

September 28, 2015

MEMORANDUM TO: James Rubenstone, Acting Director
Yucca Mountain Directorate
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

FROM: Christine Pineda, Project Manager /RA/
Yucca Mountain Directorate
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 15 PUBLIC MEETING ON THE NRC
STAFF'S DRAFT SUPPLEMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
ENERGY'S EIS FOR THE PROPOSED REPOSITORY AT YUCCA
MOUNTAIN, NEVADA

On Tuesday, September 15, 2015, members of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff held a Category 3 public meeting at the Embassy Suites Convention Center in Las Vegas, Nevada. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an overview of the NRC staff's draft supplement to the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) environmental impact statement for the proposed high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, and to accept public comments on the document. Participants had an opportunity to ask clarifying questions about the NRC's environmental review process.

The public meeting began at 7:00 p.m. Pacific Time, following a one-hour open house for stakeholders to engage with the NRC staff. The meeting began with an introduction of NRC staff and a review of meeting ground rules, followed by a presentation on the draft supplement. Meeting attendees were then given the opportunity to ask clarifying questions and present their comments. Twenty-eight individuals provided comments. The meeting concluded at approximately 9:35 p.m.

The NRC staff's slide presentation is available in the NRC's Agencywide Document Management and Access System (ADAMS) at Accession No. ML15265A504. The transcript for the meeting is available in ADAMS at Accession No. ML15268A399. A video archive of the meeting will be available in the near future on the NRC's website at <http://video.nrc.gov>, under "Archived Videos." These materials, as well as the meeting handouts and posters, are also available on the NRC's website at <http://www.nrc.gov/waste/hlw-disposal/key-documents.html#er>.

The ADAMS public electronic reading room is accessible at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS, or who encounter problems in accessing documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC's Public Document Room reference staff at 1-800-397-4737, or via e-mail at pdr@nrc.gov.

Approximately 70 people attended the meeting. Meeting attendees included members of the public, members of federal, state, and local governments, members of tribal governments, and

members of industry and public advocacy groups. A list of meeting attendees is attached to this summary.

Clarifying questions from the attendees included: whether the NRC has more than one definition for a “small” impact that it uses in its National Environmental Policy Act documents; and how or why DOE is able to “defer” to the NRC to develop the supplement.

Topics raised during the comment period included concerns about the NRC’s process or about technical aspects of the supplement, concerns about broader policies or processes relevant to Yucca Mountain, and other issues directly or indirectly related to Yucca Mountain or the proposed repository. Comments about the supplement or about the NRC’s process for developing the supplement addressed the following issues: concern about the NRC’s role in preparing the supplement and a lack of federal funding for affected local governments to pay for a technical review of the draft supplement; concerns about the assumptions and scope of the supplement; a request that the NRC staff acknowledge in the final supplement that recent developments may result in significant program changes (e.g., the Administration’s announcement of plans to dispose of defense waste separately), thus creating a need to update DOE’s EISs; the supplement’s reliance on DOE’s model of repository performance; the stability of the geology at the proposed repository site; skepticism about DOE’s plan to install titanium drip shields in the proposed repository; the potential for the proposed repository to leak contaminants into the groundwater moving through Nevada into California; the possible effects of groundwater contamination or an accident on the Las Vegas economy; concerns about the interaction among contaminants in the groundwater; and concerns about impacts on the spiritual and healing qualities of the water used by tribes, as well as other potential impacts on tribal lands, populations, and wildlife. Some commenters expressed their view that the repository would pose no danger and would not contaminate groundwater. Commenters also expressed concern that the NRC staff did not hold public meetings in California. Other commenters requested that the public comment period be extended beyond the November 20 deadline.

General policy or process comments addressed the following topics or concerns: expressions of general opposition to the proposed repository and concern that the project might continue despite such opposition; concerns that decisions about the Yucca Mountain site and the proposed repository have been politically motivated; recognition that the project cannot move forward in light of events that have occurred or decisions made since DOE submitted its license application in 2008; concerns about how the U.S. government has affected the people and lands of the Western Shoshone Nation; support for choosing a repository site based on informed consent; support for recycling, treating, or finding other uses for spent nuclear fuel; and support for nuclear power in light of global climate change.

Other commenters compared the history of nuclear activities on the Nevada Test Site to the potential for impacts from the proposed repository. Some commenters emphasized that DOE does not have the necessary land withdrawal and water rights to construct and operate a repository at Yucca Mountain. Additional comments concerned the risks of transporting spent nuclear fuel; possible train or truck routes for transporting high-level waste through Nevada; the design of spent nuclear fuel storage canisters and the potential for stress corrosion cracking; and concern that the NRC has cancelled a study to determine the long-term cancer risk to people living near nuclear power plants and the implication for potential NRC regulation of a high-level waste repository.

To subscribe to our e-mail updates, send an e-mail with the word "Subscribe" in the subject line to YMEIS_supplement@nrc.gov.

Enclosure: Meeting Attendees List

CONTACT: Christine Pineda, NMSS/YMD
(301) 415-6789

To subscribe to our e-mail updates, send an e-mail with the word "Subscribe" in the subject line to YMEIS_supplement@nrc.gov.

Enclosure: Meeting Attendees List

CONTACT: Christine Pineda, NMSS/YMD
(301) 415-6789

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC

NMSS/YMD Distribution

CSafford (OGC)

AGendelman (OGC)

Miriam Juckett (mjuckett@swri.org)

ADAMS Accession No.: ML15272A405

OFFICE	NMSS/YMD	OGC	NMSS/YMD
NAME	CPineda	LLondon via email	JRubenstone via email
DATE	9/25/2015	9/28/2015	9/28/2015

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

List of Attendees
Public Meeting on the NRC Staff's Draft Supplement to the
Department of Energy Environmental Impact Statements for the
Proposed Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada
September 15, 2015; 7:00 p.m. – 9:36 p.m.

	First Name	Last Name	Organization or Affiliation (if known)
1	William	Boyle	U.S. Department of Energy
2	Dennis	Bechtel	Citizen
3	Karen	Beckley	Nevada Radiation Control Program
4	Kevin	Bell	California Energy Commission
5	Richard	Bryan	Nevada Commission on Nuclear Projects
6	Forrest	Darby	Citizen
7	Jane	Feldman	Sierra Club
8	Gerhard	Gran	Citizen
9	Ron	Green	Citizen
10	Carolyn	Goodman	Mayor, City of Las Vegas
11	Jim	Hadnot	Citizen
12	Bob	Halstead	Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects
13	Justin	Harrison	Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce
14	Ace	Hoffman	Citizen
15	Sharon	Hoffman	Citizen
16	Gary	Hollis	Citizen
17	Steven	Ireland	Las Vegas Paving
18	Cash	Jaszczak	Nye County, Nevada
19	Greg	James	Inyo County, California
20	Eddie	Jim	Pahrump Paiute Tribe
21	Abigail	Johnson	Eureka County, Nevada
22	Joe	Kennedy	Western Shoshone Nation
23	Phil	Klevatorick	Clark County Nuclear Waste Division
24	Mark	Krauss	Citizen
25	Leonard	Kreisler	Citizen
26	Robert	Levich	Citizen
27	Lisa	Levine	Office of U.S. Representative Dina Titus
28	Andrew	Lingenfelter	Office of U.S. Senator Dean Heller
29	Frank	Loscavio	Project Resources, Inc.
30	Webster	Mack	Citizen
31	Paul	Moradkhan	Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce
32	Kelly	Martinez	City of Las Vegas
33	Vivian	Mehrhoff	Citizen
34	Rod	McCullum	Nuclear Energy Institute
35	Jenna	Morton	Citizen
36	Irene	Navis	Clark County, Nevada
37	Elia	Gay-O'Gara	Citizen

	First Name	Last Name	Organization or Affiliation (if known)
38	John	O’Gara	Citizen
39	David	Parks	Nevada Legislature, Senate
40	Jacob	Paz	Citizen
41	Martha	Pendleton	Citizen
42	John	Pfabe	Citizen
43	Shannon	Raborn	Office of U.S. Senator Harry Reid
44	Kyle	Roerink	Las Vegas Sun
45	Keith	Rogers	Las Vegas Review Journal
46	Dan	Schinhofen	Nye County, Nevada
47	Carrie	Stewart	Zeus Environmental
48	Ted	Tavcar	Citizen
49	Diane	Thornton	Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau
50	Judy	Treichel	Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force
51	Dina	Titus	U.S. House of Representatives, Nevada 1 st District
52	Gil	Waldman	Citizen
53	Leonard	Willoughby	Citizen
54	Linda	Wood	Citizen
55	Virginia	Valentine	Nevada Resort Association
56	Holly	Woodward	Citizen
57	Ian	Zabarte	Western Shoshone Nation
58	Chip	Cameron	Zero Gravity Group
59	Jim	Colgary	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
60	Miriam	Juckett	Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses
61	John	Stamatakos	Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses
62	David	Decker	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
63	Randy	Fedors	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
64	Adam	Gendelman	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
65	Tim	McCartin	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
66	Dave	McIntyre	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
67	David	Pickett	Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses
68	Christine	Pineda	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
69	James	Rubenstone	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
70	Steve	Self	Nuclear Regulatory Commission