there is no cutoff point on this confidence and this  
5 assumption that the dry cask storage infrastructure will  
6 be replaced once per century forever, literally forever.  
7 So that right away is absurd. That cannot be assumed.

8           And just to conclude this, I want to point  
9 out that some of the oldest known human institutions,  
10 things like the Catholic Church, about 2,000 years old,  
11 Buddhism perhaps 2,500 years old, perhaps some  
12 indigenous people or cultures could be looked to that  
13 extend even further back in time. But any of those  
14 examples are small by way of comparison with the  
15 radiological toxicity of the material this industry  
16 generates in order to make its profits.

17           So I think that those assumptions have to  
18 be corrected in the final Generic Environmental Impact  
19 Statement. A strong dose of reality needs to be  
20 introduced. And the courts did order the Nuclear  
21 Regulatory Commission to look at the list of storage,  
22 well, certainly onsite in dry casks and pools, but also  
23 NRC has a whole chapter of away-from-reactor storage, and  
24 so there, too. The risks of these containers failing or  
25 lack of institutional control, abandonment of these

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 facilities and their eventual simple corrosion and  
2 erosion with the elements and releasing their contents  
3 into the living environment, that is the risk that we  
4 face. The NRC has not analyzed it in any meaningful way  
5 in this document and needs to do so.

6 And two quick thoughts that I want to bring  
7 up, too. A couple of concerned citizens on this call  
8 have spoken about reprocessing as a possible  
9 alternative. I think one of them called it recycling.  
10 And I would urge them and every one on this call to look  
11 more deeply into this issue. Reprocessing is probably  
12 the worst single thing you can do with high-level  
13 radioactive waste that already exists. It's a nuclear  
14 weapons proliferation risk. It's astronomically  
15 expensive. It causes an environmental disaster  
16 wherever it's carried out. La Hague in France is one  
17 example.

18 And the final thought I'd like to share has  
19 to do with hardened onsite storage, which is an  
20 environmental coalition consensus opinion,  
21 environmental groups numbering in the hundreds  
22 representing every single state in the U.S. has called  
23 for hardened onsite storage for over a decade. This  
24 would be a good step in the right direction in terms of  
25 keeping high-level radioactive waste out of 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 environment and getting it out of the vulnerable pools  
2 and putting it into a dry cask storage system that will  
3 last not decades but centuries into the future and itself  
4 will need to be replaced.

5 And to follow on another earlier commenter,  
6 I think he was right in saying that these vulnerable  
7 storage facilities along the coastline, for example,  
8 need to be moved to higher ground, to more stable geology.  
9 And, in fact, that's been part and parcel of hardened  
10 onsite storage from the very start, a recognition that  
11 some of these nuclear power plant sites are entirely  
12 inappropriate and unsuitable for long-term storage.  
13 Prairie Island, Minnesota is another key example of that,  
14 a flood plain in the Mississippi River immediately  
15 adjacent to a Native American reservation. The reactors  
16 never should have been built there in the first place  
17 against the will and consent of the Tribe. And, of  
18 course, the storage for high-level waste should not be  
19 there either.

20 Thank you very much.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you  
22 once again, Kevin, for your comments. We're going to go  
23 to Brian Paddock and then Gretel Johnston. Brian?

24 MR. PADDOCK: This is Brian Paddock.  
25 Sorry. I had to find my own mute button. I'm from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Tennessee. I have followed the nuclear power production  
2 activities and the problems at the TVA reactors for  
3 several years. I own a housing unit on the river in  
4 Chattanooga on the north shore not far from the Sequoyah  
5 twin reactors, so I have a very real and personal interest  
6 in this.

7 Right now, Sequoyah is targeted by TVA for  
8 putting some irradiated fuel into dry cask storage, and  
9 they have appropriated somewhere under \$500 million for  
10 this activity to go to the lowest bidder, a bidder for  
11 these cask construction that actually, until a few months  
12 before the award of the TVA contract, had been debarred  
13 from Federal contracting for prior fraudulent  
14 activities.

15 But the difficulty with this waste storage  
16 and the thought of permanent aboveground storage at  
17 reactor sites like Sequoyah is very troubling, and the  
18 Sequoyah re-licensing, which is pending, of course, is  
19 now suspended in terms of the possible issuance because  
20 of the process we're currently going through about  
21 whether we could have any confidence about the management  
22 and isolation from the environment of high-level  
23 radioactive waste resulting from the continued operation  
24 of the reactors.

25 One of the difficulties with the proposal

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 is that the regulation would essentially say that this  
2 is good enough to give us confidence for every reactor  
3 at every site, and it will no longer be an issue with  
4 respect to re-licensing of these reactors. That, I  
5 think, that's an unjustifiable step.

6 The Sequoyah site is still under  
7 investigation, and TVA is under directions from the NRC  
8 to be investigating both the seismic stability and the  
9 potential for destruction by flooding of the Sequoyah  
10 site. And for anyone to adopt a document that says,  
11 without even completion of those, we know that surface  
12 storage indefinitely, for hundreds of years perhaps,  
13 past the lifetime of the operation of the reactors is  
14 simply unsustainable and unjustifiable and contrary to  
15 all common sense.

16 There's also the problem that the reactor  
17 operations by TVA are troubled elsewhere. For example,  
18 Browns Ferry 1 is the only red-tag reactor in the entire  
19 United States. And TVA has a severe question as to its  
20 financial stability. TVA has sold less energy year  
21 after year since 2008, and it is now completely  
22 abandoning, almost completely abandoning all plans to  
23 either engage in generation of renewable energy or to  
24 undertake further energy efficiency, even after it's  
25 closed down part of its coal fleet, which it's in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 process of doing.

2 In this situation, with declining annual  
3 revenues and annual deficits, it is hard to make a serious  
4 decision on a generic basis, and I think the NRC cannot  
5 do so. That, in fact, reactor operators will have the  
6 financial stability not only to finance cask storage but  
7 to refinance it and re-do it every hundred years or  
8 whatever interval seems to be necessary.

9 The TVA has not been around for a hundred  
10 years and, quite frankly, there's a pretty good question  
11 about whether the Tennessee Valley Authority will look  
12 anything like it does or even exist a hundred years from  
13 now. So that assumption that this human institution,  
14 subject as it is to both economic and political  
15 frailties, is going to be here to protect the public from  
16 cask storage waste is pretty unrealistic.

17 We have other problems that are not really  
18 adequately addressed in anything that's going to talk  
19 about waste confidence, one of which is the aboveground  
20 wet storage at places like Browns Ferry where the  
21 reactors are the Fukushima-style reactors and have these  
22 wet storage pools at higher, much higher than design  
23 density stored up in the air and were only recently, by  
24 the grace of God, saved from a direct hit by a tornado  
25 which did, in fact, cause a station blackout for several

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 days as the high-tension system went down.

2 So this idea that we should ignore the issue  
3 of this high-density wet storage that exists and what  
4 it's going to take to reduce the dangers from that alone,  
5 let alone deal with the permanent and ongoing problems  
6 of the continued generation of additional waste.

7 There's a severe problem with the way the  
8 analysis so far has been done on aboveground leak  
9 detection, as there are a number of recorded incidences  
10 in which existing wet pool leakages have not been  
11 detected for many years and whether significant volumes  
12 of radioactive waste have been released. And the  
13 assumption that decommissioned reactors and reactors  
14 that may actually have been disassembled and removed and,  
15 yet, the cask storage will be subject to adequate  
16 monitoring, inspection, enforcement, and leak detection  
17 is contrary to the experience and to the existing  
18 regulation concerning what remains at a deactivated  
19 site.

20 Finally, I would say a couple of other  
21 things. I think the NRC is ignoring the most recent D.C.  
22 Circuit decision which told the NRC to go to Congress and  
23 ask permission to stop collecting the radioactive waste  
24 fee because there seems to be no plan at hand for ever  
25 finding permanent geologic storage, which is what 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 rationale for that fee and statute was.

2 And, additionally, I would add, and, again,  
3 you can look at TVA's records at the NRC, security is very  
4 bad at these sites. We have, of course we're a nuclear  
5 area in Tennessee and we've had cases where little old  
6 ladies in tennis shoes literally have cut their way  
7 through fences and gotten into high-security areas  
8 because the security has been so bad at ORNL. Well, this  
9 is also true at TVA. TVA has tried contract security,  
10 and it's tried staff-based security, and neither one has  
11 worked consistently. Every 18 or 24 months they find  
12 that their security system is broken, and people are  
13 using drugs, people are letting their friends in to look  
14 around, and so on. So the idea that you can keep  
15 aboveground storage secure has not proven out, in fact,  
16 here in the Tennessee Valley.

17 Finally, I would say that, on  
18 transportation, if you listen to the news reports every  
19 morning, you will find that there are 18-wheeler truck  
20 accidents occurring at rush hour, morning and evening,  
21 in virtually every major city since we have Interstate  
22 75, Interstate 40, Interstate 65, and Interstate 24.  
23 And every few days, there is some kind of a collision or  
24 one of these 18-wheelers goes off a curve or goes off an  
25 on- or off-ramp. And the idea that you can transport

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 huge volumes of nuclear waste over years without having  
2 deadly accidents and accidents for which our emergency  
3 management and hazardous waste managers are not  
4 prepared.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

6 MR. PADDOCK: Thank you.

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much.  
8 Thanks, Brian. We're going to go to Gretel Johnston,  
9 then Steven Sondheim, then Priscilla Star. And, Gretel,  
10 are you with us?

11 MS. JOHNSTON: Yes. Can you hear me?

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes.

13 MS. JOHNSTON: Yes, hello. Yes. I  
14 represent BEST/MATRR at [matrr.org](http://matrr.org), M-A-T-R-R. We  
15 recently published a study called "Radioactive Emissions  
16 and Health Hazards Surrounding Browns Ferry Nuclear  
17 Power Plant," which shared our own radiation monitoring  
18 results at 50 sites we established around Browns Ferry.  
19 And it showed basically background radiation upwind but  
20 readings up to 40 times background downwind.

21 The epidemiological data in that study  
22 found alarming rises in mortality rates downwind of  
23 Browns Ferry to over 20 percent above the average U.S.  
24 community. Over 300 million curies of radiation is  
25 stored at Browns Ferry, and, at last reporting, over 85

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 percent of that is stored in raised fuel pooling pools  
2 of the same design as Fukushima.

3 BFN, Browns Ferry, is infamous for multiple  
4 fire events, a major vulnerability for any plant. But  
5 Browns Ferry still has not fulfilled the fire  
6 requirements its 1975 fire initiated. We are also now  
7 recognizing the extreme tornado dangers to these  
8 vulnerable raised cooling pools that are covered  
9 overhead only by metal roofing, such as we saw blown off  
10 in the Fukushima explosion.

11 In April of 2011, one of the strongest  
12 tornados known to man twisted a row of power towers about  
13 500 meters from the Browns Ferry fuel pools. Both Browns  
14 Ferry and Sequoyah are in tornado corridors and have seen  
15 multiple invasions of severe weather.

16 One thing Fukushima showed us is that  
17 hardened onsite storage can withstand extreme weather  
18 since the storage casks were not damaged by the tsunami,  
19 whereas the cooling pools were severely damaged and are  
20 still a major hazard.

21 We want to once again request that the  
22 Nuclear Regulatory Commission require a specific  
23 accountable schedule for moving fuel rods from the  
24 cooling pools into safe hardened onsite storage at Browns  
25 Ferry Nuclear Power Plant and other Mark I and Mark II

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 reactors. And we request that further studies be done  
2 at Browns Ferry on the radiation emissions which appear  
3 to be illustrating a bathtub effect as Browns Ferry  
4 approaches 40 years of age.

5 Thank you for listening and for  
6 investigating these important radiation dangers.

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you very much,  
8 Gretel. We're going to go to Steve Sondheim and then  
9 Priscilla Star. Steven?

10 MR. SONDHEIM: Can you hear me?

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes.

12 MR. SONDHEIM: Okay. Thank you. My name  
13 is Steven Sondheim. I also live in Tennessee, in  
14 Memphis, and I'm part of a Sierra Club Nuclear Free team.

15 I want to reiterate some things about this  
16 high burn-up fuel problem. It's come to my attention  
17 lately that an analysis of the high burn-up fuel and its  
18 impacts were not a part of the EIS. And I want to ask  
19 were they, and I want to request, if they weren't, that  
20 there be an analysis based on that.

21 And what I've learned is that they must stay  
22 in the pools much longer, up to five years. I've also  
23 learned that they put in cask storage. They have to come  
24 out, and I've seen estimates as quickly as 20 years. And  
25 I've also learned that there was a ruling that they are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 not transportable. In other words, waste from high  
2 burn-up fuel is currently disallowed in terms of  
3 transport. And so this, in my mind, shakes up the entire  
4 EIS if it did not take those factors into account, and  
5 so I ask that be taken into account.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

7 MR. SONDEHEIM: I want to reiterate a couple  
8 of things. There have been a number of parties that have  
9 asked for an extension for the comments deadline and, to  
10 my knowledge, nobody has received an answer to that.  
11 There was a statement made that there would be comments  
12 allowed 30 days after the last meeting, at the very least.  
13 Well, the last meeting was December 4th, and then there's  
14 this meeting. So I ask that there be a decision and that  
15 we be informed about that.

16 One second. I'm looking at my notes here.  
17 Well, I want to reiterate that a Generic EIS is just not  
18 wise or prudent. There are entirely too many  
19 idiosyncrasies of situations like some of the past people  
20 I've mentioned.

21 And I've said this before, but the industry  
22 promised us to provide solutions in the future if we put  
23 our trust in them, and I think that's great that they're  
24 looking for solutions. But there can be no confidence  
25 until we have a solution and not only a proposed solution

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 but an identified and tested solution. On that basis  
2 alone, there could be no waste confidence.

3 I think the work that needs to be done is  
4 to figure out what can be done with our current level of  
5 waste and to begin to transition out of nuclear into  
6 replacement energy, which is beginning to happen. Okay.  
7 Thank you very much.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Steven.  
9 We have Priscilla Star next, and I want to remind people  
10 that if you do want to talk to hit star one on your phone.  
11 And let's go to Priscilla.

12 MS. STAR: Good afternoon. This is  
13 Priscilla Star. Can you hear me?

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes.

15 MS. STAR: Hi. I'm the executive director  
16 for Coalition Against Nukes. We had another speaker  
17 earlier, Diane Messer. I want to say thank you to her  
18 for participating today.

19 Basically, I wanted to hit on three or four  
20 topics. The first one is an agreement with Steven  
21 Sondheim to extend the public commentary period for these  
22 hearings, that the GEIS is highly flawed and I believe  
23 that we should be having these public commentary, this  
24 public commentary period until the NRC has satisfied all  
25 that the public needs to have confidence in the NRC, 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 we clearly do not have, to proceed with what to do with  
2 storing high-level or low-level radioactive waste.

3 I feel as if it's being rushed through, and  
4 storing waste which is going into infinity is not  
5 something you just do lightly or discuss putting it into  
6 geological repositories which would encourage mobile  
7 Chernobyls in transporting waste on the roads and our  
8 highways. It puts everyone at risk. Every car  
9 traveling past an entourage of waste that's being moved  
10 is endangered, not to mention if there was an accident  
11 from anything that can happen on the road or a terrorist  
12 knowing that there was a route of this waste being  
13 transported. A terrorist knowing that puts the entire  
14 country at risk, so this is just sheer madness, the issue  
15 of putting it on the highway. I resent that. I believe  
16 most everyone on the call, save for a few that are  
17 anesthetized by nuclear propaganda, would agree.

18 Geological repositories for storing the  
19 waste, I don't believe we should be discussing this  
20 either because we know now that geology is not something  
21 that remains stable. It is unpredictable. Plate  
22 tectonics are constantly moving. We may be thinking or  
23 you guys may be thinking that you're storing waste into  
24 infinity, but things are occurring everyday underground  
25 that would make all people understand that putting it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 into a repository, no matter what state you think you  
2 could dump it in, is putting not just the state at risk  
3 but the entire country because there's nothing that we  
4 can predict anymore, as we're seeing with the super  
5 storms and climate changes and earthquakes happening  
6 everywhere. I mean, there's been no end in sight.

7 So I think that's the three points that I  
8 wanted to make, and I rest my case. Thank you. I'm done  
9 with my commentary for now.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.  
11 Thank you very much, Priscilla. And I should have said  
12 this earlier is that we're allowing people the  
13 flexibility in terms of how long they talk because we're  
14 not going to be going back to people for second comments  
15 today. So I just want you to know that. And, again, hit  
16 star one if you want to talk. And we have Ace Hoffman.  
17 Ace?

18 MR. HOFFMAN: Yes. Hi, Chip.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Hi.

20 MR. HOFFMAN: I guess you can hear me.  
21 Okay, good. I've been listening lately, up in Canada  
22 they're having hearings on a waste dump that's going to  
23 be maybe created just off of the Great Lakes, and these  
24 have been going on for, literally, months and they go on,  
25 you know, I don't attend them every day. They're on the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 internet. They go on for hours and hours, and the people  
2 that want to talk, like here we've been given the  
3 opportunity to talk for more than three minutes. I  
4 probably won't do that, but they're allowed to talk for  
5 as much as 30 minutes. And then after that there's  
6 rebuttal, and then there's rebuttal to answer the  
7 rebuttal. It can go on quite a bit. And then the  
8 commissioners ask questions, and everybody talks with  
9 everybody.

10 It's pretty different from what we're doing  
11 here, which is a couple of hours a week for a couple of  
12 months, and then it's over. After today, it's over. So  
13 I'd like to see more interaction between they and we. I  
14 think that would be a good thing.

15 And what's really funny, I guess, is that  
16 they're discussing a low-level waste dump, which means  
17 we're discussing something that's perhaps a million  
18 times more important than what they're discussing and,  
19 yet, they're putting more time into it than we are. And  
20 I think that's a shame.

21 And the next thing is that this is a generic,  
22 and it boggles the mind that any other state would be  
23 willing to let their requirements be the same as  
24 California's, which are bound to be much more strict  
25 because of our tsunami dangers and our earthquake

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 dangers. Maybe that's a good thing if it really is going  
2 to be bounded by the worst possible case, but I just have  
3 a lot of trouble believing that that's going to happen.  
4 I think California is going to get shorted, that the  
5 protection is not going to be as good as we need.

6 ALARA, lowest reasonably achievable does  
7 not refer to keeping costs down. If the nuclear industry  
8 cannot find a cost-effective way to resolve the waste  
9 problem, so be it. Then the nuclear industry is not cost  
10 effective, and I think that's an okay thing. I think  
11 that would be a good thing. They're not covering the  
12 cost of accidents or anything like that. These are  
13 barely being discussed here or in any other way, the  
14 problem of making the waste. We're only discussing,  
15 well, what to do now that we've got it.

16 We're part of an organization, the NRC and  
17 the public, that can determine that this whole idea is  
18 bad, and that's what we need to do. How much are we  
19 putting into these waste confidence hearings? A hundred  
20 thousand dollars, if that, to go around the country and  
21 have a couple of meetings? There could be a trillion  
22 dollar accident based on what we decide here, so we're  
23 not even spending a million of what it might cost if we  
24 fail to come to the correct decision here. So I think  
25 we need to consider 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 I think that's about it. We've already  
2 seen that nuclear accidents happen. Fukushima,  
3 Chernobyl, Hanford, Three Mile Island. Right now,  
4 today, the Marine Corps is testing bombing runs on Camp  
5 Pendleton, and we're talking about storing waste at San  
6 Onofre essentially permanently. And we've been in wars  
7 almost permanently, which means the Marines are going to  
8 be testing bombing runs on the same area where San Onofre  
9 is going to store its waste permanently. Permanently.  
10 And I think this is all wrong.

11 So thank you very much, and I'll turn it back  
12 over.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,  
14 Ace, and thank you for your other comments that you gave  
15 us and also for people we heard from today who also have  
16 given the NRC prior comments. And we are going to stay  
17 until the 4:00 adjournment time in case we get people  
18 calling in. If there's anybody on the phone that we  
19 haven't heard from, I would just remind you to hit star  
20 one. And if there are people that you know who might want  
21 to comment who are not on the line, you can tell them to  
22 give us a call and we'll be here until 4:00.

23 And, Jose, are you still there?

24 OPERATOR: This is Catherine standing by.

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Hi, Catherine.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We're waiting to see if anybody else wants to sign on.  
2 And if you put the music on that Jose had on while we're  
3 waiting, perhaps that's more pleasant for people who are  
4 on the phone who have already spoken, will you still, will  
5 we still get notification if someone wants to sign up to  
6 speak?

7 OPERATOR: Right. It will show on the  
8 screen.

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Well, if you  
10 could put some music on, and then we're going to wait and  
11 see if anybody comes on.

12 OPERATOR: Okay.

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you.

14 OPERATOR: You're welcome.

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay, Catherine. I  
16 guess we do have another speaker, and it's Erica Gray.  
17 And, Erica, are you on with us?

18 MS. GRAY: Hello?

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Sometimes there's a  
20 time lag. And, Catherine, do you have Erica Gray on the  
21 line?

22 MS. GRAY: Hello?

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Hi. Erica?

24 MS. GRAY: Yes. Can you hear me?

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes, we can.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. GRAY: I had a hard time getting through  
2 there. I'm not really sure why. I think I was in the  
3 listen mode only there for a little bit, but thank you.

4 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Well, we're glad  
5 you're on.

6 MS. GRAY: Yes. I just finished up with a  
7 client, so I felt like I had enough time to jump on. I  
8 agree with a lot of the other comments that I heard prior  
9 to getting on.

10 First of all, you know, I reject the NRC's  
11 Waste Confidence Draft Generic Environmental Impact  
12 Statement and ask the NRC to withdraw it for thorough  
13 revision. I don't have any confidence in the NRC waste  
14 confidence. There needs to be much more discussion.  
15 Just the whole idea of a generic format and discussing  
16 high-level nuclear waste is ridiculous.

17 And I don't believe that we should allow the  
18 industry to continue making more of this highly  
19 toxic-forever nuclear waste that obviously, at this  
20 point, we have nowhere to store and no idea what to do  
21 with it. I think the only thing that I can agree with  
22 is the idea of starting to unload these overfull  
23 filled-to-the-brim spent fuel pools into hardened onsite  
24 storage, HOSS units, even though I know we have a big  
25 problem with this high burn-up fuel. And it seems 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the industry, that the regulators have allowed the  
2 industry to produce this stuff without really knowing  
3 what to do with it.

4 So, really, the NRC is complicit in allowing  
5 the industry to carry on for many, many years with no  
6 solutions. So I think it's just wrong.

7 And so I do not believe that the NRC should  
8 allow the industry to continue until there's some real  
9 solution. And, frankly, I just reject this whole  
10 generic ruling. You guys needs to go back to the  
11 blackboard, and you all need to really get down to it and  
12 look at what we're going to do. But no new licenses, no  
13 renewals.

14 I mean, North Anna got a renewal way ahead  
15 of time before its renewal was even up. We had a 1.9  
16 earthquake a few miles down from the plant the other day.  
17 No. We don't need more plans for new reactors when you  
18 guys still haven't figured out what to do with 70,000 plus  
19 toxic waste that's already been created. Thank you.

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.  
21 Thank you, Erica. And we don't have anybody else on the  
22 line yet, but perhaps, if people in the Atlanta area are  
23 alerted, we'd certainly like to hear from more of them.  
24 Thank you.

25 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the record at 2:25 p.m. and went back on the record at  
2 2:32 p.m.)

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Do we have Mike  
4 Carberry on the phone?

5 MR. CARBERRY: Yes, we do. Can you hear  
6 me?

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes, Mike. Go  
8 ahead.

9 MR. CARBERRY: Yes. I'm sorry I am late.  
10 I was working, and I wasn't able to get on earlier. It  
11 sounds like most of the comments have already been made,  
12 but I appreciate you keeping the line open for other  
13 people to do that.

14 I am with the Nuclear Free Campaign of the  
15 Sierra Club. And I have called in before when you had  
16 your first call-in meeting. And I tried to make a couple  
17 of the other in-person meetings, but work and weather got  
18 in the way, especially the snowstorm that they had in the  
19 Twin Cities, Minnetonka just last week.

20 And the first thing I would like to talk  
21 about is those meetings themselves. I think that the NRC  
22 did a disservice to the public by holding those meetings  
23 in very inaccessible locations. They were mostly in  
24 suburbs or away from public transportation. A lot of the  
25 people I know that wanted to comment or wanted to show

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 up in person had to try to arrange carpools. A lot of  
2 the people do not have cars or just were very  
3 inaccessible. They were at very expensive hotels,  
4 people that were coming from out of town. They were very  
5 inconvenient places to have them.

6 Also, I don't believe all of the locations  
7 selected were opportune places. I think they should  
8 have had some meetings in Georgia or a meeting in Georgia,  
9 also in the TVA area. So that's my comment on those.

10 I just really wanted to briefly talk about  
11 generic EIS. Generic is just -- when you are talking  
12 with nuclear power, generic is a really dangerous thing.  
13 We all live in different areas of the country. All of  
14 these nuclear power plants with all their spent fuel,  
15 they all have different challenges, some of them  
16 weather-related, some of them -- just to name a few, we  
17 have flooding disasters, tornadoes, earthquakes,  
18 tsunamis, hurricanes, super storms, heatwave, drought.  
19 All of this spent fuel is really tied to water. And as  
20 we move into a climate change world, generic just isn't  
21 going to cut it.

22 I happen to live in Iowa. I live downstream  
23 from, 33 miles from, Duane Arnold Energy Center Nuclear  
24 Power Plant. They have had issues of flooding. We have  
25 had three 100-year floods in the last 20 years. Fort

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Calhoun borders Iowa. We still have Fort Calhoun shut  
2 down. It was almost a major disaster there, almost a  
3 station blackout because of the Flood of 2011 on the  
4 Missouri River, which if you look into that, there are  
5 7 dams on the Missouri River upstream of Fort Calhoun and  
6 also Cooper Station.

7 A disaster like we had in Colorado this past  
8 year, where there was so much rain that deluged the  
9 Colorado Rockies and just basically tore away a few  
10 towns. If that were to happen on the upper Missouri  
11 River Basin, we could see a cascading dam failure that  
12 would send a wave of water down the Missouri River that  
13 would be unprecedented. And Fort Calhoun, some  
14 estimates say, would be 30 feet underwater, which would  
15 create a station blackout and a disaster of unimaginable  
16 proportions with spent fuel.

17 So generic EIS does not cut it. I think we  
18 need environmental impact statements of all 100 existing  
19 reactors and all the reactors that have been recently  
20 closed or were scheduled to close.

21 I think there was a couple of other things  
22 I wanted to talk about, but I am just kind of at a loss.  
23 I just also think that we should not be making any more  
24 spent fuel until we find out what we should do with the  
25 existing.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 All the pools are completely full. They  
2 are rack systems of maybe four times as much fuel,  
3 sometimes more than that, than they were designed for.  
4 We need to get everybody out of the pool, as the lifeguard  
5 says. There's danger. There's danger. We need to get  
6 all of the spent fuel out of the pools as soon as we can  
7 into dry hardened onsite storage, or HOSS.

8 So I thank you for keeping the line open for  
9 people that were late. And thanks again. And next time  
10 you do this, please be a little bit more accessible to  
11 the public. Thank you.

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thanks.  
13 Thanks very much, Mike. We're glad that we got you when  
14 you finally got out of work. And we are going to keep  
15 the line open.

16 But we have been talking about it here in  
17 Rockville. And since we do have some time left, we  
18 thought that we would go back for a round of second  
19 comments from anybody that we have heard from already  
20 because we do want to maximize how much we hear from you.  
21 So if anybody has already talked and wants to talk again,  
22 we're going to do that.

23 And I know that David Martin a little while  
24 ago had requested to speak again. And, David, if you are  
25 still with us, we would go to you to hear what else 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 have to offer.

2 And we are going to try to keep the second  
3 -- we will keep the second round down to the usual  
4 three-minute time frame.

5 THE OPERATOR: David, your line is open.

6 MR. MARTIN: I'm not on.

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: David, are you on?

8 (No response.)

9 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And we'll  
10 wait and see if David comes back on, but right now we're  
11 going to go to Nikki. And it is Nikki, isn't it, that  
12 we met the other night in I think Toledo.

13 MS. VANDEL: San Luis Obispo, California.

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: San Luis Obispo.  
15 I'm sorry about that, but I remember it was Nikki,  
16 correct?

17 MS. VANDEL: Yes, it's Nikki. How are you?

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Oh, good. We're  
19 good. Oh, you were in the back of the room on the  
20 right-hand side.

21 MS. VANDEL: Yes. It was Crystal Baker  
22 from the Chumash.

23 FACILITATOR CAMERON: That's right. You  
24 were with Crystal. Well, good.

25 MS. VANDEL: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Go ahead. We're  
2 anxious to hear what you have to say.

3 MS. VANDEL: I guess, you know, what I boil  
4 this all down to, me being the actual human being mother  
5 that I am in my real life, you know, Elaine Claremont,  
6 but I go and play Nikki, I get down to the poetry of the  
7 story that is being told right now as it would be told  
8 to my grandchildren. And in telling this story, what we  
9 have is we have some of the most amazing minds in the world  
10 working on this problem.

11 But the problem is we're not working on it  
12 together. And we're not starting from the roots. And  
13 the roots come from the Mother Earth. And it comes from  
14 the power that we extracted from her. And only the  
15 original people that know her well as a citizen to take  
16 the time to put everything aside because this is the only  
17 thing that is important to the survival of my daughter  
18 and myself on this planet right now. And I think we all  
19 know that in this room or wherever we are on this planet.  
20 We all know that.

21 Anyway, so a poem. Yellow caution strips  
22 remind us that as pedestrians on this planet, we are  
23 guests. And each choice we make, each step we take  
24 brings us one step closer, together or apart, based on  
25 the choices we make. And the leadership and the lack

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1       thereof at making just simple decisions, like how did we  
2       come up with this NUREG, where we have half-priced human  
3       being value?

4                   I was mortified to learn that while I was  
5       on mother leave and focusing on that, that nobody paid  
6       attention to that well enough to bring it to at least the  
7       Bill Moyers' level. And the lack of the voice of the  
8       intelligencia on this issue in the mainstream is really  
9       disturbing. The lack of industry people that really  
10      need to know how to bring the waste that we have -- we  
11      have to do something with it. And putting it in the  
12      middle of Yucca Mountain, which is going to go -- they  
13      ruled. We go Yucca. Go put it in Yucca. We're going  
14      to transport it there. Good luck with that. Those  
15      roads, he's not joking about that. And there will be  
16      protests all along the way because we need to protect our  
17      Earth. And only those who know the Earth well know this  
18      connection.

19                   I don't know. That's just where I am. And  
20      I am in gratitude. I have my friend Captain John is going  
21      to call. He is an atomic veteran.

22                   FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay.

23                   MS. VANDEL: And he might go all over the  
24      place with his comments, but please listen to him.

25                   FACILITATOR CAMERON: We will. We will,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Nikki. And thank you for the poetry, too.

2 So we do have Kevin Kamps on the line.

3 Kevin, please go ahead.

4 MR. KAMPS: Hello. Can you hear me?

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes.

6 MR. KAMPS: Okay. Thanks, Chip. Thanks  
7 to the NRC for this round of second comments. I think  
8 that is a good use of this time.

9 So I did want to provide some more detail  
10 on what I had said before. It's about the absurdity of  
11 assuming dry cask storage be maintained forever into the  
12 future with once-per-century replacement of the entire  
13 kit and caboodle. And what I would like to focus on in  
14 these three minutes is the important service done to our  
15 country by nuclear whistleblowers, in both industry and  
16 the NRC, that have brought problems to light that show  
17 that that false confidence, that technological arrogance  
18 is just that.

19 So the first person I would like to mention  
20 is Oscar Shirani, who worked for Commonwealth Edison,  
21 later Exelon. He was a lead quality assurance inspector  
22 for Commonwealth Edison. And he led a nationwide  
23 quality assurance inspection on the Holtec casks.

24 I recently learned at the U.S. Nuclear Waste  
25 Technical Review Board meeting a few weeks ago 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Washington, D.C. that Holtec has 46 percent of the dry  
2 cask storage market in this country, which I hadn't known  
3 before that it was such a high percentage, which is truly  
4 frightening because in the year 2000, Oscar and a dozen  
5 other quality assurance inspectors from a dozen  
6 different nuclear industry utility companies that use  
7 Holtec casks identified 9 major categories of quality  
8 assurance violations having to do with these containers.

9           So Oscar Shirani questioned the structural  
10 integrity of the Holtecs sitting still in onsite storage,  
11 let alone, as has been mentioned by several commenters  
12 today, traveling at 60 miles per hour or greater speeds  
13 on the rails in this country as the Holtecs are a  
14 rail-sized container.

15           So that's a real problem.       And,  
16 unfortunately, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission was not  
17 there for Oscar as a nuclear industry whistleblower. He  
18 did get a few days at the Office of Inspector General to  
19 tell his story. The Office of Inspector General at NRC  
20 said they did not dispute his insights or observations,  
21 but they did not see that NRC had done anything wrong.  
22 So this nuclear industry whistleblower was left out to  
23 dry, a personal tragedy of great proportions for him,  
24 blacklisted from the U.S. nuclear industry for the rest  
25 of his life, but perhaps even greater societally is 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 fact that we have hundreds and at some point thousands  
2 of Holtec containers deployed across this country loaded  
3 with high-level radioactive waste in all kinds of  
4 terrible situations in the onsite storage, let alone  
5 discussing the transportation risks that would be  
6 involved.

7 And with my remaining time, I wanted to talk  
8 about Dr. Ross Landsman, an NRC whistleblower from Region  
9 III, dry cask storage inspector, who in February of 1994  
10 identified the fact that the dry cask storage at  
11 Palisades Nuclear Power Plant in Southwest Michigan on  
12 the Lake Michigan shoreline is in violation of NRC  
13 earthquake safety regulations. That's just 150 yards  
14 from the water of the drinking water supply for tens of  
15 millions of people downstream.

16 And since that time, Palisades has put in  
17 another dry cask storage pad, which, again, Dr. Landsman  
18 in full disclosure -- he served as our expert witness when  
19 we took this issue back to the NRC in an emergency  
20 enforcement petition, when we took it to the Federal  
21 courts. And he warns that the newer of the dry cask  
22 storage pads, in addition to the older one, is also in  
23 violation of NRC earthquake safety regulations.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Okay.  
25 Thanks, Kevin, for the information about the two

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 whistleblowers. And we're going to go on and see who  
2 else wants to talk. I think Priscilla does. And I think  
3 you've got a good three minutes there. So thank you  
4 again.

5 MS. STAR: Am I on?

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Priscilla?

7 MS. STAR: Yes? Can you hear me?

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And then Steve  
9 Sondheim. Priscilla, then Steve.

10 MS. STAR: Okay. Hi. This is Priscilla  
11 again. I am new on these calls, but what I have seen,  
12 as just any general observer would, from watching the  
13 live stream events for these public comments, hearings,  
14 and listening in, is that there is a general sense of  
15 noblesse oblige by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to  
16 listen and basically just pass on the comments without  
17 doing much more than that.

18 I'm concerned that the times that you have  
19 had these meetings, listening and acting wholly  
20 transparent in some way that you believe that you are,  
21 is the opposite and a very opaque method being used to  
22 move on and do what you want to do without really fully  
23 canvassing the public as to what the public would like  
24 to see you do. And it's the process that seems to stink  
25 like the hole in the head process, like we're kind of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com



1 absorbing all that you're doing in rapid speed, but we  
2 don't accept it.

3 If you had town hall meetings, which I'm  
4 sure would be highly improbable, I think everybody in the  
5 country would be understanding these issues better.  
6 Most of the people don't have the time to pay attention  
7 to them, just get their paychecks.

8 And I would wholly recommend that the NRC  
9 in its sense of feeling obligated now to be more  
10 transparent takes this more to the level in the street  
11 and asking people how do they feel if there were trucks  
12 moving through their town moving radioactive waste and  
13 what will those trucks be made of and how can we feel safe  
14 when, say, we're taking our children home from school or  
15 we're going home from work or we're traveling these  
16 highways where these situations are going to occur.

17 You know, the situation, as they say, you  
18 have blood on your hands. Is it not the same if there  
19 was an accident and the NRC had made that decision without  
20 fully canvassing whether or not these trucks should be  
21 on the road? This is just insanity. I don't think  
22 anyone would agree that it's smart. But I felt compelled  
23 to come back on and talk about that because I feel very  
24 strongly threatened, threatened by the concept that that  
25 may ever happen.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           The fact that that is being discussed and  
2           how to move waste from point A to point B, of course, we  
3           have to transport, right? That's what we're talking  
4           about. But that to me is insanity. You can't just take  
5           it from A to B without bringing on the worst risks known.

6           And there was someone on earlier, the second  
7           speaker, who was a nuclear physicist, I believe. I don't  
8           remember his name. He was a doctor perhaps, who said you  
9           take more risks getting in your car than the NRC takes  
10          with the public.

11          So I rest my case on the second chance.

12          FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.  
13          Thank you, Priscilla.

14          MS. STAR: You're welcome.

15          FACILITATOR CAMERON: And we're going to go  
16          back. I called Steve Sondheim's name. We're going to  
17          go back to Steve, but then we do have a new commenter:  
18          Linda Lewison. So, Steve, go ahead. Then we'll go to  
19          Linda.

20          MR. SONDEHEIM: Okay. Steve Sondheim here.  
21          I'll make this quick. I was asking about high-burnup  
22          fuel. And I want to ask you if you can answer me or if  
23          there's a way we can get an answer, if you can answer me  
24          now or if there's a way. All the possible risks of the  
25          high-burnup fuel, which has different, different

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 criteria, were those taken into account in the EIS? Do  
2 you know?

3 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Well, Steve, like  
4 the public meetings that we have been doing --

5 MR. SONDEHEIM: Okay.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: -- we have been  
7 referring -- hold on. We've been referring questions  
8 like that to the group of experts that we have with us --

9 MR. SONDEHEIM: Okay. Well, I understand.  
10 I understand.

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: -- on the meeting,  
12 but we do have someone --

13 MR. SONDEHEIM: But I would --

14 FACILITATOR CAMERON: -- that you could  
15 call.

16 MR. SONDEHEIM: like to be able to get an  
17 answer quicker than when the final decision comes out.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes. Sure. Sure.  
19 If you call Sarah Lopas at (301) 287-0675, if you call  
20 Sarah, she'll arrange for someone to give you an answer  
21 to that question in pretty real time. It won't be today,  
22 but it probably will be this week. So please do that.

23 MR. SONDEHEIM: Okay. Well, thank you.  
24 And I want to reiterate that it's looking to us like the  
25 plans for both onsite cask storage and transportation do

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 not cover the intensity of the heat and the problems that  
2 may come from the high-burnup waste. So we've got a  
3 situation that needs attention.

4 Okay. Thank you. We'll follow that up.  
5 Thank you.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,  
7 Steve.

8 And, Linda, would you like to talk to us now?  
9 Linda Lewison?

10 MS. LEWISON: Hello?

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Hi, Linda.

12 MS. LEWISON: Hi. How are you?

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Good.

14 MS. LEWISON: Okay. This is Linda Lewison  
15 in Chicago. I am with the Sierra Club Nuclear-Free  
16 Campaign and with Nuclear Energy Information Service. I  
17 am also a Con Ed ratepayer and concerned citizen of  
18 Illinois.

19 I just want to say before I start that I  
20 agree with Priscilla and with Mike Carberry that this  
21 process, although you may mean well, is essentially  
22 demeaning to the public. Giving us three-minute limits  
23 for such remarks is in itself demeaning. And all of the  
24 other points that Mike and Priscilla made about the  
25 process I would certainly concur 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           Having said that, in my three minutes, I  
2 will make a couple of points about the decommissioning  
3 process itself.

4           FACILITATOR CAMERON: And, Linda, just I'm  
5 interrupting you only to say that since this is your first  
6 time, we won't limit you to three minutes. We've giving  
7 everybody a reasonable amount of time to talk. It's only  
8 the people who come back on for the second time that we're  
9 limiting to three minutes. So you can relax a little bit  
10 on that. And I'm sorry to interrupt you, but I just  
11 wanted you to know that.

12           MS. LEWISON: No. That's very helpful.  
13 That's a really welcomed improvement. Thank you.

14           Many nuclear reactors have closed down  
15 their operations or have made the decision to close down  
16 in the near future, Vermont Yankee, Zion, Kewaunee, San  
17 Onofre to name a few. Several more are in the pipeline  
18 to close also: Clinton and Palisades. Given the  
19 high-risk levels there, it can't happen fast enough, as  
20 Kevin mentioned some of the problems just now.

21           However, as we are seeing with the  
22 decommissioning or dismantling of the nuclear reactor at  
23 Zion -- and we have been following it very closely -- our  
24 problems are just beginning.

25           Zion, site of the largest dismantling of a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reactor in history with almost a billion-dollar budget,  
2 is scheduled to start the irradiated waste fuel transfer  
3 in the next few months. One thousand metric tons of  
4 irradiated fuel will be transferred into dry casks over  
5 the course of the next 12 months. HOSS hasn't even been  
6 on the table, hardened onsite storage. This is over  
7 twice the 400 metric tons being transferred at unit 3 at  
8 Fukushima currently.

9           Since the Zion decommissioning began, there  
10 have been two license transfers through the NRC. Now  
11 Zion Solutions, LLC, a privately held company, has been  
12 granted authority by the NRC to manage the  
13 decommissioning. As a privately held company, they are  
14 legally entitled to take a profit.

15           When I, along with others as Con Ed  
16 ratepayers, contributed to the public funding of this  
17 project with a charge on our monthly electric bills, we  
18 expected that if there were any funds left over, they  
19 would be rebated back to the public. There are  
20 precedents for this in the last 20 years in the millions  
21 in Illinois with Con Ed.

22           According to the NRC, their only  
23 responsibility; that is, Zion Solutions', Energy  
24 Solutions', only responsibility -- excuse me.  
25 According to the NRC, the NRC's only responsibility 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 to see that there is enough money to cover the cost of  
2 the project. At this point, those costs include a profit  
3 margin. Even if it turns out there is no profit to be  
4 made from the Zion decommissioning, the precedent is set  
5 for a privately held company to manage public funds and  
6 build in a profit into the budget.

7 As a Con Ed ratepayer, I did not agree to  
8 this "public-private ownership" model. As a Con Ed  
9 ratepayer, I did not agree that the public could legally  
10 be prohibited from access to the records of a privately  
11 held entity. There is already one lawsuit in the courts  
12 challenging the Zion project. There may be more in the  
13 future.

14 At the last sham of a public meeting of the  
15 Zion Community Action Panel, which is a group of local  
16 people appointed by Zion Solutions who were not elected  
17 in a public process and whose backgrounds do not  
18 encompass the oversight of a billion-dollar  
19 decommissioning project, Pat Daly, who has been managing  
20 this decommissioning up until now from Zion Solutions,  
21 announced that he was leaving the post and going back to  
22 Tennessee. And he introduced the new executive, who  
23 will be starting now. He is leaving us at the most  
24 vulnerable time, when the fuel transfers are due to start  
25 and when we, the public, will be at the most risk.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           How can we possibly have confidence in the  
2 NRC that is allowing this to happen? Whatever the next  
3 executive's fine credentials may be, this is not the way  
4 for this to unfold and to put the public at this risk.

5           We do not oppose the fuel transfers. We  
6 oppose the process that is going on at Zion. And we are  
7 very concerned about the role or the lack of role of the  
8 NRC, where we feel we are all in clear and present danger.

9           I also want to support Steve Sondheim's  
10 concerns about high-burnup fuel, Kevin's comments and  
11 Steve's comments about the fracking issues. And there  
12 is no way that a generic environmental impact statement  
13 can cover this in one statement for each separate  
14 reactor.

15           The point I want to leave you with is that  
16 in this new universe that we are entering of  
17 decommissioning, each site is different. And each  
18 arrangement to do the decommissioning in each site is  
19 different. And there is no way that that can be covered  
20 through one generic environmental impact statement.

21           Thank you.

22           FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.  
23 Thank you, Linda.

24           We're going to go to Greg Wilson, then Brian  
25 Paddock, and then to Dr. Cuthbert again, and maybe hook

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 up with David Martin if he's still on the phone and wants  
2 to speak. But, Greg, go ahead.

3 MR. WILSON: Oh, okay. Thank you.

4 Yes. I am also with a Coalition Against  
5 Nukes. I just wanted to point out that to transport  
6 nuclear fuel to a safe place in south Florida, the trouble  
7 with south Florida is that due to global warming and  
8 climate change, the reactors will be underwater in  
9 probably less than 50 years. The ones at Turkey Point  
10 probably won't take as long. The entire southern part  
11 of Florida is only like eight to ten feet high. So it  
12 won't take very many years before we're looking at that  
13 whole area to be starting to go underwater. And that's  
14 seawater, which will pretty much rust out everything that  
15 comes in contact with it.

16 So to transport, as I mentioned before, it  
17 would be the shortest possible distance from Miami or the  
18 East Coast, whether that's St. Lucie or Crystal River,  
19 to high ground, which would be in the middle of the state,  
20 to be able to store it.

21 And there is one reporter in Fukushima that  
22 is posting videos all the time. And Fukushima has lost  
23 three reactors three-quarters down into the ground,  
24 which is spewing out radiation. And I saw one video that  
25 has some kind of algae or mold or something growing 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the area in this high-radioactive zone. And that could  
2 be possibly used to reduce the radioactivity in the spent  
3 fuel rods.

4 I'm not real sure. You know, that is  
5 something that someone will have to investigate and see  
6 if it could be used to basically render spent fuel rods  
7 back to a safe level.

8 But other than that, I just wanted to throw  
9 that in there, that I wouldn't recommend anybody  
10 transporting nuclear waste an inch further than what they  
11 have to, such as like on the West Coast, just to move the  
12 spent fuel away from the San Andreas Fault up into the  
13 mountains, you know, just a few miles away from San Diego  
14 or wherever else they're at, to some safe underground  
15 place or sand pit or something where they could be stored  
16 away from people a little bit and away from an active  
17 possible tsunami or earthquake zone. I just wanted to  
18 throw that in there, that I just really don't want to have  
19 anybody transferring spent fuel rods, you know, 1,000  
20 miles or 2,000 miles across the country.

21 Thank you for your time.

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you. Thank  
23 you, Greg.

24 Brian, Brian Paddock?

25 MR. PADDOCK: This is Brian Paddock.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Thank you for the additional time.

2 I served on TVA's stakeholder group for its  
3 first integrated resource plan. And what I saw there as  
4 TVA as part of the nuclear industry and highly invested,  
5 even at that point, was that nuclear power and the  
6 departments in TVA that benefitted from that activity had  
7 control of the policy.

8 And, for example, the first IRP that TVA  
9 did, which it is now in the process of starting over again  
10 because the facts on the ground have changed so much, but  
11 the nuclear people said, "Oh, you've got to put in  
12 starting and finishing Bellefonte in your integrated  
13 resource plan because if we don't start by a certain time,  
14 we can't finish the reactors within the license period  
15 for construction."

16 Of course, since then, TVA has essentially  
17 walked away and said, "We have no need for the power. And  
18 we are not going to build Bellefonte," although they  
19 haven't turned back in the licenses.

20 The Draft Generic Impact Statement has been  
21 challenged several times here. I don't see -- as an  
22 attorney who has read many EISs and litigated with others  
23 in the area of NEPA -- can't understand how you could  
24 possibly have a finding of no significant impact on the  
25 human environment.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           If nothing else, the pattern and history of  
2 leaks from existing aboveground storage, which  
3 supposedly had leak monitoring in compliance with NRC  
4 regulations, shows that one cannot say that there will  
5 not be significant releases of radioactivity to the human  
6 environment from aboveground storage.

7           The second thing that is wrong with the  
8 GEIS, a second thing, is also in the alternatives. And  
9 clearly the fact that the NRC is proposing indefinite  
10 aboveground storage shows that it has essentially  
11 abandoned the fantasy of geologic storage. And  
12 engineered geologic storage has always been the  
13 preference of probably everyone who has looked at this,  
14 but, for whatever political, economic, geologic,  
15 engineering reasons, this has been abandoned, it seems  
16 to me. And the failure to treat it as an alternative to  
17 be fully and carefully analyzed really shows that we have  
18 an industry that is making a highly dangerous waste  
19 product, which cannot be managed and which there really  
20 is no way to manage.

21           Secondly, on that point of alternatives,  
22 one of the reasons I think this process is being rushed  
23 is because the Watts Bar 2 operating license for the new  
24 reactor may be the first one that is effective by any  
25 delay in having a waste confidence regulation, 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 would allow that license to be issued.

2 If I were the NRC, I wouldn't worry about  
3 TVA and Watts Bar 2. TVA already finally admitted that  
4 it was going to take more than two more years and another  
5 billion dollars, more than a billion dollars, to build  
6 that. So, like every reactor ever built in the United  
7 States, it did not come in on time and on budget. And  
8 a delay to get the issue of licensing right is perfectly  
9 appropriate.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. And, Brian, I  
11 am going to have to ask you to just finish up right now.

12 MR. PADDOCK: Right. And my final point is  
13 that one of the issues in TVA is that the transportation  
14 of radioactive waste could be considered to be done,  
15 instead of by truck, on the rivers. TVA controls the  
16 navigable waters within its area. And it has previously  
17 let highly toxic and dangerous cargos use our rivers.  
18 And that's a problem. And we think that the problem and  
19 a prohibition on river transport of radioactive waste is  
20 in order.

21 Thank you.

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.  
23 Thank you, Brian.

24 Dr. Cuthbert? And then we're going to go  
25 to Sara Barczak, but we have Dr. Cuthbert on the line,

**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 think.

2 MS. CUTHBERT: Actually, this is Donna  
3 Cuthbert from the Alliance for a Clean Environment in  
4 Pottstown, Pennsylvania.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Oh. So this is  
6 Donna. Okay. Donna Cuthbert. Go ahead, Donna.

7 MS. CUTHBERT: Okay. Thank you.

8 I actually would like to provide a couple  
9 of specifics to support the speakers who request a  
10 separate environmental impact statement at each nuclear  
11 plant.

12 For some reason, I actually consider it  
13 regulatory malpractice for NRC to have done this, but  
14 they have excluded Limerick Nuclear Plant from the  
15 outcome of NRC's nuclear waste study and new rules.

16 Now, here are two reasons that we put on the  
17 record that that is really, really terrible. NRC's own,  
18 you know, documents for Limerick relicensing confirm  
19 that Limerick's fuel pool liners are corroding at up to  
20 ten times faster than what were anticipated. NRC told  
21 Exelon to recoat them immediately and then caved into  
22 Exelon in allowing them to wait for a decade to do that.

23 Also, the actual storage, aboveground  
24 storage, there are also corrosion concerns about that.  
25 For example, in these documents for Limerick relicensing

**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 nuclear plants that have cooling towers, they confirm  
2 that the steel onsite can corrode in 4 to 52 weeks.  
3 That's in NRC's own documents. They're overlooking all  
4 of these things. There could be times that we would have  
5 to pull some of those, some of the waste out of the cask.  
6 That might be impossible to do that because of the  
7 corrosion issues.

8 We have been raising this with NRC since  
9 2006. They have ignored, you have ignored, all of it.  
10 It's really frightening to us from the standpoint of what  
11 could happen here. And we certainly encourage NRC to do  
12 these separate environmental impact statements at each  
13 nuclear plant and have every nuclear plant benefit from  
14 any protective decisions that are made after this study  
15 is completed.

16 That would be the end of what I would have  
17 to say.

18 FACILITATOR CAMERON: So you're finished  
19 now, right, Donna?

20 MS. CUTHBERT: Yes.

21 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you for  
22 that comment.

23 And we're going to go to Sara, Sara Barczak.

24 MS. BARCZAK: Hi, Chip. Hi. This is Sara  
25 Barczak again with Southern Alliance for Clean Energy.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'll make this really quick.

2 I had prepared my comments earlier to try  
3 to fit the three-minute window. So if I had had a couple  
4 of more minutes, I would have added this part on the  
5 climate change, the level of concern we have. So if I  
6 can just be specific and point to page 4-75? That's in  
7 section 4.18. And it's in addressing spent fuel pools  
8 and the climate change analysis.

9 I think a speaker earlier, Greg Wilson in  
10 the Tampa area, had talked about some of the sea level  
11 rise concerns, among other things. And there's a line  
12 on that page in the draft GEIS that says specifically "The  
13 lowest rate above the sea level of concern for an  
14 NRC-licensed facility is currently about 4.3 meters, or  
15 14 feet. In the event of climate change and sea level  
16 rise, the NRC requires licensees to implement corrective  
17 actions to identify and correct or mitigate conditions  
18 adverse to safety."

19 In my comments and with our concerns is that  
20 I think this section needs further development and  
21 analysis because it's looking at the facilities  
22 themselves and we would argue first that we don't  
23 actually agree with those numbers and the sea level rise  
24 projections there.

25 But there are infrastructures that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)



1 facilities rely on: roadways, power lines, a number of  
2 things. So it's not just, for instance, Turkey Point  
3 Nuclear Plant in south Florida being able to solely  
4 operate and deal with dry casks or whatever is done with  
5 the spent fuel pool onsite for the indefinite future.  
6 Roadways are very likely to be underwater, a number of  
7 things that a facility would rely on, whether it's a  
8 nuclear plant or a hospital or something along those  
9 lines. And, therefore, that is somewhat of the nugget  
10 we were trying to get at with raising our sea level rise  
11 concerns if you have to look at the broader area, not the  
12 facility itself and where the onsite spent fuel pool  
13 storage or dry cask storage occurs.

14 So I hope that clarifies our comments from  
15 earlier. And thanks for the opportunity to add those  
16 couple little bits more of information. Thank you.

17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,  
18 Sara, for that clarification.

19 We have a new speaker, Laura Wilansky, on  
20 the phone. And, Laura, could you speak to us?

21 MS. WILANSKY: Great. Thank you very  
22 much.

23 I was born in 1952. And I have been living  
24 with the threat of nuclear energy for my whole life, as  
25 long as I can remember. Although the dropping of 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were unspeakable,  
2 I personally believe the ongoing nuclear catastrophe at  
3 Fukushima poses the greatest threat to the future of life  
4 on Earth that we have ever seen.

5 After Fukushima, it is clear that nuclear  
6 energy is just way too dangerous. And it's impossible  
7 to prevent or to clean up nuclear accidents. The very  
8 future of life on Earth is threatened by use of this form  
9 of energy. And accident and equipment malfunction,  
10 operator error, or terrorist attack at a nuclear plant  
11 literally could mean the end of life on Earth.

12 And if you're not convinced by Fukushima and  
13 you still think that that can't happen, think about the  
14 O-ring on the Challenger. You know, I live in Florida.  
15 And these things loom very big here, as they do with  
16 everyone. There is no way to guarantee 100 percent  
17 safety using this technology. And when you're talking  
18 about materials that remain deadly dangerous for tens of  
19 thousands of years, longer than all of human history,  
20 anything less than 100 percent safety is not safe.

21 And we are not infallible. Humans cannot  
22 produce something that is infallible. That means that  
23 nuclear plants cannot, cannot, cannot be guaranteed to  
24 be safe. And anything less than 100 percent safety in  
25 taking care of nuclear materials is not good enough.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           This technology is so dangerous that even  
2 Wall Street won't invest in it, and Wall Street will  
3 invest in anything. So all of this leads me to the  
4 conclusion that the halt on licensing new plants should  
5 be made permanent.

6           There are so many truly clean, safe,  
7 renewable, and sustainable technologies that are  
8 available and in development. We don't need more  
9 nuclear plants. They'll just drain resources from the  
10 full development of other technologies, like solar,  
11 wind, geothermal, and maybe something that is in  
12 development that we don't know about yet that needs  
13 funding.

14           So I encourage you in the strongest possible  
15 terms to please go back to the drawing board and create  
16 a new environmental impact statement. Instead of  
17 assuming that spent fuel can be stored safely forever,  
18 the NRC should examine the probability that a repository  
19 will be successfully sited, the probability that a  
20 successfully sited repository will actually contain  
21 radiation, the degree to which a repository may leak  
22 radiation, and the public health and environmental  
23 consequences that may occur if a repository is not sited  
24 or if it effectively contains radioactivity. You know,  
25 these things are very likely.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           The fact that we have not been able to come  
2 up with anything so far makes me really question our  
3 ability to do so. But, you know, we have to keep trying.

4           But I have no confidence that the current  
5 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the current plans  
6 for disposal of the nuclear waste we already have are  
7 adequate, safe, or sufficient.

8           And we should not be making more nuclear  
9 waste. I urge you to end the licensing and relicensing  
10 of all nuclear plants, end it now, and shut down all  
11 currently licensed nuclear plants. I believe that the  
12 future of life on Earth depends on this.

13           You know, as I said, I live in Florida. And  
14 people have already addressed Turkey Point, the dangers  
15 of Turkey Point. That's my local nuclear plant. And  
16 those plants and the new plants that are proposed and the  
17 nuclear waste are going to be underwater in the time that  
18 we can foresee. We should not be making new nuclear  
19 waste. And we need to do everything we can to assure the  
20 safety as best we can as fallible humans of the nuclear  
21 waste that we already have.

22           I thank you very much for listening to my  
23 comments.

24           FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Laura.

25           And we do have another person who has

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 already commented whom we're going to have on for another  
2 comment. And that is Diane Messer. Diane?

3 MS. MESSER: Yes. Thank you very much. I  
4 appreciate the opportunity. And I hope more people will  
5 dial in. We've got about 45 minutes left, I guess. I  
6 wanted to echo a lot of what people have been saying.  
7 Especially the last speaker before me just took my breath  
8 away.

9 I also want to make a point, stress that we  
10 are wasting valuable time and resources in fiddling  
11 around with how are we going to make safe something that  
12 isn't safe and cannot be safe when we should be putting  
13 our best minds and efforts into getting us off of nuclear  
14 energy? There is no future for it.

15 I could see -- did we ever manage to contain,  
16 long-term, these casks that we're talking about, dry  
17 storage, or whatever? Future generations, way in the  
18 future, if we are ever even around still then, are going  
19 to come upon this and could recontaminate because they  
20 won't understand. But I don't want to get too far down  
21 that pathway.

22 What I did want to make the point of in the  
23 limited time is that this is not a border issue. To say  
24 that we are dealing with this for the United States is  
25 very wrong. This spills over borders. We have got

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       blatant examples: the hearings that were held in Great  
2       Lakes for the Great Lakes repository and the risk to Lake  
3       Huron.

4                   And also I am here in Maine. And just over  
5       the border into New Brunswick is the Point Lepreau Plant,  
6       which is, oh, less than 50 miles away from populated area,  
7       native population that has been very concerned. And we  
8       have reservation land there, Satiag, along the border  
9       between Maine and New Brunswick. And people have spoken  
10      to me that live there that are very concerned about the  
11      impacts of that Point Lepreau, which has had severe  
12      safety issues and been shut down for long periods of time.  
13      And they're pushing them to get back up, even though the  
14      problems, the faults have not been corrected, because  
15      it's costing them money to keep it idle.

16                   We can't keep doing this. We have to get  
17      smart. We have to work for long-term future. We have  
18      to get ourselves onto clean energy and reduce demand.  
19      That's the hugest issue. We are gluttons for energy.  
20      It's affluenza. Bigger and more is not better. We can  
21      do with less. We have to be much more efficient.

22                   There are superb building methods, are new  
23      inventions coming down all the time that allow us for  
24      transportation, for industry. All of this should have  
25      the best minds working on accomplishing this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 transformation and not wasting our, pardon me the pun  
2 with waste that we're dealing with now, but not wasting  
3 our valuable assets and time in trying to deal with  
4 something that is undoable.

5 And thank you very much for letting me have  
6 my second chance.

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.  
8 Thank you for those comments, Diane.

9 If there is anybody on who wants to speak,  
10 either first time or for a second time, that we haven't  
11 heard from, if you'd press \*1, you'll be put in, placed  
12 in, the queue. And while I'm waiting for that, David  
13 Martin? David, are you with us?

14 (No response.)

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes. David, if you  
16 are with us, press \*1, and you'll go into the queue.

17 THE OPERATOR: David is not with us at this  
18 time.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thanks, Jose.  
20 Okay.

21 Well, we're going to be waiting to see if  
22 anybody else joins us. And perhaps we do have someone.  
23 And this is a new speaker. This is Scott Price. And go  
24 ahead, Scott.

25 MR. PRICE: Hi. I'm Scott Price. I'm

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 with the Alliance for Progressive Values. And I've  
2 heard a lot of great stuff said already, and I'm not going  
3 to repeat all of it again. I actually have to go to a  
4 meeting in a few minutes.

5 I do want to say that APV is based in  
6 Richmond, Virginia. We're about 40 miles from the North  
7 Anna site. North Anna was built on a fault line. We had  
8 a fairly large earthquake in -- it's an active fault line  
9 -- in 2011, we had a large earthquake. It damaged the  
10 plant. And it moved the dry cask storage containers that  
11 were onsite.

12 We were told that couldn't happen. So I  
13 have to say that, frankly, we don't trust industry as far  
14 as we can throw them. And we are extremely dubious about  
15 the level of government oversight on this.

16 Since I am basically filling in for someone  
17 else, I am not an expert on this issue, but I will say  
18 that we think that nuclear energy is now constituted. It  
19 is a dead end. And it is a very dangerous dead end. And  
20 we think we would be much better served as a nation and  
21 as a community and throughout the world to turn away from  
22 nuclear energy as a power source and, instead, invest our  
23 time and our effort into clean and renewable energy.

24 I am occasionally told by people in the  
25 industry that nuclear energy is clean, is safe, is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 renewable. And I have to say it is none of those things.  
2 So we think that this is a boondoggle and deeply  
3 troubling.

4 Again, I have to go to a meeting, but I  
5 appreciate you taking my statement.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thanks,  
7 Scott.

8 And we're going to go back to Mike Carberry  
9 for a second comment.

10 MR. CARBERRY: Yes. Can you hear me?

11 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes.

12 MR. CARBERRY: Yes. Thank you for  
13 allowing people a second bite at the apple, if you will.

14 I would like to address a few comments,  
15 really, about confidence and what confidence means. I'm  
16 looking at a dictionary definition. And one of them  
17 says, "trust or faith in a person or thing." And then  
18 a second definition is "a trusting relationship."

19 Well, I have faith in that nuclear power is  
20 dirty, dangerous, and expensive and that the waste is a  
21 serious, serious issue that is not being adequately dealt  
22 with.

23 Let's go to Fukushima, for instance. What  
24 I have faith in and confidence is that we get to the bottom  
25 of what the true causes of the disaster in Fukushima were.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 The Japanese Diet, which is their legislative body,  
2 similar to our Congress, a few months after the Fukushima  
3 disaster of 3/11/11 took a look at the causes of  
4 Fukushima. And they determined that it was not the  
5 earthquake that caused the disaster, it was not the  
6 tsunami, but that it was a manmade disaster and that it  
7 was created by the collusion of industry, the nuclear  
8 industry; nuclear regulators; and government and that  
9 was the problem. And, obviously, we know that the main  
10 issue, ongoing issue, at Fukushima is the spent fuel  
11 pools.

12 So I and many others relate the situation  
13 in Japan to be very, very similar to the situation in the  
14 United States. Having industry capture regulation of  
15 the nuclear power industry is very dangerous. And I'm  
16 confident that we have that.

17 And so another definition of confidence is  
18 actually when it's talking about a scam. And that is "or  
19 relating or involving a swindle or a fraud, a confidence  
20 scheme, a confidence trickster." I believe this whole  
21 waste confidence issue in these hearings has been kind  
22 of a waste confidence con and a swindle. And the people  
23 are really tired of it.

24 And I really think that things need to  
25 change. I think the Congress needs to step up. 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 people need to step up. We are trying to speak up. I  
2 don't think we've had a very good opportunity.

3 I mean, I get three more minutes, but, you  
4 know, we should have been allowed a lot more time. The  
5 time of the written should be extended. We had a month  
6 of government shutdown. We had just a lot of, you know,  
7 bait and switch, shell game-type tactics that have made  
8 this whole process just very unpalatable.

9 So, again, I thank you for my additional  
10 three minutes, but it's really not enough. So thank you  
11 very much.

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Well, thank  
13 you, Mike.

14 And, again, hit \*1 if you want to talk to  
15 us. We're in a lull right now. We have no one signed  
16 up. But we are going to stay until 4:00 o'clock in case  
17 someone does want to talk to us.

18 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at  
19 3:28 p.m. and went back on the record at 3:34 p.m.)

20 FACILITATOR CAMERON: We're ready, Jose.

21 THE OPERATOR: Linda, your line is open.

22 MS. SEELEY: Hello. This is Linda Seeley  
23 from San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Hi, Linda.

25 MS. SEELEY: Hello. I would like to first

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comment that I have been trying to get on the line for  
2 about 25 minutes. And I pressed \*1 probably a dozen  
3 times. And I hung up and called back. So your system  
4 is not perfect is what I am saying. And there may be  
5 other people who have experienced the same problem  
6 because it's not going through for some reason. So that  
7 is my first comment.

8 My second comment is thank you for giving  
9 me this opportunity to speak to you once again. I spoke  
10 to you when you were in San Luis Obispo.

11 And I feel that this is pretty much an  
12 exercise in futility. However, because I am persistent  
13 and dogged, like many of my allies in this work, to shut  
14 down nuclear energy, I will keep at it.

15 The draft GEIS is really kind of ludicrous.  
16 I have been reading it since you were here. I picked up  
17 a copy, and I have been reading it. And, you know, the  
18 whole idea of a generic environmental impact study for  
19 over 100 nuclear plants is absurd, to say the least. And  
20 other people have told you why. You have heard it from  
21 us. There seems to be just an unbelievable amount of  
22 collusion between the agency that is supposed to be  
23 regulating nuclear power and protecting the public and  
24 those people who are producing nuclear power for profit  
25 and have -- and nobody has any idea what we are going 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 do with the waste. And the draft GEIS does not address  
2 that. It is only sensible and logical and practical.

3 From the eyes of anyone who just looks at  
4 the world in practicable ways that the only logical thing  
5 you can do is stop making the waste. There is nowhere  
6 to put it. Saying that we can safely store it onsite for  
7 the next 300 to 10 million years is the most, one of the  
8 most, absurd things that I have ever heard in my life.

9 Saying that there is a risk of a terrorist  
10 attack, although the consequences would be high that the  
11 probability is so low that the consequence or the  
12 environmental consequence or whatever you call it would  
13 be small, risk is small, well, that's crazy. That's  
14 absurd. We have already had two planes that went into  
15 the twin towers. And that was only like what, 2001, 12  
16 years ago. And apparently they thought that they were  
17 going to or, they were planning on going to Indian Point,  
18 but they thought it would be too well protected against  
19 them. So that in itself, this is insane.

20 And then you have no absolutely -- you do  
21 not address the fact that no civilization and no human  
22 institution has lasted for thousands of years. And so  
23 you don't have a credible plan for mitigating the risks  
24 of environmental contamination in the event of the  
25 government's failure. Our government has been here 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 what, 250, 80, 75 -- I don't know -- years. I don't know  
2 how many governments have lasted for thousands of years.  
3 I think zero. I think zero is the number. So your  
4 foresight is very inadequate.

5 I am sorry to be -- I know I sound snarky,  
6 but I don't mean to be snarky. I mean to be outraged,  
7 concerned, feeling helpless against an institution that  
8 is deaf to the logical and sensible and practical and  
9 hard-fought lessons that we have been trying to tell you  
10 all over this country in your 12 public meetings.

11 As I said before, I am hopeless that it will  
12 do any good. But there is nothing else that we can do  
13 as citizens. And so that is why we're doing this because  
14 this is our venue. And if I could fall on the ground in  
15 front of you and beg you and think that that would make  
16 a difference, I would do that. I would do whatever I  
17 could do and will do whatever I can do in my life as long  
18 as I live to try to help you understand what you are doing  
19 to this Earth that we are all inhabiting together. And  
20 you are the only ones who have the power to do anything  
21 about it. And so that is why. That is why we spend our  
22 nights and our days not getting paid, not getting  
23 rewarded, but for the sake of our world is why we're doing  
24 this.

25 And so, you know, I wish I had a magic word

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 that would go into your brain that would go ping and you  
2 would suddenly wake up and look at it through our eyes.  
3 I know that won't happen, but I want you to hear the words.

4 So that's all I have to say. Thank you.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,  
6 Linda. Thanks for persevering.

7 And we're going to go to Jane Feldman from  
8 the Sierra Club. Jane?

9 MS. FELDMAN: Hi. Thank you for giving us  
10 this opportunity. I live in Las Vegas. And I am the  
11 Energy Chair for the Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club.

12 I got involved with nuclear waste issues in  
13 the past 20 years with Yucca Mountain being 30 miles up  
14 the highway from my home. One of the things that I would  
15 ask you to add to the EIS is the alternative that 175  
16 environmental groups have been advocating for over the  
17 last couple of years. It's called the hardened onsite  
18 storage principles. And I think that probably most  
19 people are familiar with this document already. It was  
20 signed off in March of 2011.

21 And 175 environmental groups who put public  
22 health and safety and environmental protection as number  
23 one have looked at the situation of waste management and  
24 have decided that the only thing that we can do that is  
25 possibly safe for people and for the environment is 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](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 keep it where it is, hardened onsite storage as close as  
2 possible to the site of generation as possible, until we  
3 have a final disposal plan ready to put into place.

4 Interim storage doesn't do that for us. It  
5 just doesn't. It has too many risks involved in it. And  
6 the hardened onsite storage plan is missing from your  
7 EIS.

8 I have emphasized a couple of times 135  
9 environmental groups have signed onto these hardened  
10 onsite storage principles because they are independent  
11 of industrial concerns. They are independent of  
12 steam-making concerns. They are looking at public  
13 health and safety and environmental protection. And as  
14 an EIS, it should look at that as an alternative so that  
15 we can go into that alternative or whatever alternative  
16 we want to pursue with open eyes as to the pluses and  
17 minuses of every single alternative that is open to us.

18 Interim storage is a dangerous proposition.  
19 It's not good for Nevada. It's not good for any of the  
20 interim storage sites. And it's going to put people and  
21 the environment at risk.

22 If you would like to have more information  
23 about the hardened onsite storage principles that these  
24 135 organizations have signed onto, it's readily  
25 available on Sierra Club's website and from other

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 websites of some of our partnering organizations, such  
2 as Beyond Nuclear and the Nuclear Information and  
3 Research Service.

4 Thank you so very much.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,  
6 Jane.

7 And I think that Kevin Kamps from Beyond  
8 Nuclear probably has provided that website to us.

9 MS. FELDMAN: Right.

10 FACILITATOR CAMERON: We're going to go to  
11 Susan Myers. Susan? And hit \*1 if you are having  
12 trouble getting through.

13 THE OPERATOR: Go ahead, Susan. Your line  
14 is open. And, Susan, just verify that your line is not  
15 muted on your end, please.

16 MS. MYERS: Okay. How about now?

17 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes, we hear you.

18 MS. MYERS: Technology is wonderful.

19 My name is Susan Myers. My first degree is  
20 in geology from New Mexico State University way back in  
21 the Dark Ages, where I had an opportunity to work for the  
22 BLM in Roswell, New Mexico, just north of the WIPP pilot  
23 project, which is now actually running. I had a chance  
24 to review a lot of that documentation as a geology intern  
25 and found it very interesting that the parameters for how

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 close the closest well would change every time they found  
2 a well closer than they wanted, big concerns with that,  
3 still have those big concerns, not to mention the area  
4 has a lot of issues with hydrogeology and salt zones, et  
5 cetera.

6 I have also lived in Santa Fe, New Mexico  
7 and have been on the bypass and had one of the waste trucks  
8 overtake me in the middle of the night in an unsafe  
9 manner, scared the bejeezus out of me, not really  
10 comfortable with that whole process either, and got a  
11 degree in nursing a few years after all of that was  
12 happening and have seen the effects of long-term  
13 radiation, slow radiation poisoning on veterans, worked  
14 at the VA for a long time. So I have a lot of concerns  
15 about transporting waste, storing waste safely, and the  
16 long-term effects on humans.

17 Is there a good solution? No. But I think  
18 steering away from any kind of nuclear power, nuclear  
19 waste would be advantageous for us. The solar is -- oh,  
20 and I used to work at New Mexico Solar Energy Institute.  
21 Now, that was really a long time ago, back in the late  
22 '70s. But investigating solar energy options,  
23 everywhere from passive gain to actually photovoltaics,  
24 which was merely a dream in the late '70s. There's a lot  
25 of other options that we can do before we go further with

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 the nukes and start permitting more and more.

2 I just wanted to give you guys a little bit  
3 of feedback that I am still here, I am still fighting the  
4 fight, and I know there are solutions out there that don't  
5 involve nuclear power and nuclear waste.

6 Thanks for listening.

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you, Susan.

8 And press \*1 if you want to talk. Okay. We  
9 have Erica Gray back for a second comment. And, Erica,  
10 go ahead if you are on the line.

11 MS. GRAY: Hello. Can you hear me?

12 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes.

13 MS. GRAY: Yes. I had a chance to come back  
14 to the phone again at work. So I did have a couple of  
15 comments. One of them, I guess, in particular, is I have  
16 been reading through the GEIS book. Of course, it's 500  
17 whatever pages. So, so far I haven't been able to find  
18 anything, in particular, dealing with the temperature of  
19 water. I think there should be a concern.

20 I noticed at Dominion's North Anna site,  
21 they said that like the lake that they used to cool the  
22 reactors, the other day, it was at 50 degrees when it goes  
23 in and when it comes out. They said it's typically 14  
24 degrees, but it was coming out at 76.1 degrees. So that  
25 was actually 26.1 degrees hotter and, obviously, dealing

**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 with climate change. I'm just wondering how or maybe I  
2 haven't gotten to it yet, but I haven't been able to find  
3 anything yet talking about the issues of water, in  
4 particular, cooling the reactors and as well as water  
5 usage, how, you know, how the impacts are from all the  
6 water that is used because, obviously, I guess, in the  
7 cooling process, a lot of it is turned to vapor.

8 So the water issues -- and I haven't been  
9 able to find anything dealing with that. I realize that  
10 in parts, it was talking about, you know, in particular,  
11 with the spent fuel pools and the dangers of a drain-down  
12 or leak, but is it addressed?

13 Maybe I haven't seen it, but what if we lose  
14 Lake North Anna and we lose the dam and we lose the water?  
15 I don't think we have water that is being piped in in the  
16 quantities that we need it if there was a diversion of  
17 the water. That is a manmade lake. So I have concerns  
18 with the water as well.

19 And so I don't know if anyone there or maybe  
20 you all aren't answering any questions today, but I can't  
21 seem to find anything on the water issues other than the  
22 spent fuel pools themselves. So I don't know if there  
23 is something there or not.

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Erica, we  
25 want to make sure that you are guided to that information

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 if it is there. And what we have been asking people to  
2 do is to call one of the staff of the Waste Confidence  
3 Directorate. And that's Sarah Lopas.

4 MS. GRAY: Okay.

5 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And she can be  
6 reached at (301) 287-0675. And I think she can provide  
7 you some leads on where there is information on water  
8 temperature. Okay?

9 MS. GRAY: And then I just had one other  
10 comment or question, rather, is who is going to review  
11 all of our, you know, citizens' comments and the input  
12 and et cetera? Who is going to be reviewing or what  
13 agency or who in particular is going to reviewing all of  
14 this information?

15 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Well, the staff.  
16 The answer to that is the staff of the Waste Confidence  
17 Directorate. And also the attorneys from the NRC's  
18 Office of General Counsel will be involved in that  
19 review. And there will be a final environmental impact  
20 statement with a separate part of that environmental  
21 impact statement will have a comment disposition  
22 document. And after the staff is done with their work,  
23 then it has to go to the Commission.

24 MS. GRAY: To the Commission, as in the NRC?

25 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes, yes. So it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 will be a thorough staff review. And then the  
2 five-person Commission will review that staff work  
3 before it is finalized as a final environmental impact  
4 statement.

5 MS. GRAY: So no EPA, no third party, no  
6 anything, and this is all in-house?

7 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Well, there is an EPA  
8 review of all environmental impact statements that any  
9 agency in the government prepares under section 306 of  
10 the Clean Air Act. That is where the authority comes  
11 from. So that is where the review is. And sometimes  
12 even the Council of Environmental Quality acts as sort  
13 of a conflict resolution.

14 MS. GRAY: So you're saying the EPA will  
15 review this document or what other agency or government

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: The Environmental  
17 Protection Agency. They have a specific branch within  
18 the Environmental Protection Agency that reviews the  
19 environmental impact statements.

20 MS. GRAY: Okay. So the EPA will be  
21 reviewing it as well?

22 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Absolutely.

23 MS. GRAY: Okay. Well

24 FACILITATOR CAMERON: But thank you for  
25 bringing that up. I'm sure that other people are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 wondering about what the review process is like.

2 MS. GRAY: Okay. Well, then also just in  
3 finishing, I really would like to see this industry focus  
4 on waste, securing the waste, and stop making more of it.

5 Thank you.

6 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,  
7 Erica.

8 Now, we do have one speaker. And I think  
9 that's probably going to be our final speaker. And this  
10 is someone who is back for a second comment. And it's  
11 David Schonberg.

12 MR. SCHONBERGER: Hi. Am I on?

13 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Yes.

14 MR. SCHONBERGER: Hi. Thank you. This is  
15 David Schonberger, D-a-v-i-d Schonberger.

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: I'm sorry, David. I  
17 think I said Schonberg. It's Schonberger.

18 MR. SCHONBERGER: Yes, sir.

19 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Thank you for  
20 spelling that for us, too.

21 MR. SCHONBERGER: So I'm from Ann Arbor,  
22 Michigan. This is a continuation of my personal oral  
23 comments on this NRC public telephone conference call in  
24 December 9th, 2013. I have no affiliations today.

25 I would like to expand my comments regarding

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the generic structure of the proposed rule as being  
2 perhaps the most insidious and alarming aspect of the  
3 policy. Apparently taking the lead from the NRC, the  
4 State of Michigan is demonstrating how establishing  
5 generic rules can be a game changer for the corporate  
6 stakeholders.

7 I would like to read a few passages from a  
8 regulatory impact statement and cost-benefit analysis  
9 published in October 2013 by the State of Michigan  
10 Department of Environmental Quality pertaining to  
11 proposed generic rules governing environmental  
12 contamination response activity and cleanup criteria  
13 requirements for response activity, also known as  
14 remediation and redevelopment of brownfields,  
15 contaminated sites, and facilities.

16 FACILITATOR CAMERON: And, David, it's  
17 fine to read us some of those passages, but we will have  
18 to ask you to stop within three minutes so that we can  
19 see if there are any final people on the line before we  
20 adjourn. So, with that, go ahead.

21 MR. SCHONBERGER: Thank you.

22 My comments are very applicable today,  
23 regardless of whether we are discussing the Rocky Flats  
24 facility in Colorado or the Waste Confidence Rule for  
25 continued storage of spent fuel. On page 4, part 3,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 number 2, it says, "Other states do not have generic  
2 cleanup criteria. A site-specific risk assessment must  
3 be conducted to determine environmental conditions and  
4 develop cleanup standards for each site. Generic  
5 criteria in Michigan provide a mechanism to quickly  
6 determine environmental concerns and provide  
7 information to parties involved in property transfers.  
8 Generic criteria facilitate property transactions,  
9 allowing financial institutions to make loan decisions  
10 regarding contaminated properties, allowing liability  
11 protection for a party not liable for the contamination."

12 Now, on page 6, part 3, number 5, it says,  
13 "Purchasers of properties would not be able to limit  
14 their liability for cleanup of past environmental  
15 concerns if criteria are not available to assess the risk  
16 posed at a property and, therefore, would be less likely  
17 to purchase the property."

18 Now, on page 9, part 3, number 18, it says,  
19 "An environmental assessment report to provide the  
20 information necessary to utilize the generic cleanup  
21 criteria is estimated to cost 5,000 to 20,000 dollars.  
22 If generic criteria were not an option, the cost of an  
23 environmental assessment report to provide the  
24 information necessary to develop site-specific cleanup  
25 criteria would be 50 to 100 thousand dollars or more

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 depending on the circumstances and nature of the site."

2 And, finally, on page 9, part 3, number 21,  
3 "The proposed rules are designed to be less burdensome  
4 then the effort and costs to evaluate the Environmental  
5 concerns . . . in the absence of generic cleanup  
6 criteria."

7 Thank you very much.

8 FACILITATOR CAMERON: Okay. Thank you,  
9 David, for being brief. And I know you are going to  
10 submit written comments. And if that Michigan report is  
11 relevant to the NRC's work, I hope that you submit the  
12 citation to the document.

13 So I think we're at the time for  
14 adjournment. And I was going to ask Carrie Safford,  
15 Deputy Director of the Waste Confidence Directorate, to  
16 close out this meeting.

17 MS. SAFFORD: Thanks, Chip. And thank  
18 you, everyone, who participated today in our final public  
19 meeting. I wanted to let you all know that we will review  
20 and consider today's comments as well as all of the other  
21 comments that we have received throughout all of the  
22 public meetings that have been held as well as those that  
23 will be submitted to us in writing.

24 And, finally, as a quick reminder, the  
25 public comment period closes on Friday, December 20th.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 So please submit your comments by that deadline.

2 And thank you. Thank you for participating  
3 today. This closes out the meeting.

4 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter was  
5 concluded at 4:01 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)