

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

Title: Public Meeting on the NRC Staff's Draft Supplement to the Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Thursday, October 15, 2015

Work Order No.: NRC-1941

Pages 1-75

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
+ + + + +  
PUBLIC MEETING ON THE NRC STAFF'S  
DRAFT SUPPLEMENT TO THE  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT  
FOR THE PROPOSED GEOLOGIC REPOSITORY  
AT YUCCA MOUNTAIN, NEVADA

+ + + + +  
THURSDAY  
OCTOBER 15, 2015

+ + + + +  
The Public Meeting was convened via  
teleconference at 2:00 p.m., Chip Cameron, Facilitator,  
presiding.

PRESENT

CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator

ADAM GENDELMAN, Office of the General Counsel

CHRISTINE PINEDA, Senior Project Manager, Yucca  
Mountain Directorate, NMSS

JAMES RUBENSTONE, Acting Director, Yucca  
Mountain Directorate, NMSS

A-G-E-N-D-A

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

Meeting Opens

    Chip Cameron.....3

Introduction

    James Rubenstone.....6

Overview of Supplement

    Christine Pineda.....8

Opportunity for Clarifying Questions.....17

Opportunity to Provide Oral Comments.....23

Meeting Closes.....75

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

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

2:00 p.m.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Sydney. Good afternoon, everybody, on the phones. My name is Chip Cameron, and I wanted to welcome you to today's meeting.

The topic today is the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on Groundwater Issues at Yucca Mountain Repository for High-Level Waste Disposal. The draft was prepared by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC, and the NRC would have licensing authority over any repository proposed for Yucca Mountain.

My pleasure to serve as your facilitator for today's meeting. And our meeting today will be conducted over the phone. The NRC has held previous public meetings on this subject in front of live audiences in Rockville, Maryland; Las Vegas, Nevada; and Amargosa Valley, Nevada, but today's meeting by phone only is to give all of you another opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Listening to your comments today is a prime objective of the meeting. Other important objectives are to have the NRC Staff clearly explain to you not only the process for the Environmental Impact Statement, but

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 also to tell you some information about the findings in  
2 the Draft EIS. And I'm emphasizing the word "draft."  
3 This Environmental Impact Statement will not be  
4 finalized until the NRC has considered all of the  
5 comments from this phone meeting today, the other public  
6 meetings, as well as written comments that are submitted  
7 on the Draft EIS, and the NRC Staff will be telling you  
8 how to submit written comments in a few minutes.

9           The format today is very simple. We're  
10 going to have some brief NRC presentations. Then we're  
11 going to have a short time for clarifying questions on  
12 the EIS process, and then we're going to go to comments  
13 from all of you who wish to make them. And during that  
14 comment portion of the meeting, the NRC Staff is not  
15 going to engage in a discussion with you about your  
16 comments, but they will be listening carefully, and they  
17 will consider your comments in preparing the Final  
18 Environmental Impact Statement.

19           If you reference a document in your  
20 comments such as a map or a study, the NRC Staff may ask  
21 you, remind you to submit that document with your  
22 comments.

23           In terms of ground rules, after the NRC  
24 Staff presentations, we'll go out to you for clarifying  
25 questions, and then for comments. And as Sydney has told

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you, and I think she'll remind you again; Sydney is the  
2 operator managing the phone call. She'll ask you to  
3 press star, 1 on your phone, and then she's going to  
4 place your call in line to come into the room here at  
5 NRC Headquarters in Rockville, Maryland. And as always,  
6 I would ask you to be crisp in your comments so that we  
7 can make sure that we hear from everyone who wants to  
8 talk before we adjourn today. So, I'm asking you to  
9 follow a five-minute rule in your comments. And,  
10 fortunately, if you want to amplify on your oral  
11 comments today, you can do that by submitting a written  
12 comment to the NRC.

13           The focus of the meeting, the focus of the  
14 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement are  
15 groundwater issues at Yucca Mountain, and I know that  
16 you might have broader concerns than groundwater. The  
17 Yucca Mountain repository process has been long and  
18 complicated, and there's been many, many issues, but the  
19 NRC Staff is going to listen to any concern you raise,  
20 but it would be most helpful to hear comments on the  
21 groundwater issues in the Draft Environmental Impact  
22 Statement.

23           And, finally, we're transcribing this  
24 meeting and that's going to be NRC's record, and your  
25 record of what happened today on the phones. And please

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 note that we have all of your comments from the previous  
2 meetings. You can comment again, if you want to, but if  
3 you're worried that the NRC did not hear your comment,  
4 you don't have to worry about that. They have all of the  
5 comments.

6 Let me introduce our speakers from the NRC  
7 Staff. First, we're going to go to Jim Rubenstone. Jim  
8 is the Acting Director of the Yucca Mountain Project  
9 Directorate in the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and  
10 Safeguards here at NRC Headquarters in Rockville,  
11 Maryland. Then we're going to go to Christine Pineda.  
12 Christine is the Senior Project Manager in the  
13 Directorate. And we also, although he doesn't have a  
14 speaking role, we do have Adam Gendelman here. Adam is  
15 the counsel to the Yucca Mountain Project Directorate  
16 from NRC's Office of General Counsel, and if there are  
17 any legal issues, he'll be able to deal with all those.

18 And with that, I thank you for being on the  
19 phone, and I'm going to turn it over to Jim Rubenstone.

20 MR. RUBENSTONE: Thank you, Chip. Good  
21 afternoon to everyone on the phone, and welcome to this,  
22 our fourth public meeting on the NRC's Draft Supplement  
23 to the Department of Energy's Environmental Impact  
24 Statements for a Geologic Repository for Spent Nuclear  
25 Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Mountain, Nevada.

2 As Chip said, I'm Jim Rubenstone. I'm  
3 Acting Director of the Yucca Mountain Directorate at  
4 NRC. And I think as you all know, the NRC has released  
5 this Draft Supplement for public comment. The public  
6 comment period began on August 21st, originally for a  
7 comment period of 60 days, but in response to formal  
8 requests from the State of Nevada, Nye County, and  
9 others, NRC has extended this comment period for an  
10 additional month, so it now closes on November 20th.

11 We have scheduled an additional public  
12 teleconference, as well as this one, to receive comments  
13 that will be on November 12th during this extended  
14 period.

15 As Chip noted, public comments are very  
16 important to the NRC, and one of the purposes today is  
17 to accept your comments. We want to be sure that they  
18 are properly captured and can be addressed, so today's  
19 call is being recorded and will be transcribed.

20 Let me remind you that in addition to  
21 providing your comments at this and at our other public  
22 meetings, comments could be submitted by mail to NRC or  
23 through the website Regulations.gov. More details on  
24 how to submit comments are available on the NRC public  
25 website to [www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov), under the Radioactive Waste

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 High-Level Waste Disposal Key Documents drop-down.

2 The transcripts, meeting summaries, and  
3 handouts from our other public meetings are also  
4 available at the same page on the NRC website, and we  
5 will be posting the transcript and meeting summary from  
6 today's call at the same page as soon as they are  
7 available.

8 Let me now introduce Christine Pineda, who  
9 is the Senior Project Manager in the Yucca Mountain  
10 Directorate, and she will introduce the Draft  
11 Supplement, and describe the opportunities for  
12 providing comments.

13 MS. PINEDA: Thanks, Jim. Hi, everyone, and  
14 thank you for your interest in the NRC's Supplement to  
15 the Department of Energy's Environmental Impact  
16 Statement for the proposed Yucca Mountain repository.

17 The agenda for this call is similar to the  
18 agenda for our public meetings in September, as Chip  
19 described. First, I'll provide some background about  
20 the NRC's environmental review process for the Yucca  
21 Mountain repository, and describe the areas covered by  
22 the Draft Supplement. And I will follow the order of the  
23 slides that we used for the September meetings;  
24 although, we're not using slides for this call. And if  
25 you want, you can access the slides by going to the NRC's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 web page, as Jim described, at [www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov), then to  
2 Radioactive Waste, then High-Level Radioactive Waste  
3 Disposal, and then Key Documents.

4 After my overview of the Supplement, we'll  
5 have an opportunity for you to ask clarifying questions,  
6 and then we'll go to the public comment portion of the  
7 call. As Chip mentioned, try to keep your comments to  
8 about five minutes.

9 So, how did we get to this point in the NRC's  
10 environmental review process for the repository? The  
11 framework for the NRC's environmental review process is  
12 defined by the National Environmental Policy Act, and  
13 that Act requires that federal agencies consider the  
14 environmental consequences of their proposed actions.

15 The NRC's proposed actions are licensing  
16 actions or rulemakings, and the NRC develops  
17 Environmental Impact Statements, or Environmental  
18 Assessments for these types of actions. The Nuclear  
19 Waste Policy Act requires that the Department of Energy  
20 prepare the Environmental Impact Statement for the  
21 proposed repository, and it also requires that the NRC  
22 adopt the Department of Energy's Environmental Impact  
23 Statement to the extent practicable.

24 A number of events or activities have  
25 occurred over the last several years that relate to the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 NRC's environmental review process. The Department of  
2 Energy published its Final Environmental Impact  
3 Statement in 2002, and it submitted that EIS along with  
4 its site recommendation to the President in 2002.

5 In 2008, the Department of Energy published  
6 a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement,  
7 which supplemented the entire 2002 repository  
8 Environmental Impact Statement. And in 2008, the  
9 Department of Energy submitted that EIS along with its  
10 original EIS and its license application to the NRC for  
11 review.

12 The NRC Staff reviewed the Department of  
13 Energy's Environmental Impact Statements and issued  
14 what we refer to as our Adoption Determination Report,  
15 and we issued that in September of 2008.

16 What did the NRC Staff find in the Adoption  
17 Determination Report? We determined that the Department  
18 of Energy's EISs could be adopted, but that  
19 supplementation was needed. The Adoption Determination  
20 Report describes the scope of the needed analysis  
21 stating that further characterization was needed of how  
22 the groundwater moves through the aquifer, especially  
23 beyond the post-closure regulatory compliance point.

24 The Staff also determined in the Adoption  
25 Determination Report that an assessment was needed of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the potential impacts from the repository that could  
2 occur beyond the regulatory compliance point. So, these  
3 would be the potential impacts on the aquifer from  
4 contaminants coming from the repository, as well as the  
5 impacts at locations where groundwater discharges to  
6 the surface.

7 The Staff also concluded in that report  
8 that further characterization of the aquifer and the  
9 potential impacts should account for both radiological  
10 and non-radiological contaminants.

11 You may be wondering why the NRC Staff is  
12 supplementing the Department of Energy's EISs, and it  
13 is a complicated chain of events leading up to this  
14 point. In 2008, when we issued our Adoption  
15 Determination Report, the NRC requested that the  
16 Department of Energy produce the needed supplements,  
17 but at that time the Department of Energy deferred to  
18 the NRC.

19 In 2011, the Commission directed the NRC  
20 Staff and the NRC's Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
21 to cease its license review and hearing activities  
22 related to the repository in response to a lack of  
23 continued funding for the project.

24 In 2013, the Court of Appeals for the  
25 District of Columbia Circuit ordered the NRC to continue

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 its licensing activities as long as it still had funds  
2 available from appropriations that were made in  
3 previous years. In response to the court decision, the  
4 Commission directed the Staff to complete its Safety  
5 Evaluation Report, which was finished in January of this  
6 year. The Commission also requested that the Department  
7 of Energy complete the needed supplementation for the  
8 Environmental Impact Statement. But, again, the  
9 Department of Energy deferred to the NRC, so the  
10 Commission directed the Staff to develop the  
11 Supplement, which we began to work on after completing  
12 the Safety Evaluation Report.

13 The scope of the Supplement, as I mentioned  
14 earlier, is described in our Adoption Determination  
15 Report, and the scope is limited because the Staff  
16 determined in that report that the EISs were otherwise  
17 acceptable to be adopted by the NRC.

18 The potentially affected area that we cover  
19 in the Supplement is the area of the groundwater flow  
20 path that could include contaminant releases from the  
21 repository. The focus is on the area beyond the  
22 post-closure regulatory compliance point. From that  
23 point onward, the groundwater flows through the  
24 Amargosa Desert and, ultimately, to the Furnace Creek  
25 and Middle Basin areas of Death Valley. The groundwater

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reaches the surface both in irrigation areas and natural  
2 discharge areas. For example, in the Amargosa Valley  
3 area, groundwater is pumped for the irrigation of crops.

4 As its primary model of the regional  
5 groundwater system, the NRC Staff used the Death Valley  
6 Regional Groundwater Flow System Model developed by the  
7 United States Geological Survey. You can see the area  
8 encompassed by the model if you click on the poster  
9 titled "Regional Groundwater Flow System," on our Key  
10 Documents web page, or Slide 8 of the presentation from  
11 the September meetings.

12 The resources that we determined could be  
13 affected by potential contaminants from the repository  
14 entering the groundwater include the groundwater  
15 itself, which we refer to in the Supplement as the  
16 Aquifer Environment, and we refer to it that way because  
17 we consider the rock that the groundwater is flowing  
18 through, whether it's bedrock or sediment, because some  
19 contaminants can become attached to rock particles,  
20 while others may flow along with the groundwater.

21 We also looked at impacts on soils at  
22 locations where the groundwater discharges to the  
23 ground surface, impacts on public health, if members of  
24 the public were exposed to contaminated soils or  
25 groundwater, and impacts on vegetation and wildlife. We

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 looked at the potential for disproportionate impacts on  
2 minorities or low-income populations that may be  
3 located in the areas of groundwater pumping, or at  
4 natural surface discharge locations.

5 The framework for the analysis, or the key  
6 elements of the analysis are the consideration of  
7 radiological and non-radiological contaminants, and  
8 consideration of the potential impacts from those  
9 contaminants for a period of one million years after the  
10 repository would be closed.

11 The NRC Staff's analysis builds on DOE's  
12 model of repository performance that the NRC Staff  
13 assessed in its Safety Evaluation Report. In our  
14 analysis in the Supplement, we considered different  
15 groundwater pumping and climate cases so that we could  
16 identify a good range of potential impacts. For  
17 groundwater pumping, we assumed in one case that  
18 groundwater would be pumped as is currently occurring at  
19 Amargosa Farms for irrigation. And for that case, we  
20 conservatively assumed that all the contaminants that  
21 enter the groundwater from the repository and flow to  
22 that point would be drawn up through the pumping.

23 In another case, we assumed that no  
24 groundwater pumping occurred, and in that situation all  
25 of the groundwater would be left to flow to natural

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 surface discharge locations. And for each discharge  
2 location, we assumed conservatively that all of the  
3 contaminants would reach the ground surface.

4 We also looked at two different climate  
5 cases. In one case, we assume a hot and dry climate  
6 similar to today's climate. And this case also  
7 encompasses the conditions of a hotter climate that we  
8 might see in the near future.

9 In another case, we assume a cooler and  
10 wetter climate which would experience more  
11 precipitation, and this would result in more water  
12 entering the groundwater system, which could affect the  
13 concentrations of the contaminants flowing through that  
14 system.

15 Both the amount of groundwater pumping and  
16 climate could also affect where groundwater would reach  
17 the surface. For example, in the case of a wetter future  
18 climate, ancient springs that are now dry areas could  
19 become active again. If you happen to be looking at the  
20 slides from the previous meetings, you can see how these  
21 spring areas look currently on Slide 12.

22 What conclusions does the Staff make in the  
23 Supplement? The Supplement concludes that the potential  
24 direct and indirect impacts from contaminants entering  
25 the groundwater from the repository would be small, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 the NRC defines "small" as the environmental effects  
2 would not be detectible, or would be so minor that they  
3 would not noticeably alter important attributes of the  
4 resources that we assessed the impact for.

5 Likewise, we concluded that the potential  
6 cumulative impacts would be small, and these are impacts  
7 from the repository alone when combined with the  
8 potential impacts from other activities in the region,  
9 such as activities on the Nevada test site.

10 The Staff ultimately determined that our  
11 impact conclusions are consistent with our  
12 understanding of how the potential contaminants would  
13 move through the aquifer.

14 That summarizes our Draft Supplement. The  
15 next steps, we will have another teleconference, as Jim  
16 mentioned, to receive comments on November 12th, and the  
17 comment period closes November 20th. We will then take  
18 all the public comments we have received, read them,  
19 summarize them, and provide responses to the comment  
20 summaries. The responses will be in an appendix to the  
21 Final Supplement that we'll publish in the first-half  
22 of next year.

23 Now we can take some clarifying questions  
24 about the NRC's process.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Sydney, can you see if

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 anybody has a clarifying question on the process for us,  
2 and then put that person into the room?

3 OPERATOR: At this time, if you do have a  
4 question, please press star 1 at record your name at the  
5 prompt. I will then open your line. Again, star 1 if you  
6 do have a question. It will take just a moment for people  
7 to come in.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Do we have Cecile Pineda  
9 on the line?

10 OPERATOR: Cecile, your line is open.

11 MS. PINEDA: Thank you very much for your  
12 commentary, Christine and Jim. My hat is off to you;  
13 your ability to prophesy what will be pertaining  
14 conditions on this planet one million years from now is  
15 truly astounding, and you have my deep congratulations.  
16 I am a mere mortal, so I cannot foresee a million years  
17 ahead.

18 What I can share, however, is that the  
19 western Shoshone whose land of this repository happens  
20 to be proposed for, know that that mountain is swimming  
21 west, and they have known that before contact; that is,  
22 before the White man, number one.

23 Number two, that mountain is 10 percent  
24 water. Any kind of burial system that you can create will  
25 not be impervious to the constant leaching of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 salt-contaminated waters. Under those conditions, any  
2 canisters that are deposited there will begin to  
3 disintegrate within 20 minutes.

4 MR. CAMERON: Cecile ---

5 MS. PINEDA: I want to refer you to my  
6 sources because I think that before any further  
7 discussion is necessary, it is very important to factor  
8 in more information.

9 The first one is a film. The director is  
10 Michael Madsen. The title of the film is "Into  
11 Eternity," and it documents what the experience is in  
12 Finland at Onkalo, which is deep depository that has  
13 been designed and is currently under construction in  
14 solid granite, and is a very important document that  
15 must be looked at before any kinds of decisions like that  
16 can be made.

17 The second source is equally important. It  
18 is a book by John, J-O-H-N, D'Agata, capital D,  
19 apostrophe, capital A-G-A-T-A, and the title is "About  
20 a Mountain." It documents precisely what the various  
21 steps and missteps have been in terms of trying to create  
22 a depository out of Yucca Mountain.

23 The last comment that I basically have to  
24 make is that fundamentally, nuclear energy does not have  
25 a proper means of disposal, and that any kind of attempt

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to identify Yucca Mountain or any other location as a  
2 repository is simply window dressing to make people less  
3 afraid of what will happen to waste substances.

4 I think that alternative technologies need  
5 to be investigated, and some do exist. They are in a  
6 purely hypothetical stage as yet, and one of them is  
7 called the Roy Process, that's R-O-Y, and it has to do  
8 with the possibility of transforming highly, highly  
9 radiological waste into something that is far less  
10 toxic. But I do counsel you to consider that Yucca  
11 Mountain will yet again be another boondoggle. Billions  
12 of dollars will be allocated to it, and the same thing  
13 will occur. It will become very, very apparent that  
14 Yucca Mountain is simply not a suitable location for  
15 such a depository because the mountain is swimming west,  
16 and it will have moved a great deal in the next million  
17 years. And at the same time, any kind of drip from any  
18 kind --- in any kind of storage area is going to corrode  
19 whatever canisters are placed there, and that process  
20 will begin within 20 minutes. Thank you very much.

21 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Cecile. We're going  
22 to consider that as a formal comment. And I'd just like  
23 to remind everybody at this point of two things. One,  
24 this is an opportunity to ask a question, a clarifying  
25 question on process. This is not the opportunity to make

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 your comment, which we're really interested in hearing.  
2 And, secondly, we are going to hold people to, when we  
3 do get the comments, to a five-minute ground rule.

4 Now, we're going to go to another  
5 opportunity for a clarifying question, and that's to  
6 Kenneth Freelain. Kenneth, can you put --- Sydney, can  
7 you put Kenneth in?

8 OPERATOR: His line is now open.

9 MR. FREELAIN: Yes, hello. Can you hear me?

10 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

11 MR. FREELAIN: It is possible that perhaps  
12 I should make my statement a little later in a different  
13 part of the program.

14 MR. CAMERON: I think if it's a comment,  
15 Kenneth, I think we would ask you to save that so we can  
16 just make sure that we get any clarifications on the  
17 record, and then we'll go to those comments. And I'll  
18 make sure that when we go to the comment period we're  
19 going to start with you first. Okay?

20 MR. FREELAIN: Okay.

21 MR. CAMERON: All right. Thank you, Kenneth.

22 MR. FREELAIN: Sure thing.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And we have Mary Olson  
24 with, perhaps, a clarifying question. Mary?

25 MS. OLSON: Hey, Chip Cameron, can you hear

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 me?

2 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

3 MS. OLSON: Okay. I have two questions. I  
4 understand that there was a court directive to get this  
5 piece of work done, this Supplement, but what options  
6 do people have to at this juncture challenge the idea  
7 of supplementing the previous documents? In other  
8 words, there's been so many shifts and changes that have  
9 occurred, that supplementing documents that are out of  
10 date is, in our view, what's happening. So, the first  
11 question is, are there options in the NRC's regulatory  
12 processes for someone to engage with that, as opposed  
13 to commenting on the product, you know?

14 And then my second question, a little bit  
15 further afield, but maybe someone can address it; which  
16 is, if the licensing proceeding were to resume on Yucca,  
17 this is sort of happening with the Staff's issuing those  
18 documents, but were the full proceeding to be resumed,  
19 will there be a Federal Register Notice, and what will  
20 be the juncture? I mean, will there be an opportunity  
21 for additional parties at that time, since the whole  
22 thing was suspended, or how will that kick-start happen,  
23 if it does?

24 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Mary. And we're going  
25 to go to Staff Counsel, Adam Gendelman, to address both

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of your questions. The first one was the ability to  
2 comment on other documents that may have been superseded  
3 by events. And the second question was related to the  
4 process, if it ever gets started again, how will the  
5 public get notice? Will there be an opportunity for  
6 other parties to join the adjudicatory hearing? And I'm  
7 going to turn it over to Adam now on both of those  
8 questions.

9 MR. GENDELMAN: This is Adam Gendelman.  
10 Thank you for the questions.

11 First, with regard to the decision to  
12 supplement and the NRC Staff process, the NRC Staff  
13 supplemented the EIS consistent with direction from the  
14 Commission. With regard to the other documents, for  
15 example, the other NEPA documents, there are currently  
16 admitted Contentions in the suspended adjudication  
17 concerning those documents, but beyond that, I don't  
18 believe there's an opportunity to comment on the process  
19 as it's occurred to this point.

20 With regard to the potential resumption of  
21 the adjudication, I would be very hesitant to speculate  
22 on if and when that could occur. But, in general, if it  
23 did, there would certainly be robust notice of its  
24 resumption. And if additional parties sought to join the  
25 adjudication at that point following our Rules of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Practice in Part 2, that opportunity would present  
2 itself.

3 MR. CAMERON: And, Mary, do you have a  
4 follow-up for hearing Adam's answers? Okay, thank you,  
5 Mary, for the questions. And I believe that's all the  
6 clarifying questions we have, so we are going to go to  
7 comment now. And as promised, we're going to go to  
8 Kenneth Freelain first. Sydney, could you put Kenneth  
9 through to us?

10 OPERATOR: One moment. Kenneth, your line is  
11 now open.

12 MR. FREELAIN: Okay, thank you. My name is  
13 Kenneth Freelain, and I am a licensed professional  
14 engineer. I can be reached by telephone at 301-891-0496.  
15 I can be reached by email at the following email address;  
16 engineering, E-N-G-I-N-E-E-R-I-N-G, dot or period,  
17 tribute, T-R-I-B-U-T-E@gmail.com.

18 In this brief statement, I will outline  
19 some of the reasons why the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste  
20 Repository should be discussed and analyzed during the  
21 forthcoming Engineering Tribute to the Presidential  
22 Inauguration of January 20th, 2017.

23 The Engineering Tribute will be  
24 videotaped, and then it will be aired on television, so  
25 I am now extending this open invitation to individuals,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 to corporations, and/or to government agencies who wish  
2 to participate by taking one of the following two  
3 choices. Choice number one, by providing me with  
4 prerecorded material which has already been prerecorded  
5 for television broadcasting; or choice number two, by  
6 coming into our television studios and then recording  
7 the material which can be aired on television at a later  
8 time.

9 The forthcoming Engineering Tribute should  
10 include information about the Nuclear Regulatory  
11 Commission, the United States Department of Energy,  
12 and/or the proposed Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste  
13 Repository.

14 Now, here is some historical background  
15 information about the Engineering Tribute. During  
16 various Engineering Tributes, a variety of subjects  
17 have been discussed over the years, including bridges,  
18 roads, the condition of the infrastructure, water  
19 supplies, environmental protection, climate control,  
20 mass transit systems, et cetera. The next Engineering  
21 Tribute is scheduled to take place after the  
22 Presidential Inauguration of January 20th, 2017.

23 During past Engineering Tributes, various  
24 individuals, governmental agencies, organizations  
25 have participated in using the following material.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           The following three topics should be  
2 included in the Engineering Tribute of 2017, which is  
3 approximately a year and a half away. Information  
4 --- this is Topic 1, information about the Yucca  
5 Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository. Topic 2, information  
6 pertaining to the United States Department of Energy.  
7 And Topic 3, information which is relevant to the United  
8 States Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

9           The closing of the Yucca Mountain Nuclear  
10 Waste Repository leaves many American non-governmental  
11 entities, such as utilities, without any designated  
12 long-term storage site for the high-level radioactive  
13 waste which is stored on site at various nuclear  
14 facilities around the country. Right now, the United  
15 States Government disposes of its nuclear waste at the  
16 Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico in rooms which  
17 are located underground. The Department of Energy is  
18 reviewing other options for a high-level waste  
19 repository.

20           I want to thank you for your time and  
21 attention, and interested prospective participants are  
22 welcome to call me, Kenneth Freelain, at 301-891-0496.  
23 Those who care to correspond with me by email may use  
24 the following address: [Engineering.tribute@gmail.gov](mailto:Engineering.tribute@gmail.gov).  
25 Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Kenneth, for  
2 telling us about the Engineering Tribute. And we  
3 remember you from when you came to our first public  
4 meeting here in Rockville, Maryland. So, thank you,  
5 Kenneth.

6 And now we're going to go --- okay, we're  
7 going to comment and if you press star 1, Sydney will  
8 put you in the queue. And please introduce yourself to  
9 us.

10 OPERATOR: I'm showing one comment coming  
11 in. Please stand by. Our first comment will come from  
12 Bill Stremmel. Your line is now open.

13 MR. STREMMEL: Thank you. Particularly  
14 responding to the woman from the Shoshone Tribe, and she  
15 seems to echo this general line of criticism that Yucca  
16 Mountain is not perfect, so we've got to start the whole  
17 thing all over again, and either find another  
18 centralized repository, or just do things at the  
19 individual sites which we have now over 100, they're  
20 disasters waiting to happen, whether it's the fuel rods  
21 sitting in the pools, or if they're already in casks,  
22 but it's still --- these have to be individually  
23 secured, maintained.

24 It's just impossible to replicate the  
25 degree of protection and mitigation that we can do with

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the supervised at all these locations. We have a  
2 disaster ongoing at Hanford Nuclear Reservation in  
3 Washington State. The waste that was in liquid was meant  
4 to be solidified in new casks and brought down to Yucca  
5 Mountain. Because the project has been delayed purely  
6 for political, not technical reasons, it has to stay up  
7 there in liquid form, and now it's --- we have a  
8 radioactive pool heading for the Columbia River. Nobody  
9 knows how to stop it. If it goes get in the watershed,  
10 heaven forbid, that all the efforts we've had to restore  
11 the salmon run will be for naught. It will just be  
12 permanently poisonous and rendered inedible for human  
13 consumption. That's just one of many examples.

14 The Indian Point plant off of New York City,  
15 the two planes that crashed into the Trade Center, they  
16 could have just swooped down and if they had hit that  
17 pool instead, we would have had a much greater  
18 catastrophe than what did happen on 9/11. We would have  
19 had to immediately evacuate over 16 million people from  
20 the disposal of the radioactive content.

21 So, these are examples of why the present  
22 situation of leaving of waste scattered around the  
23 country is just unacceptable. Maybe there is some  
24 technology for rendering it harmless, but to undertake  
25 all these activities, which is essentially reprocessing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 again, you run the risk of leakage and whatever  
2 replicated over 100 places around the country.

3 We cannot complete the decommissioning  
4 process at any of these plants. Some of them were closed  
5 decades ago, until the waste is removed off the site.  
6 And this is tying up a lot of valuable real estate.  
7 Almost all of it is prime water frontage because the  
8 plants had to be on some body of water, river, lake,  
9 ocean for their cooling. And we can't redevelop this  
10 land, also because people are afraid of, you know, the  
11 specter of knowing that waste is proximate. It depresses  
12 the property values around. So, I was just at a seminar  
13 in Nevada chaired by Gary Hollis, and he explained, just  
14 went down the line why Yucca Mountain is just about the  
15 only suitable location in the country.

16 Sure, maybe as the woman said, in a million  
17 years theoretically it's supposed to flow, but that's  
18 true of just about any place on the earth's crust. I  
19 mean, we need to do something. I think this is the best  
20 way forward.

21 Finally, I do want to ask if there was any  
22 possibility of leakage. There's leakage going on now.  
23 People don't acknowledge it. There's waste constantly  
24 being plugged into Shoshone up on 27 and 178, and to  
25 Peralta to the Nuclear Security Sites. But if there was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 any leakage in addition to what's happening now, will  
2 they consider say a pilot desalination pipeline from the  
3 coast to replace our groundwater that becomes  
4 contaminated?

5 And, finally, there's a matter of if we had  
6 Yucca Mountain, what is currently being trucked in, it  
7 would be feasible to establish a rail line all the way  
8 down there, and then put everything, including what's  
9 coming in now onto railroad and cease the trucking all  
10 together. And rail is apparently more secure and safe  
11 because it's self-steering, as opposed to trucks which  
12 can run the highways and suffer a much higher degree of  
13 accidents. So, that's the end of my comments.

14 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very  
15 much, Bill.

16 We're going to hear from Marty Malsch now,  
17 and then David Schonberger, and then Susan Carpenter.  
18 So, Marty, are you on the line? Sydney, can you put Marty  
19 Malsch through?

20 OPERATOR: His line is now open.

21 MR. MALSCH: Okay. Thank you, Chip. This is  
22 Marty Malsch, Egan, Fitzpatrick, Malsch, and Lawrence  
23 representing the State of Nevada.

24 I had one comment and a related question,  
25 and another question. The comment arises from a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 statement the Staff made on page 3-35 of Section 3.3 of  
2 their Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

3 At the top of that page, the NRC Staff  
4 concludes that "DOE would need to assess whether further  
5 consultation and investigation are necessary to account  
6 for potential impacts on cultural resources that may be  
7 located in areas where groundwater discharges to the  
8 surface."

9 It strikes me this is an issue within the  
10 scope of the SEIS, as the Staff has defined it; yet, it  
11 indicates that there's an incomplete evaluation. So,  
12 I'm wondering whether the Staff plans to take any  
13 additional steps to close this issue out?

14 And my second question is really whether in  
15 light of what has happened so far, and the comments that  
16 have been received so far, whether the Staff foresees  
17 any changes to its schedule or its resources estimates  
18 for completing the SEIS? Thank you.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Marty. Usually,  
20 we don't answer questions raised during the comment  
21 period, but your questions are very pertinent. And I  
22 think Jim Rubenstone is going to attempt to address  
23 those now. Jim?

24 MR. RUBENSTONE: Yes. On your first  
25 question, I think we're --- our activities planned

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 right now are limited to finalizing this Supplement to  
2 the Environmental Impact Statement.

3 And on your second question, as of now we  
4 have a schedule which has comment period closing on  
5 November 20th. And at that point, we will evaluate based  
6 on the volume and complexity of the comments whether we  
7 need to revise our plan to complete the Final in the  
8 first half of 2006, or 16. Excuse me.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,  
10 Marty. Did you have a comment, or was that it? All right.  
11 Well, we're going to go to David Schonberger now.  
12 Sydney, can you put David into the call?

13 OPERATOR: He is now on talk.

14 MR. SCHONBERGER: Hello.

15 MR. CAMERON: Hi.

16 MR. SCHONBERGER: Yes. This is David  
17 Schonberger, member of the public calling from the State  
18 of Michigan to submit comments on NUREG-2184 Draft SEIS.

19 So for Michigan, I would say that there are  
20 tremendous groundwater and surface water issues  
21 pertaining to the Yucca Mountain facility, which are,  
22 in fact, applicable to the Great Lakes Region where I  
23 live. So, I do request, therefore, that additional  
24 in-person public meetings be scheduled in the Great  
25 Lakes Region, including Michigan specifically, where

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 there are aging reactors that will need to be  
2 decommissioned.

3 The opening of the Yucca Mountain facility  
4 would trigger the launch of unprecedented large-scale  
5 interstate shipments of radioactive materials by train,  
6 truck, and barge. There are groundwater and surface  
7 water implications to that.

8 I contend that the Draft SEIS is currently  
9 deficient for failing to take a hard look at the siloed  
10 federal regulations governing the nation's  
11 transportation infrastructure; specifically,  
12 including the current lack of any federal standards for  
13 railroad wear and cracking.

14 In rebuttal to a previous commenter, rail  
15 safety is overseen by the Federal Railroad  
16 Administration, but the rail industry has successfully  
17 opposed enacting any federal rules on track wear, so  
18 that the railroad companies are allowed to use their own  
19 voluntary internal guidelines to self-regulate. The  
20 industry's record is terrible as evidenced by recent oil  
21 train accidents which have impacted surface water and  
22 groundwater resources in this country. It is reasonably  
23 foreseeable that the heavy weight and the dynamic loads  
24 of Yucca train shipments heading to Nevada from Michigan  
25 could cause track weaknesses on the rail lines to fail.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This issue has not been comprehensively analyzed, or  
2 alternatives addressed, or mitigation proposed by the  
3 Draft SEIS, simply due to the limitation of scope of your  
4 Agency's jurisdiction. So, therefore, your Draft SEIS  
5 is inherently structurally flawed, and incomplete, and  
6 inadequate. Thank you.

7 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, David.  
8 And the Staff did hear your request for meetings in  
9 Michigan. Thank you.

10 Sydney, could you put Susan Carpenter in to  
11 us?

12 OPERATOR: Susan's line is now open.

13 MS. CARPENTER: Thank you. Thank you for the  
14 opportunity to speak.

15 First of all, I am rather appalled that we  
16 are sitting here talking about Yucca Mountain today. I  
17 am not sure how this came about, because everything I  
18 had read basically disqualified it, and the only reason  
19 it was chosen is because Nevada was politically  
20 vulnerable.

21 I'm worried about the timeline. You're  
22 talking about putting in storage. First of all, there's  
23 not enough storage space in Yucca Mountain for all of  
24 the waste we already have. Second, I have discovered  
25 that you're talking about putting the waste there,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 leaving it for 100 years, and then installing titanium  
2 drip shields, which makes no sense to me because if  
3 there's a problem with groundwater, then those shields  
4 are necessary. But if everything is safe as you say, then  
5 it kind of makes the question pointless.

6 I was thinking about this. I was thinking  
7 we're talking about 10,000 years, and now I'm hearing  
8 a million years. And it was only a few thousand years  
9 ago that we entered --- we left the Stone Age. And how  
10 we can have the arrogance to think that we can basically  
11 handle a situation that far in the future. I consider  
12 what happens in four years as a Presidential term, and  
13 imagine this extended into a million years. And we have  
14 no idea what will be happening then. We have no idea how  
15 man will evolve, how the world situation will be. And  
16 I think we're just biting off far more than we can chew,  
17 with the thoughts of taking all of this radiation  
18 material, radioactive waste and moving it across  
19 country, when we know the average rate of accidents in  
20 different areas, and can factor that in. And I think it's  
21 a very bad idea.

22 I was very interested in what Cecile Pineda  
23 had to say, and I will follow-up those sources. But I  
24 thank you.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Susan. And

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we're going to go next to Marvin Lewis, then to Sarah  
2 Fields, then to Paula Gotsch. And, Sydney, could you put  
3 Marvin into us, please?

4 OPERATOR: Marvin's line is now open.

5 MR. CAMERON: Are you there, Marvin?

6 OPERATOR: Marvin, please check your mute  
7 button or pick up your handset.

8 MR. LEWIS: This is Marvin.

9 MR. CAMERON: Hi, Marvin.

10 MR. LEWIS: Are you ready for my question or  
11 comment? Thank you.

12 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

13 MR. LEWIS: Well, initially, I mean like  
14 today the TPP treaty's text has been partially released.  
15 I feel that this whole Yucca Mountain thing is deficient  
16 in that it has not looked at NAFTA, TPP, and what have  
17 you. In other words, we may find ourselves, depending  
18 on what the text will be, hoisting on our own petard and  
19 having to be the national sacrifice zone for all the  
20 radioactive waste in this world. Just a thought, but I'd  
21 like to hear the comments from the Staff, and I'd like  
22 to see it explored. Thank you.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you  
24 very much, Marvin. Sydney, could we have Sarah Fields?

25 OPERATOR: Sarah's line is now open.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. FIELDS: Thank you. I'm Sarah Fields  
2 from Moab, Utah, and I would like to reiterate some of  
3 David Schonberger's concerns regarding the impacts of  
4 opening Yucca Mountain as it spreads out throughout the  
5 country because of the transportation issues, and the  
6 other issues that would impact groundwater in local  
7 communities.

8 Next to Nevada, Utah would have the most  
9 --- the largest number of casks transported to the  
10 state, and so that will come down to Colorado into Utah.  
11 And a particular concern is the narrow rail line to a  
12 canyon right above the Colorado River. I have ridden on  
13 that rail line before. It's also an Amtrak Rail Line,  
14 and then into canyons in Utah. Also, I-70 which goes 30  
15 miles north of my community would also  
16 --- particularly going through Colorado, any accident  
17 could impact the Colorado River. And our rail lines are  
18 not sufficient to protect the public health and safety  
19 for this type of transportation, and nor are our  
20 interstate highways. This is an issue.

21 One of the problems is the NRC tries to  
22 isolate issues so that you can work on one little issue,  
23 and say oh, okay, here, and not look at the whole picture  
24 where you have an accumulation of numerous problems. One  
25 problem I understand is that Yucca Mountain was designed

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for a certain type of uniform storage container, and yet  
2 those types of storage containers are no longer under  
3 development. And throughout the country, high-level  
4 nuclear waste is being put into various types of casks.  
5 Many of those would not be suitable for transportation,  
6 or for ultimate storage at Yucca Mountain, so you have  
7 to go through a process of moving waste from spent fuel  
8 pools, from possible interim storage sites, or dry cask  
9 storage at reactor sites, and yet you --- into the  
10 proper type of container, and that has its own issues,  
11 which would also impact groundwater and surface water  
12 at these reactor sites. Thank you.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much,  
14 Sarah. We're going to go to Paula Gotsch now. And I would  
15 just remind everybody, if you want to comment just press  
16 star 1 and Sydney, the operator, will be keeping track  
17 of that. Now we're going to hear from Paula.

18 MS. GOTSCH: Hello?

19 MR. CAMERON: Hi, Paula.

20 MS. GOTSCH: Hi. Okay. I couldn't help  
21 having great sympathy for Bill Stremmel who told about  
22 the problems at Hanford, and being in a place where our  
23 local nuclear plant will shut down soon, and we will have  
24 all those fuel pool risks, et cetera. But I want to say  
25 that the whole nuclear industry, I think from the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 beginning has based on a game of let's make believe it's  
2 okay. And I think historically, that's been the mantra.

3           And if we make believe that this repository  
4 at Yucca is okay, which we all know it isn't, and the  
5 thing of it is then we're perpetrating this awful  
6 industry which has brought us all these insurmountable  
7 problems that everybody speaks about. Oh, my God, what  
8 are we going to do? And that happened because they've  
9 always said everything is okay, or it's okay. So, if we  
10 say Yucca Mountain is okay, that will not have the effect  
11 Mr. Stremmel would like. It will have the effect of any  
12 still crazy pro nuclear people and industry people who  
13 want to then say okay, Yucca is on the board again, and  
14 we're all set, and we can keep on pushing for more  
15 nuclear plants to make more of this awful waste, and to  
16 keep --- and to make us say oh, my God, this is for  
17 millions of years?

18           Somebody, the woman from the Shoshone place  
19 complimented the people who are, you know, doing this  
20 program that they could foresee millions of years from  
21 now. So, it is past ludicrous, it's past any reasonable  
22 person's ability to try to think about this. So please,  
23 let's not do the next step of make believe. Yucca is not  
24 okay. The transportation will not be okay. The  
25 high-burnup fuel is there, and there are lots of things

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we haven't even dealt with.

2 The man who talked about the railroads,  
3 David Schonberger, is 100 percent right. And we're mere  
4 mortals, and we've been acting like it's okay. Thank you  
5 for your time.

6 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Paula.  
7 And we don't have anybody in the queue right now to  
8 comment. And I would just remind people, if you do want  
9 to make a comment press star 1, and then Sydney will be  
10 able to put you into the room with us, so to speak. We  
11 do have Mary Olson now. Mary, are you on?

12 MS. OLSON: Yes, I'm sorry. I had the button  
13 on my phone pushed.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

15 MS. OLSON: I think there's going to be a  
16 little overlap with the previous comments that we made  
17 at a previous call, but I think we've been thinking a  
18 lot more about it, so I'm going to give an expanded  
19 version.

20 In reviewing, Nuclear Information and  
21 Resource Service, I am Mary Olson. I work for that  
22 organization, NIRS. Our website is [www.NIRS.org](http://www.NIRS.org). And  
23 back in the archives of our website, reviewing it myself  
24 during a period when Kevin Kamps was focusing on these  
25 issues more than I was, we did challenge the federal

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 regulation upon which this portion of the SEIS is  
2 hanging, the EPA's standard. And, yes, there was a shift  
3 because of our lawsuit from 10,000 years to the peak dose  
4 according to when the NAS evaluation thinks it might  
5 happen, and others, and that put it out around a million  
6 years. And so that's how the transition went from 10,000  
7 to a million years, for anybody who's still listening.

8           And I can say that the other facet of that  
9 lawsuit which, unfortunately, was not unsuccessful, but  
10 we did try, was to challenge the notion that 11 miles  
11 away from the repository underpinning, 11 miles out  
12 would be the point at which that regulatory standard  
13 would be applied. So, on one hand it got pushed further  
14 out in time, but it also stayed at this kind of  
15 ridiculous sacrifice zone. I mean, there's --- that's  
16 a lot of space for radionuclides to be allowed to pollute  
17 to any level. And we regret, and we apologize officially  
18 to everybody who may be impacted now and in the future  
19 by that ludicrous idea that you could impose a standard  
20 that far away from the site.

21           So, I'm just putting it in the record that  
22 we are not happy. We were not happy then, we are not happy  
23 now. We understand that is the situation. So,  
24 understanding that situation, we will now assert once  
25 again that there have been changes in this entire

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 program since 2002 that were changes made by elements  
2 of either the waste generating community, the waste  
3 regulating community, or the waste promoting community.  
4 These are not changes that my community had anything to  
5 say about, but they are changes that --- what is the  
6 waste? There's now an Executive Order that will  
7 commingle the defense waste. The 2002 EIS projected that  
8 there would be commingling. That is a major change for  
9 factors that influence that 11 mile, million year mark  
10 of meeting that standard or not, because the heat  
11 factors are totally pivotal in how you would project  
12 when the containers will fail. That which is the thing  
13 that would allow the radioactivity and any other  
14 contaminant that is inside those containers to travel.

15 So, secondly, you're going to have then the  
16 container issue. The whole EIS in 2002 is strung on a  
17 TAD, a standardized container for transport, aging, and  
18 disposal. There may or may not be TADs in this picture,  
19 but if there are, it's going to be involving a whole lot  
20 of steps that is also going to impact the waste form.  
21 And believe me, the waste form is also pivotal in the  
22 2002 filing of the application, and the original Draft  
23 EIS. And what are we going to be doing if we have a bunch  
24 of fuel pellets instead of fuel assemblies? And that  
25 seems to be a very high probability given the fact the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Nuclear Regulatory Commission itself approved  
2 high-burnup fuel in the 1990s, which is not reflected  
3 fully. It is somewhat reflected, but I think NRC Staff  
4 has actually admitted it is not fully reflected in the  
5 EIS, nor its subsequent documents.

6           So, now we have this growing pile of things  
7 that are influential in when and how those containers  
8 fail, what is inside them, how it's going to get out,  
9 and how long it's going to take for it to travel. And  
10 none of it, none of these issues is fully reflected in  
11 the documents that are now being supplemented. And now  
12 you're talking about compliance with a standard 11 miles  
13 out, a million years out that has not, has not been  
14 updated to reflect the change in the type of waste, the  
15 change in the thermal properties of the proposed site,  
16 the change in the container, the change in exactly what  
17 is in the container, and how many times it has been  
18 handled to be in that container, in other words the waste  
19 form. And all of it together, we believe, undercuts any  
20 assertion that anyone could make at this time about an  
21 impact being large or small. It's just too speculative  
22 to make an SEIS that has no, what do you call it, rooting,  
23 anchoring, reality. Yes, like where does it turn into  
24 fantasy?

25           And I think for a lot of people, you talk

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about a million years out, it's instantly talking about  
2 fantasy. But I come from an evolutionary biology  
3 background, and I'm willing to talk about a million  
4 years out, but only when we have a solid footing on what  
5 exactly we're talking about in 10, or 20 years, or 30  
6 years, or whatever the frame is. When that is out the  
7 window, then you have absolutely no basis for projection  
8 on a million years, because you just don't know what  
9 you're saying.

10 And I apologize to all of you that you have  
11 careers, that you have things you need to hang your hat  
12 on. I know how angry everybody got when this whole  
13 project was suspended, or tried to be suspended. I  
14 apologize to you, but we've got to get this right.

15 And I'm going to end by invoking Thomas  
16 Pigford, one of the fathers of nuclear power, and one  
17 of the authors of the National Academy of Science's  
18 report on a site-specific standard for Yucca Mountain.  
19 And Thomas Pigford wrote a dissent on that report  
20 because he said this: "If we don't get the isolation of  
21 nuclear waste correct, then the entire nuclear future  
22 is in jeopardy." So, if you really care about your jobs,  
23 you shouldn't be covering over these mistakes, and  
24 lapses, and fantasies, and departures from good, solid,  
25 empirical approach. You shouldn't cover that over. You

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 must stand up for it, because that is the basis upon  
2 which your industry has a future. Without it, well, it's  
3 just going to be a mess, and I really, really encourage  
4 you to hear me saying that as much as I don't want nuclear  
5 energy, I want there to be a very solid, appropriate  
6 outcome of all the decisions that your industry and your  
7 federal regulation have already made.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

9 MS. OLSON: And without that, we're all SOL.  
10 So, thanks, Chip, I'm done, but I appreciate you  
11 listening.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very  
13 much, Mary. And, Sydney, we're going to go to Leonard  
14 Kellen next, if you could put him through.

15 OPERATOR: His line is open.

16 MR. KELLEN: Hello.

17 MR. CAMERON: Hi.

18 MR. KELLEN: Hi. I just wanted to say that  
19 for those in the nuclear industry, I'm glad what you did  
20 to help us win World War II, but I've got to say ever  
21 since Fukushima happened, I'm just waiting for our  
22 Pacific Ocean to start dying, and that I think one of  
23 these days you guys will be looked at as maybe  
24 responsible for killing the planet, and then we're going  
25 to need to be around the people who have to clean up that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 mess. And you guys will probably be first on the criminal  
2 list. I'm talking about the supporters of this industry,  
3 this wasteful, dangerous, toxic industry. And that's  
4 all I have to say. I'm not really well educated on  
5 nuclear, except I believe what Helen Caldicott said  
6 about no ionizing radiation is safe. Thank you.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Leonard, for  
8 those comments. And we're going to go to Rose Gardner  
9 now. Sydney, can you activate Rose?

10 OPERATOR: Rose, your line is open.

11 MS. GARDNER: Thank you very much for taking  
12 my call. I'm Rose Gardner. I live in Eunice, New Mexico.  
13 Just five miles from my home is Waste Control  
14 Specialists, which is a low-level nuclear dump. I'm also  
15 next to a uranium enrichment factory, URENCO, which is  
16 a foreign-owned company. In Texas, also there is an  
17 organization called AFCI that's trying to open a  
18 high-level nuclear waste dump in Culberson County. And  
19 then here in New Mexico about 70 miles, maybe not even  
20 that far, another company, ELEA, the Eddy Lee Energy  
21 Alliance, is trying to open a high-level nuclear waste  
22 dump. And I listened to the arguments that Yucca  
23 Mountain opposition has made. We are a nation of many  
24 hungry companies, corporations that are wanting to dump  
25 high-level nuclear waste next to people that do not want

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it. These companies will not listen to the average lay  
2 people, so in order for these high-level nuclear waste  
3 dumps to be fought, regular people that know very little  
4 about nuclear waste, nuclear energy are having to join  
5 up, sign up, and petition against these companies. And  
6 may very well go into Eminent Domain to acquire the  
7 sites. It's very frightening, and I wholeheartedly  
8 support all opposition against Yucca Mountain and other  
9 high-level nuclear waste sites.

10 We have to understand these transportation  
11 issues are horrible. I have a train just south of my  
12 hometown that is being speculated as being used to carry  
13 high-level nuclear waste. It derailed earlier this  
14 year. People, this is a frightening thing to happen.

15 I totally and completely support  
16 opposition to all high-level nuclear waste sites, and  
17 transportation. Thank you so much.

18 MR. CAMERON: And thank you, Rose. Next  
19 we're going to hear from Amber Ladeira, and then Artie  
20 Andrews. And, Sydney, can you put Amber through, please?

21 OPERATOR: Amber's line is open.

22 MS. LADEIRA: Thank you, and thank you for  
23 taking my call.

24 Basically, you know who I'm angry at?  
25 Decades back, the geologist who signed off that Yucca

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Mountain is a geologically stable, safe repository for  
2 rad waste. And how that person ever got a degree is  
3 beyond me, because Yucca Mountain, first of all, is on  
4 or near earthquake fault lines. All we have to do is look  
5 up the United States Geological Survey to ascertain the  
6 voracity of that statement.

7           Meanwhile, though, we do have waste that we  
8 have to deal with. And as far as I know, HOSS, Hardened  
9 Onsite Storage, is still the safest way to store rad  
10 waste until better solutions are created, if they ever  
11 are. I have a dim view about nuclear energy, believe me.  
12 Living in Illinois where we have more energy nukes than  
13 anybody else has, you know, and 48 percent of our  
14 electricity comes from them.

15           As far as the casks go, HOLTEC casks had or  
16 have improper welds according to a now dead General  
17 Electric engineer who issued stop work orders, and those  
18 were largely ignored.

19           Regarding transporting this high-level  
20 waste across the country to any place, or even to a  
21 mid-located whatever, it's dangerous on the water,  
22 dangerous on the rails, dangerous on the roads. I mean,  
23 years back, and interesting that Mary quoted so many  
24 statistics from 2002. I was looking into certain  
25 statistics in 2002, so I decided to contact the United

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 States Department of Transportation, and they sent me  
2 per my request a whole bunch of documentation as to all  
3 kinds of accidents, very --- I mean, all kinds,  
4 hazardous waste transport, as well as others. There  
5 weren't terribly many, but they do exist. And anybody  
6 who watches the news with any regularity would be aware  
7 of that.

8 And I want to remind people that in the  
9 industry, outside of the industry regular Joes and  
10 Joannas. Rad waste is toxic for 300,000 to one million  
11 years depending on the isotope, and those numbers have  
12 to do with the half-life. So, it's just --- I just can't  
13 imagine --- and there are so many problems associated  
14 with those whole scenario, and have been associated, and  
15 have not changed in the decades this has been proposed,  
16 put on the back burner. It's like trying to resurrect  
17 a damn dinosaur, but you cannot change the fact of all  
18 of these earthquake fault lines under the mountain or  
19 near the mountain.

20 I don't understand, other than money and  
21 myopia, why anybody would be for this. Anyway, thank you  
22 for letting me expostulate my anti-rad waste madness for  
23 today.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Amber. I  
25 would just remind people that if you do want to make a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comment press star 1, and that will alert Sydney that  
2 you want to make a comment. And we're going to RD Andrews  
3 now. Sydney, do we have RD on?

4 OPERATOR: His line is open.

5 MR. ANDREWS: Yes, can you hear me?

6 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

7 MR. ANDREWS: Okay, thank you.

8 Yes, I'm calling from Colorado not too far  
9 from where the former Rocky Flats sat, a matter of a  
10 short number of miles from here. And that put things a  
11 little bit in context for me, because I have to say that  
12 there was a whole lot of people that --- well, you know,  
13 they were in the environmental community, I would argue,  
14 as I am, myself. But really, they were arguing hey, leave  
15 the waste where it is at Rocky Flats and the nuclear  
16 materials that were there when that plant was proposed  
17 to be decommissioned. And they didn't want anything  
18 moved. Well, I happen to be totally of an opposite  
19 opinion, and I'm very glad that in that case the DOE  
20 didn't listen. And, in fact, they did move the materials  
21 out of there.

22 I hear a lot of groups arguing Mobile  
23 Chernobyl, Fukushima Freeways, things like that, that  
24 sloganing, that is arguing against moving these  
25 dangerous materials to a repository. And I have to say,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you know, I have done personally, because I am  
2 professional engineer myself, modeling of the accident  
3 potentials at all of the existing sites which are  
4 scattered all across the country, and most of which are  
5 sitting in or very near major metropolitan areas. So,  
6 my point is we have to do something with these materials.  
7 We can't just keep putting up roadblocks to getting  
8 something done.

9 For my entire life, which basically covers  
10 most of the atomic age, we have not solved the problems.  
11 We only keep getting piles of reports that just put it  
12 off and put it off. Like the Blue Ribbon Commission most  
13 recently said well, you know, we might get around to  
14 these things someday, maybe 50 years into the future,  
15 maybe never.

16 We do --- Yucca Mountain may not be the  
17 perfect solution, and I will not argue that it is but,  
18 in fact, I think we do need to face the issue of moving  
19 these materials, and getting them fairly promptly out  
20 of the major metropolitan areas where they are, in fact,  
21 incredibly attractive terrorist sites. We just cannot  
22 run that risk. Hardened onsite storage is best at the  
23 moment, but even more dangerous, of course, are the  
24 spent fuel pools.

25 We just have to get this process underway.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I encourage you to do everything you can to start the  
2 process. Don't put it off for decades to come. Thank you.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, RD. And  
4 please hit star 1 if you want to get in the queue. We're  
5 here until 4:00, and we want to hear from as many people  
6 as possible. So, if you want to comment, please hit star  
7 1, and Sydney will place you into the call.

8 OPERATOR: And at this time, I'm showing no  
9 one prompting. And I—looks like as I said that, one  
10 question did come in.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

12 OPERATOR: Ace Hoffman, your line is open.

13 MR. HOFFMAN: I think that you asked for me,  
14 Ace Hoffman.

15 MR. CAMERON: Yes. This is --- hi, Ace. This  
16 is Ace Hoffman. Welcome to the call, Ace, and go ahead.

17 MR. HOFFMAN: Hi. I don't have a whole lot  
18 to say today, but I would like to point out that what  
19 the NRC seems to be doing here is something that they're  
20 guilty of on a regular basis, which is to limit the scope  
21 of whatever they're looking at. And, in particular, to  
22 eliminate anything that they think they've decided  
23 before. And I think it was Mary Olson who pointed out  
24 that there's been an awful lot of changes in the  
25 background information. And one of the changes that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we've learned about here at San Onofre is that the cost  
2 of onsite storage should really be quite a bit higher  
3 than the utilities are calculating. And if safe onsite  
4 storage is going to also occur at Yucca Mountain,  
5 because it can't all go into the mountain right away,  
6 then that cost should also be greatly increased over  
7 what you're probably estimating it to be. And, also, the  
8 cost of using the rail lines. There's millions of costs  
9 that are being underestimated.

10 But my point here is simply that I think a  
11 lot of things that are not actually properly decided are  
12 being taken as a matter of fact by the NRC. And that  
13 policy maybe needs to be looked at after so many years  
14 of assuming that anything that went before was right.  
15 We now know that there were a lot of mistakes made in  
16 all sorts of areas of the nuclear industry. And thank  
17 you for taking my call. Bye-bye.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,  
19 Ace. And do we have --- let me ask my colleagues, do we  
20 have anybody on the line now who wants to make a first  
21 comment?

22 Okay. Well, what we're going to do is we're  
23 going to go to Bill Stremmel, who commented previously,  
24 and we're going to hear him again. And in fairness to  
25 others who already commented, we'll listen to them as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 long as we don't have any first commenters on the line.  
2 They have to take precedence. So, Bill, let's go to you.

3 MR. STREMMEL: Yes. I didn't mean for this  
4 to become a debating society, but with the lack of other  
5 first commenters, I do feel the need to respond to some  
6 of the people who were responding to me.

7 They were talking about this giving license  
8 to renewed nuclear development. I do think we need to  
9 separate the two issues. The point is, we have many tens  
10 of thousands of tons of waste now that are here and they  
11 need to be dealt with. And we just can't be in denial.  
12 I agree that many terrible mistakes were made with the  
13 selection of the types of reactor, size of the reactors,  
14 fuels and so on, but those mistakes are made, and we need  
15 to take the most prudent and feasible course of dealing  
16 with the waste, and not just being in denial and saying  
17 it just has to stay as is.

18 For example, my mother and I, she lives on  
19 the shores of Lake Michigan north of Chicago. We were  
20 hiking over Zion Plant, which is closed now, and I heard  
21 this buzzing in the electric lines over there. I said,  
22 "Mother, why am I hearing this buzzing? I thought the  
23 plant was shut down." And she said, "Power is having to  
24 flow back into the plant from the grid to run the cooling  
25 pumps so the spent fuel rods do not melt down and cause

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a catastrophe there, and poison all of Lake Michigan."  
2 And, indeed, that would condemn all of the Great Lakes  
3 down the St. Lawrence River. So, that's just one  
4 example.

5 Another one is California has been  
6 celebrating the closure of San Onofre, but the waste is  
7 still there. Suppose you have tsunami? That would add  
8 to the contamination we're already dealing with from  
9 Fukushima on the other side of the ocean.

10 We also need to examine the issue of  
11 pristine. You know, even if it's found that maybe  
12 Arizona, perhaps, there's more room, it's more  
13 appropriate geologically, but Arizona is still  
14 pristine. It doesn't have the heritage of over 100  
15 above-ground nuclear explosions done during the test  
16 phase of the Cold War, and many more hundreds  
17 underground, and all these other activities at the  
18 Nevada Nuclear Site Center there. And Yucca Mountain is  
19 straddling the western boundary of the nuclear test  
20 range, so you have this heritage, and you have already  
21 contamination until the end of foreseeable time from  
22 what's already been done. There's no point in  
23 introducing even the specter of hypothetical risk to a  
24 new area that then we'd have to establish a whole new  
25 security perimeter and everything, acquiring a buffer

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of real estate around it, when that already exists there  
2 around the Yucca Mountain facility. So, we need to stop  
3 being in denial. We need to deal with the issue of  
4 pristine. We don't want to introduce any possible  
5 conceivable source of contamination to an area where  
6 there hasn't been any nuclear activities. Whereas,  
7 there certainly has been and is ongoing at the DOE's and  
8 the DOD's cycle.

9 So, thank you. That's my follow-up  
10 comments.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks. Thanks again,  
12 Bill.

13 We're going to take the opportunity now, we  
14 don't have anybody in the queue right now, but as I  
15 mentioned we are here until 4:00, and take the  
16 opportunity now for Christine Pineda, the Senior  
17 Project Manager on this Supplemental EIS to provide some  
18 more information to you all. And that information will  
19 be, like everything else we heard today, that will be  
20 on the transcript. Christine?

21 MS. PINEDA: Thanks, Chip. Yes, I was just  
22 going to go over how you can submit your written  
23 comments. We provided --- this information is also in  
24 the handout on the website and it's the last slide in  
25 the set of slides.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1           You can mail your comments to Cindy Bladey,  
2           that's B-L-A-D-E-Y. She's the Chief, Rules,  
3           Announcements and Directives Branch. And then that's in  
4           the Division of Administrative Services in the Office  
5           of Administration. And that's Mail Stop OWFN for One  
6           White Flint North, dash 12, dash 808. And then United  
7           States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C.  
8           20555-0001.

9           Another way you can submit your written  
10          comments is you can post them on the Regulations.gov  
11          website, so that's [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). And then you'll  
12          see a search field, and you can search for any documents  
13          that come up under Docket I.D., identification  
14          NRC-2015-0051. And the comment you'll see for the  
15          documents that come up, the comment button is, I think,  
16          attached to the Federal Register Notice for when we  
17          published this Supplement. And you'll see a button that  
18          says, "Comment Now." You can click on that and it will  
19          bring up a web form, and you can fill out the form. You  
20          can type your comments directly into the form, or  
21          there's also a button I think below the field for putting  
22          in your comments for uploading a document if you want  
23          to just upload a Word file or something like that.

24          So, those are the two ways, and if you have  
25          any questions after this call, you can call me at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 301-415-6789 or, of course, you can email us at the  
2 ymeis\_supplement@nrc.gov.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much,  
4 Christine. Do we have anybody in the queue yet? Okay.  
5 Do we need to provide information to people about the  
6 next telephonic meeting that we're going to have?  
7 Christine, would you just put that in the record?

8 MS. PINEDA: The next meeting is going to be  
9 on November 12th, and it will also be at 2:00 Eastern  
10 Time. And the phone number and the pass code for that  
11 meeting are the same as the phone number and pass code  
12 for this meeting. Those are, bear with me for just a  
13 moment, 888-790-2936 is the phone number, and the pass  
14 code is 1715992.

15 MR. CAMERON: And it's going to start at  
16 2:00.

17 MS. PINEDA: Yes, 2:00 Eastern.

18 MR. CAMERON: And run from 2:00 to 4:00, 2:00  
19 Eastern. Thank you.

20 MR. RUBENSTONE: And this is Jim Rubenstone.  
21 If I could just remind people again that all this  
22 information is available on the NRC website,  
23 [www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov). And as we said, if you follow the drop-down  
24 menu under "Radioactive Waste," to High-Level Waste  
25 Disposal Key Documents, you'll find the announcements

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for all the meetings related to the Supplement to the  
2 EIS, and the transcripts and summaries from previous  
3 meetings. And we will endeavor to get the transcript and  
4 summary of this meeting up as soon as it's available.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Jim. And I would  
6 just remind everyone out there that if you do want to  
7 make a comment, please press star 1. Okay, we're going  
8 to be waiting to see if anybody comes on, because we're  
9 scheduled to be here until 4:00 p.m. Eastern.

10 OPERATOR: Mary Olson does have a question  
11 or comment at this time.

12 MS. OLSON: Hi. Just a brief additional  
13 comment to make, which is that Nuclear Information and  
14 Resource Service would like to endorse the verbal  
15 comments given by the Amargosa Conservancy at your rural  
16 meeting in Nevada. I don't remember which community you  
17 were in, but those comments were delivered that evening,  
18 and we thank the Conservancy, and want to support what  
19 they offered in terms of real-time, real world  
20 observations about the water systems in that area.

21 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Mary. We remember the  
22 commenter from that meeting and those comments. Thank  
23 you.

24 MS. OLSON: Thank you.

25 MR. CAMERON: Again, if you want to comment,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 please press star 1.

2 OPERATOR: I'm showing no one queuing at  
3 this time.

4 MR. CAMERON: Oh, Marvin? Didn't he --- do  
5 we have someone who wants to talk. Marvin Lewis,  
6 perhaps?

7 OPERATOR: Marvin's line is open.

8 MR. LEWIS: Yes, for a real question. You're  
9 talking about transcripts. How do we get hold of the  
10 transcripts? How do we find it in the Electronic Reading  
11 Room, or whatever?

12 MR. CAMERON: We're going to go to Christine  
13 Pineda.

14 MS. PINEDA: Hi, Marvin. This is Christine  
15 Pineda. I think you are on my email distribution from  
16 the ymeis\_supplement address.

17 MR. LEWIS: Yes, I am.

18 MS. PINEDA: And I sent out an email I think  
19 last week, and it provides a link to our web page. And  
20 on that web page you can scroll down and go to the date  
21 of the meeting that you're interested in, and the  
22 transcript is linked there. But I can also send you an  
23 email tomorrow. It will be probably be tomorrow, I can  
24 send you an email with the transcript. Which date, which  
25 meeting date were you interested in?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. LEWIS: This one right here. If you send  
2 me a link, it would be great.

3 MS. PINEDA: Oh, yes. When the transcript  
4 and the meeting summary are available on our public web  
5 page from this meeting, I will send out another email  
6 to the distribution letting everyone know that it's  
7 available. So, that should be next week sometime.

8 MR. RUBENSTONE: And the people who want to  
9 be on our distribution list, as Christine said, that  
10 email address, send an email to Christine at that  
11 [yweis\\_supplement@nrc.gov](mailto:yweis_supplement@nrc.gov), and she will add you to the  
12 distribution list if you're not receiving those emails  
13 now.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,  
15 Jim. And, again, press star 1 if you want to make a  
16 comment to us.

17 OPERATOR: We do have a question or comment  
18 from Kevin Kamps. Your line is open.

19 MR. CAMERON: Well, good. Welcome, Kevin.

20 MR. KAMPS: Hi, Chip, thank you. Can you hear  
21 me?

22 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

23 MR. KAMPS: Very good. Well, I did speak  
24 before when the hearing was held at NRC Headquarters,  
25 so I just wanted to add some more comments at this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 opportunity. And I thank you for it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, regarding high-burnup fuel which is something I didn't have time to talk about at the last hearing, I just wanted to raise the issue of its significance in this Environmental Impact Statement. There is very little to no data about the integrity of high-burnup fuel, whether it be in storage in pools, or dry casks on site at reactors. Especially significant will be the impacts of transporting high-burnup fuel, and the potential for damage to occur during transport. And, also, its integrity in storage at a proposed repository such as Yucca Mountain, its integrity during operations; that is, during long-term or permanent disposal at Yucca Mountain, how it will hold up. And I think that that's a significant discrepancy in the NRC's Environmental Impact Statement; this lack of data on the integrity of high-burnup fuel, and how it's going to perform over really forevermore into the future at Yucca Mountain. So, it throws the total system performance assessment into question as to how accurate it is, because high-burnup fuel, which is now the vast majority of what atomic reactors are generating, is very suspect as to how it's going to perform, the levels of radioactive contamination it will release into the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 groundwater at Yucca Mountain. And, certainly, this is  
2 increasing the risks of contamination of the  
3 groundwater. And that's kind of a segue into the next  
4 area that I would like to talk about, which is the  
5 disproportionate impact on the indigenous people  
6 downstream of Yucca Mountain, the Western Shoshone  
7 Indian Nation, and more specifically the Timbisha  
8 Shoshone who live in Death Valley and utilize the spring  
9 water that comes forth from the ground which is Yucca  
10 Mountain groundwater.

11 And even in the Federal Register Notice for  
12 this proceeding, the NRC asked specifically about that  
13 issue, disproportionate impacts on people of color,  
14 communities, low-income communities. And I think an  
15 important area that needs to be addressed and has not  
16 been yet is the traditional lifestyle of the Western  
17 Shoshone Indians, which if you look big picture at Yucca  
18 Mountain and its history, and its future, the Western  
19 Shoshone traditional lifestyle has been the standard  
20 for many thousands, if not tens of thousands of years  
21 in the area of Yucca Mountain. So, what I'm describing  
22 is more of a hunting and gathering lifestyle, a  
23 traditional lifestyle that utilizes spring water as a  
24 drinking water source, that utilizes the wildlife as a  
25 food source from that area; all of which is being put

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in harm's way by this Yucca Mountain dump proposal where  
2 the entire area for a long distance downstream is being  
3 treated as a nuclear sacrifice zone out to a long  
4 distance. I mean, the point of compliance, 11 miles  
5 downstream, is one issue, but then also the very  
6 precious and irreplaceable drinking water supply of  
7 that area. So, this is very much an issue of  
8 environmental justice that has not been adequately  
9 covered by this NRC EIS proceeding thus far.

10 And the final issue I did already raise is  
11 an important issue in terms of damage that could be done  
12 to already fragile high-burnup fuel during transport.  
13 Just the transport issue on all fronts, including not  
14 just high-burnup fuel, but also low-burnup fuel that  
15 happens to be damaged. And I think it's still very fair  
16 to say that there is very little experience with  
17 transporting damaged fuel, fragile fuel. And the entire  
18 risk issue with transport in general from truck  
19 shipments, to train shipments, to barge shipments needs  
20 to be part and parcel a part of this proceeding, and has  
21 not been. And that's why we previously called for  
22 hearings to be held in transport corridor communities  
23 that would be impacted by this proposal. And also called  
24 for an extension beyond the 30 days that NRC has granted,  
25 we called for 60 days so that folks living in those

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 corridor communities can learn about this proceeding,  
2 learn about how it impacts them, and take part in it.  
3 So, we would reiterate our call for another 30-day  
4 extension, and also for hearings to be held in  
5 transportation corridor communities. And I think that's  
6 it for now for me.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much,  
8 Kevin.

9 MR. KAMPS: Thank you, Chip.

10 MR. CAMERON: And, again, a reminder, if you  
11 want to comment, please press star 1 on your phone.

12 OPERATOR: We do have a comment from Ace  
13 Hoffman once again. Ace, your line is open.

14 MR. HOFFMAN: Hi, thank you. There's 10,000  
15 dry casks worth of nuclear waste in America, and that's  
16 if we keep building them as big as we're building them,  
17 maybe 20, 25,000, maybe 100,000 if we make them smaller  
18 so that they're safer. There's millions of miles that  
19 this waste is going to be transported over. There's a  
20 million-year outlook of how far we're going to determine  
21 whether or not this idea is safe. And all of that points  
22 to one --- oh, and the 10,000 dry casks that DOE assumes  
23 that only a tiny, tiny fraction of them will ever be  
24 released. And even in a worst, what they call a worst  
25 case scenario, which obviously doesn't include a bridge

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 falling on a dry cask that's being transported, or  
2 anything like that.

3 So, all of these minute possibilities and  
4 enormous time frames, enormous distances, and enormous  
5 quantities point to one thing, which is that we need to  
6 restart the NAS study of the dangers of low-level  
7 radiation that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
8 that's you guys, stopped. You've got enough extra money  
9 lying around to start working on Yucca Mountain again  
10 until the money runs out. Well, I think start and stop,  
11 and put the money into the study that was stopped. The  
12 study is particularly important, or it could be  
13 particularly useful because, unexpectedly, one of the  
14 study areas shut down suddenly, two reactors closed down  
15 never to reopen. That's, of course, San Onofre, which  
16 was one of the six areas to be studied. And that might  
17 have been some very telling information about whether  
18 or not the radiation that's being emitted on a daily  
19 basis is dangerous. And from that, we're supposed to  
20 interpolate what's going to happen with the 10,000 dry  
21 casks, and the millions of miles, and the millions of  
22 years.

23 Thank you very much. That should be it for  
24 today. Thanks.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Ace. Thanks for that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comment and suggestion. And we don't have anybody on the  
2 line to comment, but we're still here until 4:00. And  
3 if you do want to comment, press star 1.

4 OPERATOR: I'm showing no one queuing at  
5 this time.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We don't have anybody in  
7 the queue to talk at this point, but we will be here until  
8 4:00 Eastern, and that's about 17 minutes from now. So  
9 please, if you want to make a comment to the Agency, just  
10 hit star 1.

11 Hi, we're here at the NRC public telephone  
12 meeting on the Draft Supplemental EIS on Groundwater  
13 Issues at Yucca Mountain. And if you would like to make  
14 a comment, if you could just press star 1. And for those  
15 of you who might be joining us, we are asking people to  
16 follow a five-minute guideline on presenting their  
17 comment. So, we're here until 4:00 Eastern. And we do  
18 have Michael Keegan from Don't Waste Michigan. And,  
19 Michael, are you on the line now?

20 MR. KEEGAN: I believe I am. Can you hear me?

21 MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can.

22 MR. KEEGAN: Okay, thank you for taking my  
23 call.

24 Yes, I would argue that Yucca Mountain has  
25 been a tremendous success. It's kept the lie alive, the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 illusion that there's a solution of what to do with  
2 nuclear pollution. Nuclear pollution that was generated  
3 by private interests making private profit, and now it's  
4 a public responsibility, a risk to have to be borne by  
5 the public, and publicly responsible for dealing with  
6 this waste. And it's very much a kabuki dance.

7 It's known from the onset that Yucca  
8 Mountain was unacceptable but, yet, you've proceeded.  
9 Many of you made a career, many folks have retired, many  
10 folks came back from retirement for another dip.

11 You know, folks know that this is not the  
12 solution, and you've got to stop making this waste.  
13 We've got to stop --- we've got to confront this lie,  
14 not perpetuate it and allow the production of more and  
15 more nuclear waste, with which no one knows what to do.  
16 But it is known. Mary Olson mentioned that people know  
17 that this is foolhardy. It's not going to work. And  
18 knowing that, there's a responsibility that goes along  
19 with that. And I believe that the Nuremberg principles  
20 apply to all those who are propagating this propagation  
21 of nuclear --- of the generation of nuclear waste. To  
22 say oh, well, we're going to figure this out, we're going  
23 to get this right allows the continued generation of  
24 waste that has no solution.

25 This is beyond science. We've got to stop

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the generation of this nuclear waste. The paradigm is  
2 in absolute collapse. What I would ask for is --- this  
3 is going to be very costly to deal with this, and what  
4 I would ask is that the NRC reach back into the private  
5 utilities who have made money hand over fist and inform  
6 them it's going to cost more money. And we now need to  
7 generate additional revenues going forward on any  
8 additional waste that's being generated, because not to  
9 do so is to be derelict. It's under-funded and these  
10 companies are in collapse. And when they collapse,  
11 someone is going to have to pay that tab. And I suggest  
12 that there be legislation and regulation put in place  
13 to reach back to these companies right now and get  
14 additional monies to deal with this waste going forward.

15 I am party to over 200 groups in the U.S.  
16 who have advocated hardened onsite storage until a  
17 resolve is come to a consensus on, but we've got to stop  
18 the problem, stop generating this waste for which no one  
19 knows what to do.

20 And, again, the Nuremberg principles do  
21 apply to those folks who continue to do what they're  
22 doing knowing full well there is no solution. So, thank  
23 you for allowing me to make some comments, and I'm with  
24 Don't Waste Michigan.

25 MR. CAMERON: Thank you for those comments,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Michael. If you want to make a comment, please press star  
2 1.

3 OPERATOR: We do have a question again, or  
4 a comment from Ace Hoffman. Your line is open.

5 MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, thank you. Since we have  
6 a few extra minutes, I want to describe in the 1970s,  
7 this was a while ago, I visited the Connecticut Yankee  
8 Nuclear Power Plant, and I was given the small black box.  
9 In fact, it's specifically four cubic inches in size.  
10 I want to read you what it says to show how long this  
11 charade has been going on. This is from the black box  
12 on the sides of it. "Congressman Mike McCormack of  
13 Washington, a scientist by training, often sizes up the  
14 nuclear waste situation this way. The cube you are  
15 holding," which I'm holding, "which has a volume of four  
16 cubic inches represents one person's share of the  
17 high-level waste that will be produced by present and  
18 planned nuclear power plants from 1976," that's how old  
19 this thing is, "until 2000. The waste will be diluted  
20 and put permanently into solid glass. If the cubes for  
21 the entire year's population were stacked 12 feet high  
22 they would fit handily within a regulation football  
23 field. As they accumulate, the waste can be put into safe  
24 and permanent storage deep underground. By the end of  
25 the century, nuclear power should supply about one-half

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of our nation's electricity, and about one-third of our  
2 total energy. Each year, a single nuclear plant, 1,000  
3 megawatts, saves electricity customers \$50-100 million  
4 worth of fossil fuel, much of it imported oil, and takes  
5 us another step further towards solving our energy  
6 crisis."

7           How much of that came true? It's not going  
8 to be vitrified in glass. We can't --- since then we  
9 still haven't come up with a permanent storage solution.  
10 Nuclear power is incredibly expensive, and the  
11 alternatives are not oil. The alternatives are wind,  
12 rain, solar, all the things like that. So, I think that  
13 it's time for some honesty on the part of the Nuclear  
14 Regulatory Commission to throw your arms up and say we  
15 really can't protect the public unless we shut these  
16 reactors down. And then maybe the entire public can get  
17 together and say well, here we can build a solution  
18 because we have a finite problem instead of a constantly  
19 recurring problem; instead of enabling the nuclear  
20 power industry to continue, we only have to solve the  
21 problem that they've already created.

22           I don't think there is a good solution, but  
23 we have to choose whatever is best. But until we stop  
24 sniffing, we can't choose a best solution. So, thank you  
25 once again, and thank you for holding this hearing even

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 if nobody feels like attending, or not very many people.  
2 I'm especially sorry to not hear anyone from the  
3 Southern California Edison's Community Engagement  
4 Panel, for example. You would think they would be very  
5 interested in this topic, that they'd want to get the  
6 waste out of San Onofre, but they're not here. And I  
7 don't hear any other pro-nuclear voices either, which  
8 is a little surprising. The NEI guy showed up in Las  
9 Vegas, but is not speaking today. I'm sorry to hear that.  
10 I think that we can't have a debate about it unless they  
11 try to present their best points. Thank you.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you  
13 very much, Ace. I would note that we have had about 20  
14 commenters, and it seemed like it was pretty well  
15 --- the country was pretty well represented, so we're  
16 appreciative for those 20 comments, and for your  
17 comments, Ace. And we're sort of getting to the point  
18 of adjournment, but we're going to see if there is  
19 another commenter out there. Press star 1 if you want  
20 to comment.

21 OPERATOR: Susan Carpenter does have a  
22 comment. Your line is now open.

23 MS. CARPENTER: Yes, I live near Pilgrim  
24 Nuclear Power Plant that is just shutting down; well,  
25 it says it will. And I am wondering if the NRC is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 concerned about public safety and the storage of waste.  
2 Why these closing plants are allowed to keep their fuel  
3 in the spent fuel pool for up to 60 years, rather than  
4 securing it in dry cask storage?

5 MR. CAMERON: Susan, this is Chip. I figured  
6 you were near Pilgrim, and I think I'm going to ask the  
7 Staff to just note that on the NRC website there is a  
8 brief explanatory document on the NRC's decommissioning  
9 regulations. And it explains the rationale for why  
10 things like that might happen. And I'm just going to ask  
11 my colleagues if they want to offer any more information  
12 on that.

13 MR. RUBENSTONE: Yes. I would just point you  
14 to the website. There is a section on decommissioning  
15 and it discusses the different options. Pilgrim, the  
16 operator just announced in the last week or so that they  
17 would be closing within several years. They have yet to  
18 submit to NRC their decommissioning plan, so we don't  
19 know exactly what will be happening there.

20 There are a couple of, you know, plants that  
21 have been decommissioned, some of them move the fuel out  
22 of the spent fuel pool very early, some wait some time,  
23 so there's a variety of ways they're done. The Zion Plant  
24 was mentioned earlier. To my understanding, Zion has  
25 completed just this year moving all of the spent fuel

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 out of the pool to dry cask storage. So there are a number  
2 of ways of going, and I would point you to the NRC website  
3 to understand our regulations, and stay involved, and  
4 there will be announcements about the decommissioning  
5 plan proposed by the utility for Pilgrim.

6 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Jim.

7 MS. CARPENTER: Thanks.

8 MR. CAMERON: And thank you, Susan. Do we  
9 have anybody else on the line? Okay. I'll just say one  
10 more reminder. If you do want to make a comment, press  
11 star 1. And anybody who wants to comment, if anybody gets  
12 in before 4:00, we'll be here to listen to your comments.  
13 But at 4:00, if we don't have anybody on the line, then  
14 we're going to adjourn the meeting. And I'm going to ask  
15 at that point for Jim Rubenstone, who's our senior  
16 official here, to close the meeting out for us. So, that  
17 will happen momentarily. Anybody coming on?

18 MR. RUBENSTONE: Give it another minute or  
19 two.

20 MR. CAMERON: Yes, let's do that, and then  
21 we'll close out.

22 OPERATOR: At this time, no one is queuing.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We're going to go to Jim  
24 Rubenstone to close the meeting for us, and thank all  
25 of you for your comments, and for following the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 guidelines. Thank you very much. Jim?

2 MR. RUBENSTONE: Yes. Thank you, Chip, and  
3 we very much appreciate everyone who participated in  
4 this call. We had more than 25 people make comments,  
5 which we --- this is the point of the calls. We  
6 appreciate your comments. We will look at those and take  
7 those into consideration as we complete the final  
8 document.

9 Just a reminder, the comment period is open  
10 until November 20th. You can submit comments by mail as  
11 Christine said at Regulations.gov, and we will have one  
12 additional telecon like this on November 12th, again at  
13 2 p.m. Eastern Time.

14 So, thank you once again to everyone who  
15 participated, and we will talk to you next time.

16 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went  
17 off the record at 4:00 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701