

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

Title: Public Scoping Meeting for the Environmental Impact Statement for Waste Control Specialists LLC's Application for a Consolidated Interim Storage Facility for Spent Nuclear Fuel, Andrews County, Texas

Docket Number: 72-1050

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: February 23, 2017

Work Order No.: NRC-2888

Pages 1-122

**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 SCOPING MEETING FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT  
STATEMENT FOR WASTE CONTROL SPECIALISTS LLC'S  
APPLICATION FOR A CONSOLIDATED INTERIM STORAGE  
FACILITY FOR SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL,  
ANDREWS COUNTY, TEXAS

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,

FEBRUARY 23, 2017

+ + + + +

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

+ + + + +

The Public Scoping Meeting was convened  
in the Commissioners' Hearing Room at the Nuclear  
Regulatory Commission, One White Flint North, 11555  
Rockville Pike, at 1:00 p.m., Brian Smith presiding.

NRC STAFF PRESENT:

BRIAN SMITH, Deputy Director, Division of Fuel Cycle  
Safety, Safeguards, and Environmental Review,  
Office of Nuclear Material Safety and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Safeguards (NMSS)

CRIS BROWN, Facilitator

JOHN-CHAU NGUYEN, Senior Project Manager, Spent Fuel

Licensing Branch, NMSS

CINTHYA ROMÁN, Chief, Environmental Review

Branch, NMSS

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

	<u>Page</u>
Opening Remarks and Introductions.....	4
Welcome and Meeting Purpose.....	6
NRC Mission and Regulatory Role.....	10
NRC Licensing Review/EIS Process.....	15
Question and Answer Period.....	27
Receive Public Comment.....	35
Closing Remarks.....	121

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

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

1:01 p.m.

MS. BROWN: All right. Welcome, everybody. My name is Cris Brown, and I am going to be facilitating the meeting here today. Susan Salter, who is also in the room with me, will be assisting.

The NRC staff that are here with us today will make statements about the primary purpose of the meeting, which is to talk about the NRC's environmental impact process and to get comments on the scope of that process from the public so that they can move forward with their -- with their efforts, and this is in regard to the Waste Control Specialists application to build and operate a spent nuclear fuel consolidated interim storage facility in Andrews, Texas.

The meeting today will be broken into several parts. We will begin with a presentation by NRC staff that will broadly cover the environmental review process. When that concludes, we'll have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

about 10 to 15 minutes for process and procedure questions related to the NRC presentation. We do hope to very quickly get through that portion of the meeting so that we can allow plenty of time for comments. We know there are many people that do want to comment on this topic today.

After that, the rest of the meeting will be devoted to hearing those comments on the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement. There is a registration table out in the hallway, so if you have not already signed up, for those of you that are here in the room, you can sign up to speak to offer comments during this meeting. So if you haven't already done so, you can step outside and get registered.

Now for some basic ground rules: while we have no expectation that this will happen, we do want to make very clear that threatening gestures or statements will under no circumstances be tolerated. If you feel that you are being threatened, please let me or Susan or any of the NRC staff that are here today presenting, let them know that that is the case.

So a few minor housekeeping items: the bathrooms are out the doors on the left-hand side and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

off to the left, and the exits are on either side, and actually in the front and in the back of the rooms. While we will permit cameras, we ask that you be careful of blocking anyone's view. Be cognizant of the other audience members. And if you would be so kind, if you have not done so already, to silence your phones for the remainder of the meeting.

At this point, I would like to offer, and I know that there are some here in the room, any elected officials or any official representatives the opportunity to stand and be recognized. This is Judge --

MR. DOLGENER: Dolgener.

MS. BROWN: -- Dolgener --

MR. DOLGENER: From Andrews County.

MS. BROWN: From Andrews County, Texas.

All right, thank you. Sorry that we didn't quite get the microphone to you in time.

So now let me turn it over to Brian Smith of the NRC.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MS. BROWN: It's all --

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

MS. BROWN: -- yours, Brian.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Cris. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Brian Smith. I am the Deputy Director of the Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards in the NRC's Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. My division has a responsibility for the overall licensing and oversight of the fuel cycle facilities in the United States. We are also responsible for performing all of the environmental reviews associated with the licensing actions within the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

So one of the other divisions that is within the NMSS is the Division of Spent Fuel Storage. We have one person here today, John Nguyen, the project manager for the overall lead of the safety and security review of WCS's license application. One of the branches within my division is the Environmental Review Branch, and I have two staff here today that will be participating in the meeting. Cinthya Román is the branch chief, as well as Diana Diaz-Toro, who will be making a presentation in place of Jim Park, who is our project manager lead for performing the Environmental Impact Statement. Jim is out sick today, so --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

We are here today to hear your comments associated with the scoping of the Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS, for WCS's license application for a consolidated interim storage facility for spent nuclear fuel to be located at WCS's site in Andrews County, Texas. WCS is seeking a license for 40 years to allow construction and operation of the storage facility, which could potentially store up to 40,000 metric tons of uranium contained in spent nuclear fuel.

In our presentation today, we will be discussing WCS's proposal and NRC's process for reviewing WCS's request. We encourage and welcome your comments today on the scope of the NRC EIS, and I can assure you that we take each and every comment very seriously. The NRC's job is to protect the public health and safety and the environment by thoroughly reviewing each license application we receive before deciding whether or not to grant an applicant's request.

We understand that in the audience and on the phone today, there are those who may oppose WCS's license application for the storage facility, as well as those who may support it. I want to assure you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

that we want to hear from both sides. However, I want to remind you that the purpose of the meeting is to gather comments for the scoping of our EIS. We want to know what important information and issues we need to consider and analyze in our EIS. We are not from that part of the country, that area, so if there is something specific to that area that you think is important, we want to know that as well.

We want to try to hear from as many of you as possible about any environmental issues related to this proposed project in the time we have allotted today, so I would appreciate it if you could focus your comments only on matters related to the appropriate scope and content of the EIS that we -- that we will be preparing. Otherwise, we may not get to everyone who wants to speak.

We treat all the comments we receive the same, whether a comment was made by one person or by 100 people. We give each comment we receive the same careful consideration during the preparation of the EIS. The NRC will consider all the oral and written comments we receive as well as those we receive via letter, email, or through the federal rulemaking website. Comments are to be submitted by March 13th,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

2017.

The EIS, combined with NRC's safety and security review of WCS's license application request, will result in an NRC licensing decision to either approve the license request or disapprove it. So next slide.

So this is the slide that covers our public meeting objectives. Cinthya Román will be the first -- will be the next speaker, and she will describe the NRC's roles and responsibilities. Diana Diaz-Toro will be the next presenter, and she will talk about the NRC's licensing review, which consists of a safety/security review as well as an environmental review, and she will also talk about the process that we follow in developing our Environmental Impact Statement.

Following that, Cris Brown will lead us through a short question and answer session, and then it is the public's turn to provide their comments to us on the scoping of our Environmental Impact Statement. So with that, I will turn it over to Cinthya.

MS. ROMÁN-CUEVAS: Good afternoon. As Brian mentioned, my name is Cinthya Román. I am the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Chief for the Environmental Review Branch under the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards -- Safety and Safeguards in NRC.

Staff in my branch will be working on the NRC's environmental review of the Waste Control Specialists license application, and today, I just want to discuss the NRC mission and its regulatory role. Next slide, please.

So who are we? Our Agency is charged by federal law to be the nation's only regulator of commercial nuclear materials, independently ensuring these materials are used, handled, and stored safely and securely. Specifically, the NRC's mission is to license and regulate the nation's civilian use of radioactive materials to protect health and safety, promote the common defense and security, and protect the environment. Next slide.

So what do we regulate? We regulate the operation of 100 nuclear power reactors that generate nearly 20 percent of the electricity in the United States. We also regulate research reactors located primarily at universities, where they are used for research, testing, and training. We also regulate nuclear materials. In the United States, there are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

more than 20,000 source, byproduct, and special nuclear material licenses. About a quarter of these licenses are administered by the NRC, while the rest are issued by states that have entered into agreements with the NRC to give them authority to license and inspect certain nuclear materials possessed within their borders.

Along with the Agreement States, we license hospitals, clinics, and other medical facilities. We also regulate other radioactive materials, uranium recovery facilities, and fuel cycle installations. In addition, NRC is responsible for the transportation of nuclear material and the decommissioning of nuclear facilities from service. We regulate the storage and disposal of nuclear materials and waste. That is why we are currently reviewing the WCS license application for a consolidated interim spent fuel storage facility.

In addition, we have the responsibility for physical security of nuclear material to protect it from sabotage or attacks. Next slide.

So the NRC regulations are designed to protect both the public and the occupational workers from radiation hazards. Our primary

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

responsibilities include establishing rules and regulations; issuing licenses; providing oversight through inspection, enforcement, and evaluation of operational experience; conducting research to provide support for regulatory decisions; and responding to emergencies. As part of our regulatory licensing process, we also conduct environmental reviews. Particularly in my branch, we conduct environmental reviews covering, for example, uranium recovery and milling, uranium enrichment, fuel fabrication, storage of the spent fuel, and nuclear facility decommissioning. Next slide.

There are several nuclear-related activities that do not fall under the NRC's jurisdiction. For example, we do not promote or build nuclear facilities. We don't own or operate nuclear power plants or other nuclear facilities. We don't regulate or own nuclear weapons or military reactors or space vehicles reactors, and also, we don't regulate naturally occurring radioactive materials or radiation-producing machines such as x-ray equipment. Next slide.

The NRC views nuclear regulation as a public business, and as such, it believes it should

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

be open and transparent as possible. Stakeholders will have many opportunities to participate in the regulatory process before issuance of a license. To continue its practice of communicating clearly and frequently on important issues, the NRC holds meetings with the public or external stakeholders both in the vicinity of the nuclear facilities and its Headquarters and regional offices, just like this public scoping meeting.

In addition, documents and correspondence related to the licensing actions and inspection findings, with the exception of certain security-related, proprietary, and other sensitive information, are made available through the Agency's public website. Next slide.

Open communication is key, and public involvement is critical in conducting the NRC's regulatory and environmental review process. You will hear more details on this environmental review later during this presentation. The NRC engaged in active communication with stakeholders to ensure meaningful stakeholder participation, mutual understanding, and timely response. We will continue to coordinate with a wide array of federal, tribal,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

state, and local authorities on issues related to the regulatory and licensing process. Next slide.

So to conclude my remarks, I want to tell you why we are here. As part of the regulatory and licensing review process for projects like the WCS license application, the NRC conducts safety and environmental reviews. The NRC's environmental reviews are required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, or NEPA. The environmental review for the WCS applications involves the NRC staff preparing an Environmental Impact Statement in accordance with the NRC regulations for environmental protection and applicable NRC guidance.

As stated previously, the NRC's licensing process is open and transparent, and we are interested in hearing from you. Your input for our Environmental Impact Statement is vital. Your comments will be used -- will be used in developing the appropriate scope and content of the Environmental Impact Statement. The NRC has just started its licensing review process for WCS's license applications, and no decisions have as yet been made. That is why we are here: to listen to you and for you to help us inform the licensing process,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

and in particular, the Environmental Impact Statement in support of this process.

To -- this concludes my remarks. I will turn now the presentation over to Diana Diaz-Toro. Thank you.

MS. DIAZ-TORO: Good afternoon, and welcome. My name is Diana Diaz-Toro, and I am the backup project manager for the NRC's environmental review of WCS's license application.

Brian mentioned Jim Park, the lead project manager for the WCS license application, is unable to provide today's presentation, and I am subbing on his behalf. We are also being assisted by experienced subject matter experts from our contractor, the Center for Nuclear Regulatory Waste Analyses.

Today in my presentation, I will discuss the NRC's licensing review process and the process for developing the Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS. As Cinthya mentioned, along with the safety review, the environmental review informs the NRC licensing decision with respect to the WCS license application for a consolidated interim storage facility for spent nuclear fuel. Next slide, please.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

I would like to begin by providing a brief summary of WCS's license application. WCS is proposing to site the consolidated interim storage facility, or CISF, on approximately 320 acres of its site in Andrews County, Texas. WCS is currently licensed by the State of Texas to treat, store, and dispose of certain types of radioactive material at its site. The State of Texas has assumed NRC's regulatory authority for the licensing and regulation of certain types of radioactive materials within the state and at the WCS facilities. Next slide, please.

In its license application, WCS proposes to construct the CISF in a series of eight phases over a period of 20 years. Each phase would be designed to store up to 5000 metric tons of uranium of spent nuclear fuel. It is WCS's intent, however, to store up to 40,000 metric tons of uranium fuel in the facility if the eight phases are constructed. However, if licensed by the NRC, WCS would be authorized only for the storage of the initial 5000 metric tons of uranium. WCS would be required to seek NRC approval for any further expansions.

This figure in this slide shows a drawing of the facility after the full expansion of the site

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

after construction of the eight phases, with a proposed rail spur, which I will discuss in the next slide, and with the facility located to the north of the existing storage and disposal facilities at the WCS site. Next slide, please.

WCS foresees that the spent nuclear fuel to be stored in the initial phase of the facility would come from decommissioned shutdown commercial nuclear power plants located around the United States. If future phases of the facility were authorized by the NRC, WCS foresees that the spent nuclear fuel would also come from other future shutdown and decommissioned commercial nuclear reactors and from operating commercial nuclear reactors in the United States.

Over the requested 40-year license period, and with all phases approved by the NRC, WCS estimates that approximately 3000 canisters of spent nuclear fuel could be transported to the CISF for storage. These canisters would reach the site by rail lines, with WCS needing to construct an approximately one-mile-long spur of the existing rail line at its site for access to the facility. Once a canister containing the spent nuclear fuel arrives at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

the facility, WCS would unload the canister, check it for leaks and damage, and if no leaks or damage are found, place the spent nuclear fuel canister on concrete storage pads, either in vertical arrangements or in horizontal storage modules.

The figure in this slide is from WCS's application, and it shows the rail lines near the WCS site, and the Texas -- Texas-New Mexico Railroad in blue that would bring the spent nuclear fuel canister from Monahans, Texas up to Eunice, New Mexico, and then east into the WCS site and the CISF. Next slide, please.

This slide shows a conceptual drawing from WCS of what the first phase, the 5000 metric tons, of the CISF might look like, with both the vertical placement and the horizontal storage modules. Next slide, please.

On January 30th, 2017, the NRC published a notice in the Federal Register of NRC's acceptance of WCS's license application for detailed technical review. In the same notice, the NRC posted an opportunity to request a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene are to be filed to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

the NRC by March 31st, 2017. The same Federal Register notice provides the instructions for filing these petitions. Next slide, please.

This slide schematically illustrates the NRC's license review process. It shows the NRC's safety review, its environmental review, and the hearing process. Following the submittal of an application and the NRC's initial review and acceptance of the application for detailed review, which we know as docketing, the NRC began its independent technical and environmental review, and that is the stage where we are at right now with this WCS license application.

The NRC conducts its safety and environmental reviews in parallel, with the staff's final safety review findings documented in a safety evaluation report, or SER. The environmental review, which we will describe in greater detail later in this presentation, involves the scoping activities for the EIS, for which we are here today; preparation of the draft EIS for public comment; and then preparation of the final EIS which will address the comments received on the draft EIS. The final EIS will document the NRC's final findings and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

conclusions on the environmental review. The NRC staff's findings in the SER and the final EIS will both feed into the NRC licensing decision whether to grant or deny WCS's license application request.

This diagram also shows the NRC adjudicatory hearing. This hearing, if one is granted, would be held by an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel on specific contentions submitted by parties whose interests may be affected by the licensing action and for which contentions have been admitted by the ASLBP for hearing. Should there be a hearing, the ASLBP's decisions will affect the NRC licensing decision. Next slide, please.

As I mentioned previously, the NRC's comprehensive safety review will be documented in a safety evaluation report. The NRC staff's independent safety evaluation of WCS's proposed action -- proposed action will specifically review WCS's Safety Analysis Report against the regulations and criteria found in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 72, "Licensing Requirements for the Independent Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste and Reactor-Related Greater Than Class C Waste." Next slide, please.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

As required by NRC regulations, any proposed independent spent fuel storage installation must provide for the following safety requirements: it must maintain confinement of radioactive materials; it must provide adequate radiation shielding for the workers and the public; prevent nuclear criticality; and maintain retrievability of spent nuclear fuel.

In addition, any applicant must demonstrate that the proposed storage system design, when used at the proposed location, meets the above safety objectives under the following conditions: normal conditions; abnormal events, such as temperature and pressure extremes; and accidents, such as earthquakes, fires, floods, lightning, tornado, and cask drops and tip-over. Next slide, please.

This slide just shows the NRC's preliminary schedule for its licensing review of the WCS's license application. The NRC's notice of intent to prepare an EIS and to conduct the scoping process was published on November 14th of last year. The EIS scoping comment period ends this March 13th of 2017.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

As I mentioned, the NRC completed its acceptance review of the WCS license application on January 26th of 2017, and we published a notice of an opportunity to request a hearing and petition for leave to intervene on January 30th, 2017. As a reminder, petitions for hearings and for leave to intervene are to be filed with the NRC by March 31st, 2017.

The NRC's safety review and SER are anticipated to be completed within a period of about 21 months from NRC's acceptance of the application, and the NRC's environmental review and final EIS are anticipated to be completed within a period of approximately 26 months from NRC's acceptance of the application. The final licensing decision by the NRC is presently anticipated by spring of 2019. Next slide, please.

The NRC's independent environmental review for this project will be documented in an Environmental Impact Statement. An EIS is a comprehensive document that provides decision-makers and the public with a detailed and thorough evaluation of the environmental impacts which may result from WCS's proposed actions and from other reasonable alternatives, including the no-action

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

alternative. An EIS provides sufficient evidence and analysis of impacts to support the NRC's record of decision regarding the environmental impacts and final NRC licensing action.

NRC's EIS will be prepared in accordance with NRC regulations at 10 CFR Part 51, which implement the National Environmental Policy Act, and NRC guidance in our NUREG-1748, 1-7-4-8. Next slide, please.

This figure shows a flow diagram of the EIS process, and the bubbles in blue color show the two discrete times in the EIS process where the public input is sought. One of them is the EIS scoping process, and the other is the draft EIS commenting process. Next slide, please.

As I mentioned, there are opportunities for public involvement in this environmental review process of the WCS license application during, you know, the period that we are currently holding, which is the scoping process, which closes on March 13th, and then following issuance of our draft Environmental Impact Statement, the NRC will also open a public comment period for the draft EIS and hold public meetings like this one and the ones that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

we held last week in Hobbs, New Mexico and Andrews, Texas to hear from the public on the draft EIS. Next slide, please.

So why are we here today? We are here today as part of the EIS scoping process. This process occurs early in the development of the EIS, and it is designed to seek input from the public and from other governmental and non-governmental organizations to help in determining a range of issues, alternatives, and potential environmental impacts to be considered in the EIS. Scoping helps to identify the significant issues related to the proposed action, and in this way, the analysis can be more clearly focused on the issues of genuine concern.

The principal goals of the EIS scoping process are to ensure that important issues and concerns are identified early and then are properly studied; identify reasonable alternatives to the proposed action; identify significant issues to be analyzed; eliminate unimportant issues from detailed consideration; and identify public concerns. Next slide, please.

Although subject to change based on the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

scoping process and other possible factors, this slide provides the main chapters likely to be included in the EIS. So the EIS will include a brief description of what WCS proposes to do in seeking a license from the NRC and a statement of the purpose and need for the proposed action. It will discuss in detail the proposed action and reasonable alternatives to the proposed action that could also accomplish the purpose and need.

The EIS will describe the baseline environmental conditions of the WCS site and its vicinity at the time that the license application was submitted to the NRC. It will then discuss the potential environmental impact of the proposed action and of the reasonable alternatives identified and will identify the proposed measures that could -- that could reduce potential adverse impacts or enhance beneficial impacts. The EIS will also describe the major components of WCS's environmental monitoring program. And finally, the EIS will include a cost-benefit analysis and will describe the consultation and coordination activities that the NRC staff conducted with federal, tribal, state, and local agencies. Next slide, please.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

So initially, we have two alternatives that have been identified for detailed consideration in our EIS. One is the proposed action, which means and assumes that the NRC would grant a license for - - to WCS for a period of 40 years for the construction and operation of the CISF at the WCS site in Andrews County, Texas. The EIS however will look at the construction over 20 years of the eight phases, with an eventual storage capacity of 40,000 metric tons of uranium.

The other alternative is the no-action alternative, and this means that the NRC would not grant WCS a license for the proposed facility. However, activities at the site, current activities at the site, such as storage and disposal of various waste under license by the State of Texas, would continue. It is important to note that the no-action alternative will serve as the baseline for comparison of potential environmental impacts with the proposed action and the other alternatives identified. Next slide, please.

This slide shows the various aspects of the environment that are addressed typically in our EIS. We will look at land use. We will look at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

transportation, both workers and materials; geology and soils. We will look at water resources, both surface water and groundwater; ecological resources, both flora and fauna; socioeconomics, such as income, housing, and schools; public and occupational health, both radiological and non-radiological; and we will also look at environmental justice. During this EIS scoping process, other review areas may be identified as well. Next slide, please.

This slide is just meant to visually represent those environmental resource areas that I just touched on, and how all are integrated, and how all will be looked at in our EIS. Next slide, please.

So in closing, here are the different ways that the scoping comments can be submitted to the NRC for consideration: comments can be provided at this meeting; by regular mail; online; and by email. Please keep in mind that the scoping comments should be provided by March 13th, 2017 to ensure consideration of the comments. Next slide, please.

If you would like additional information about this project, you can go to any of the sources identified in this slide. The slide also has Jim Park's contact information, as well as that of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

NRC safety project manager, John Nguyen, and both of those are provided at the end of -- at the bottom of the slide.

This concludes the portion of my presentation, and I will turn it back to Cris. Thank you so much.

MS. BROWN: All right. Thank you. So before we take public comments today, we do want to reserve a small portion of time to see if anybody has any questions regarding the environmental review process that was just discussed by the NRC, such as why we're here, how tonight's meeting fits into the overall process, et cetera. Again, the intent is to address process and procedure questions. Matters regarding the content of WCS's application should be raised during the public comment period which will immediately follow the Q&A period.

So if you have a process question, not a comment, because that portion will follow immediately after, we ask you to press star 1 now if you are on the phone so that we can recognize you. And if you're in the room, I ask for you to come to the podium. If you can't make it to the podium, we will have a microphone brought to you. So with that, do we have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

any questions?

Okay. We -- so we have a question on the -- on the webinar, as well as we have one in the room. We'll go to the one that's in the room, and then we'll move to the one that's on the webinar, okay? And -- and if you will please tell us your name and spell your last name for us?

MR. KAMPS: Okay, thanks. My name is Kevin Kamps, last name is K-A-M-P-S. I am with Beyond Nuclear, and this is an NRC process question.

So for today's public meeting, technically, only eight days' notice were provided. That is when the notice finally appeared on the NRC website. And granted in the Federal Register there was a note that a week after the Texas and New Mexico meetings, there would be a Headquarters meeting, but essentially, when the NRC depends on our organizations to spread the word nationally to get people to take part in these things, I -- I want to understand how the NRC is okay with violating its own rules for minimum notification requirements to the public and just proceeding as if nothing happened.

MR. SMITH: This is Brian Smith. You are correct. We did not get the notice out in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

proper amount of time. There was an administrative error on our end. We had intended to get it out in time, but it just did not happen this time. But we felt like once it got posted, we needed to go ahead forward with the meeting.

MR. KAMPS: I am sorry? I didn't hear the last part.

MR. SMITH: Once it got posted, we decided to go ahead and continue the meeting. We are, based on comments we received at the previous two meetings that we held, we are considering potentially having additional meetings. No decision has been made on that yet, but we are taking that comment into consideration that we received previously.

MR. KAMPS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Okay. Now we have three people on the webinar that want to ask a question. We are first going to go to Cyrus Reed, so if we can have Cyrus's line unmuted?

THE OPERATOR: The line is open.

MR. REED: Okay. Thank you. This is Cyrus Reed from the Lone Star Chapter of the Sierra Club down in Austin, Texas. Just had a process

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

question: you folks mentioned that there was the comments due on March 13th in terms of the scoping for the EIS, but you also mentioned there is a legal procedure for those who might be considering intervening. Can you just go over that, how the two processes are different and the timing of that?

MR. NGUYEN: Yes, hi, this is John Nguyen, the licensing safety project manager. So there's two parts. One is the comments regarding the Environmental Impact Statement, and that is the -- the -- some of the folks from the NRC had mentioned that it's going to be due -- it's due on March 13th.

The March 30th, or I believe March 31st, is regarding the public that wanted to submit information in terms of -- to be admitted -- to -- to submit information or contentions so that -- regarding on the safety aspect, so that once that comment period is over, which is on March 31st, I believe, that will go through the process where NRC will determine whether or not those contentions are going to be submitted and that's going to be part of the hearing process. Does that --

MR. REED: Thank you.

MR. NGUYEN: -- does that --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MR. REED: Yes, thank you.

MR. NGUYEN: -- answer the question?

Okay.

MS. BROWN: Okay. So next we will go to Susan Rodriguez.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, hello?

MS. BROWN: Yes, we can hear you.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. I had to take off the mute. I am with a group here in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and we are concerned about the -- the -- mostly with Sandia, Los Alamos, and the nuclear waste dump that we have there between Kirtland Air Force Base and Sandia, and so I have been watching this and listening to this.

And I am concerned about the comment that there was a railway line, but it only goes so far, and then it is up to this company, they wanted to store the waste and take it over the rail line, but the next part that leads to where they actually want to store it will have to be brought by them. What -- are you going to oversight that? I mean, is this a completely separate situation? I mean, at what point and how are they going to do that, aside from the fact that there have been so many national

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

problems with -- with waste being -- I mean, oil, trains with oil have crashed and all this.

So I am really concerned that it is not really put in place, and it is kind of somewhere in the future, we're going to build a link to Eunice, New Mexico, so it's not going to be staying in Texas. They're going to bring it over the border to New Mexico, that already has its hands full with all kinds of waste. That is my general comment and question.

MR. SMITH: Hi, this is Brian Smith. You asked about the -- the construction of the additional rail line. What -- what WCS is proposing is to add about an approximate length of one mile of track that would be located on property that they already own, which would be next door, right adjacent to where they plan to store the spent nuclear fuel.

From the NRC's oversight perspective, we will look at the impacts of the construction of that one-mile length of track within our Environmental Impact Statement, but from the construction aspects and -- and meeting either Department of Transportation or the Federal Railroad Administration's requirements, those would be overseen by those other agencies.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MS. RODRIGUEZ: So they're taking it as far as Texas and then moving it onto their private land that's in New Mexico?

MR. SMITH: The WCS property is primarily in the State of Texas. It does spill over, if you will, into New Mexico a small -- a short distance. But yes, the -- the way it is proposed is the fuel, the spent fuel will be routed through into New Mexico and over into WCS, which is located on the border there with New Mexico.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: And to bring it into New Mexico is -- are there any consultations with -- with the -- the government and the senators and legislators that this is happening?

MR. SMITH: I am not sure on the answer to that. Well, as far as the -- the transportation of the spent fuel, once this facility is licensed and operational and the material is being shipped there, there are specific requirements that they have to meet from I guess our requirements from a transportation standpoint as well as a security standpoint, and I believe part of those requirements includes notification of the jurisdictions that it will be passing through. Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MS. BROWN: Okay. So now we are going to move on to Tony Leshinskie -- sorry, Leshinskie.

MR. LESHINSKIE: Yes. Hi, can you hear me?

MS. BROWN: Yes.

MR. LESHINSKIE: Okay. The correct pronunciation is Leshinskie.

My name is Tony Leshinskie, and I am the State Nuclear Engineer for Vermont. I have a brief question regarding the -- the process as it was described.

Earlier in the presentation, it was stated that the safety -- safety evaluation review and the environmental review are conducted in parallel, and my question is do the two processes interact as they are carried through? Because I know that has been a question on our end, that sometimes it appears that the -- the environmental assessment is conducted well after the safety -- safety evaluation is completed, in which case we question, well, you know, the -- the environmental assessment is supposed to be part of the overall evaluation process. Is that truly the case?

MR. NGUYEN: Yes, thank you for your

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

question. This is John Nguyen, the project manager on the safety side again.

So to answer your question at a high level, yes, they do interact. A certain portion of the safety review that is being done will be taken into consideration by the environmental review. For example, Chapter 2 of the safety review, which is siting characteristics, those evaluations will be collaborated with the environmental review.

Yes, it was brought to my attention by Mr. Brian Smith that the accident analysis will also be collaborated between the two reviews.

MR. LESHINSKIE: Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. BROWN: Okay. So now I just have a few remarks before we move on to the public comment portion of the meeting.

We are going to first call on individuals that signed up previously in advance of the meeting to speak. Then we are going to move on to the people that have signed up when they arrived today, and we're going to move on to the folks that expressed an interest, the ones that are attending via webcast. We will call everyone in chronological order, so if

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

you are on the webcast and you wish to make a comment, we ask that you press star 1 now so that we can identify you and call you in the order that you make the request.

So if you're here and you need a microphone, you cannot get to the podium, please say so. Susan would be glad to bring a microphone to you. And if you're on the phone, as we just did with the Q&A, your line will be unmuted as I call your name. And for your awareness, the meeting is being recorded, and a transcript will be generated, so for those of you that are on the webcast, we have your names. You don't have to spell your name. But if you're in the meeting, we do ask that you -- if you are here in the meeting room, we ask that you spell your name so that we get the accurate documentation of that.

So we do have a number of people that are signed up to speak today, and we are going to limit the speakers to three minutes apiece. I have a timer on my phone that I am going to run. I am going to hold it next to my microphone. When you hear the tone, I ask that you wrap up very quickly so that we can allow the other speakers to provide their

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

comments today so that we can allow everyone to be heard.

So before we begin with our -- our speakers on our comment section, I want to open up for a few minutes if there are any elected officials or representatives that would like to speak or give a prepared comment. For those of you that are on the webcast, we do have somebody in the room that is coming to the podium. If you will spell your last name for us.

MR. DOLGENER: Richard H. Dolgener, D-O-L-G-E-N-E-R, Andrews County Judge sitting as we speak.

I appreciate the things that the NRC does on our behalf. And, I know that sometimes it's a little testing about meetings and stuff, but I appreciate you all having this meeting.

I spoke in Andrews and didn't get to go Hobbs, but I am here and just want to express to you all, Andrews have done -- the community has done a very good job, I think, of vetting this. There's been numerous studies, probably millions of dollars spent trying to figure out what we do.

The community, at this point, wants to be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

a partner in the nuclear fuel cycle, probably at the end of it. But, one reason we started this was to diversify ourselves from oil and I think it's done a pretty good job of doing that.

Now, we have other sights of energy as in solar and maybe some wind projects coming. So, the county itself is really into energy and have that for us.

But, we're here on an environmental thing, you all's study of this and the safety part. The safety part has a lot of ups and downs and laws and configurations and codes. So, leave that to you all.

But, the environmental part, WCS has 39 states right now that can store Class B and Class C waste there. The DOE, we've helped the DOE out in some WIPP stuff. So, that stuff doesn't get moved without somebody signing off on it.

And, I just want the environmental record to reflect that, that we've already been through a lot environmentally. There's pages and pages and pages of documents on the environmental.

So, review those and then come up with your situation.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

I do want to express, personally, that it got brought up in Andrews Environmental Justice and I know that that's probably the last star on you all's paper, I think. It was in Andrews, but the community's very good about that. And, I think it kind of blew the community back that race was being brought into this and I don't think it's fair for the community.

And, I do hope you all look at that. There's reasons that the Hispanic community is there in Andrews. You can go back to the Census and go back to when oil in the \$60s was getting -- you know, it's jobs is what it is. And, jobs brought the Hispanic community to Andrews and I think if you look in the records, that's going to be, you know, you all's finding.

But, to bring up that a company or a county or a county government or anybody in Andrews is bringing that there because of, you know, people that are dumb and don't know what to do, I think that's a very bad thing to say about a community that has done what it has done in this arena to the fact of passing a \$75 million bond issue that we're on the hook for.

I don't know of any other community

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

that's done that in any of the nuclear things I've been around the last 16 years.

So, I appreciate you all. I know you all do a good job up here of protecting us, making energy work. I know upstairs there's, you know, all the plants and the things that make us like have electricity here, so I appreciate you all, appreciate your services to the government.

Thanks.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

So, we now have our list of speakers that have identified themselves on the phone.

I do want to comment that we had several people contact us in advance of the meeting and we believe that they had expressed a desire to speak. But, we've done a comparison and the folks that we have on the list haven't press star one, so perhaps we didn't receive the message appropriately.

But, if you do want to speak and you're on the webcast, please press star one now so we can give you your opportunity to speak.

With that, I'd like to open the phone to Mary Olson to provide her comment.

MS. OLSON: Hi, can you hear me?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MS. BROWN: Yes, we can.

MS. OLSON: Thank you.

Mary Olson, Nuclear Information and Resource Service in the Southeast Office.

And, I'll just say, you can't say star one too many times because I was trying to figure out how to get a question in and only at the very end figured, oh, it's not star six, it's star one.

Anyway, so, keep repeating it as people join because I suspect they will across the three hours.

Okay, so I'm going to make a comment based on the question I didn't get to ask. But, I have heard a rumor that NRC staff do recognize that transportation is in scope. But, we hope it's not just from Eunice to WCS.

There will be impacts every step of the way, including the reactor sites, every single channel on rail. And, if they end up using road, because plans change through the urban areas of the United States, this must be considered in any major shipping campaign, which the WCS proposal would trigger if, in fact, there is a federal carrier.

And, that's my second point, first point

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

is transportation from the fuel pool, from the site, the cask on site all the way to WCS is part of the scope of the impact of this activity.

Second point, Private Fuel Storage in Utah didn't have any waste to travel there. For one, well, probably a whole long list of reasons. And, we could all have dinner and share our favorite reason WCS, no, PFS, Private Fuel Storage in Utah, never had any waste go there.

But, one of them is the liability associated with moving waste. And, I've sat in the room with colleagues who currently have closed reactor sites in their care and heard them say, it's my waste and I want it on my site until it's not my waste.

So, my next comment is the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is brazenly wasting its time unless and until there is a situation where this waste is going under federal banner.

And, in our view, unless it is going to a permanent site where it will not move again, this is going back to point one, all those impacts from transportation.

And, I would warn you that I'm going to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

contact staff and find out what papers they're using to either address or dismiss transport. And, if it's the Yucca Mountain stuff, you've got to do a lot of it over because this scenario is very different.

And, a lot of the assumptions built into the Yucca work were wrong. The general public will be exposed en route even without an accident.

Our current understandings about radiation are different than they were in the '80s and '90s when all that work on Yucca Mountain was done.

You can't do boilerplate here. It's worth doing and doing it right and doing it once. And, this whole proposal is supposedly temporary. And, if it's not temporary, NRC has a whole different kettle of fish.

So, these are the kinds of reasons that our community has said, regardless of the corporation, regardless of the community, regardless of any of those factors, interim storage is a really bad idea for all of us.

And, I'm going to put a check there. We will certainly be putting written comments in during your scoping comment period.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

But, I really, really want you guys to look in the mirror tonight and ask why you're effectively breaking the law. There is no authority for DOE to move that waste. And, it looks to me like there's a blizzard going on in the federal world and it's not very focused on radioactive waste.

So, how long is it going to be until you have that authority? And, how big is the fight going to be over whether that authority should ever be to a temporary site?

MS. BROWN: Okay.

MS. OLSON: I think NRC should be taking that side, not the WCS side.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

Next, we have Leona Morgan.

MS. MORGAN: Hi, good afternoon. Can you hear me?

MS. BROWN: Yes.

MS. MORGAN: Yes, my name is Leona Morgan and I am the Dine', I am Navajo, my family is historically from the New Mexico side up in the northwestern part of New Mexico that was severely impacted from the past uranium boom that was for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

defense purposes.

So, now, looking at this waste disposal facility, I just want to say, the Navajo Nation as a whole has passed a law against transport of any type of radioactive materials.

So, even though we do not have jurisdiction on I-40 where this waste will most likely be transported along from the east, I mean, from the west or the railroads, our nation is against the transport.

Like I said, it's very unfortunate we don't have jurisdiction to enforce that, but, if we did, this waste would not be allowed through the Navajo Nation.

And, so, that's a whole lot of folks represented there which does also go back to the issue mentioned before which is environmental racism.

Our communities have already been impacted by a lot of this waste and, as a New Mexican, I would say most people are against it.

However, in Lea and Eddy County, there's a fear of speaking out against these projects. And, on behalf of those folks who are not at the meeting or able to comment, I know there are several residents

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

concerned about the health impacts from any type of nuclear facility.

We just had a study come out from the fallout from the Trinity blast, and that was a long time ago, but we found scientific evidence showing the numbers, the cancers, the deaths and all of the impact to the human health that has occurred.

And, with the uranium mining, all the stages of the nuclear fuel cycle impacted our people or health and, as an indigenous person, our sacred sites.

And, so, these are all forms of environmental injustice. And, so, as a New Mexican, I'll tell you that this is a really bad thing to allow in our state, especially one that doesn't have nuclear energy production happening.

We shouldn't be the people who are given the waste when none of us are even benefitting right now from any type of industry or produce of the electricity that is not happening here.

And, so, this happens often with coal and oil production is the proceeds, the revenues and the electricity are exported out and then we're left with the waste, we're left with the mess and that's going

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

to hurt our health.

And, so, please, please do not allow this to happen. The transport issue and the facility, as a whole, are very dangerous to our people and our future.

So, thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

Next we have Cyrus Reed. Okay, it appears that Cyrus has dropped off. So, we'll move on to Nancy Hollow.

MS. HOLLOW: Hi, thank you.

I just -- my concern is about the possibility of earthquakes. I think Andrews County needs to be really, thoroughly studied for seismicity before approval is given for the facility or for transports.

It's in the Permian Basin, it's a big hub for oil and gas drilling now and for the foreseeable future. And, the Texas Railroad Commission is in the process of evaluating seismicity in Texas. It's not fully understood yet. Okay?

But, Commissioner Sitton stated just last November that he takes the issue of induced seismicity very seriously. He believes the science

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

is clear that injection disposal wells, which are abundant in Andrews County, may actually cause earthquakes.

And, the USGS also came to the same conclusion in 2013. Unfortunately, the Texas Railroad Commission who hired a seismologist in 2014 is right now concentrating efforts in Johnson County, not Andrews County.

So, I think Andrews County needs to be thoroughly studied for seismicity before approval is given for the facility or for the transports because, just minor shaking of railroad lines in a low magnitude earthquake can derail a train. And, God forbid.

So, I also just want to real quickly state that, West Texas is not real well known for earthquakes. If you pull up a map of earthquake faults in Texas, you probably won't see any under Andrews County, but, that's because there's low population density in Texas on the whole.

A huge geographic area, few seismographs. Seismicity in Texas is not fully known. So, we don't know if there are fault lines under there, either. And, so, there's the distinct possibility for many

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

low magnitude earthquakes and it's a huge unknown as far as the larger magnitude earthquakes.

And, I think that's something that could have a huge environmental impact.

Thanks.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

So, before we move on to the next speaker, I do want to remind folks that are on the webcast that they can enter star one if they want to speak.

So, Cyrus Reed, we had skipped over you. We thought we'd lost you. So, we understand that you've rejoined. You're next up to speak.

MR. REED: Yes, I'm sorry, at the same time I was about to speak, I was called in a House Appropriations hearing to speak, so I ran over there and said my two sentences, now I'm back. Sorry about that.

MS. BROWN: That's all right.

MR. REED: Cyrus Reed, C-Y-R-U-S R-E-E-D. I'm the Conservation Director of the Lone Star Chapter of the Sierra Club.

We have a bit of a history with this site. We were one of the organizations that opposed the low

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

level radioactive waste site and we sought what was called a contested case hearing.

We didn't ultimately -- that went to the Texas Supreme Court, but we ultimately did not get an opportunity of a contested case hearing on the low level radioactive waste license.

But, a lot of our concerns really did involve the hydrogeology of the site. And, so, I want to make sure that you look, in particular, at potential pathways to the Dockum Aquifer in eastern New Mexico and nearby Eunice and really look at the presence of both fissures and faults in the underground features. I hope that that's part of your environmental analysis.

I would also echo what was said previously about oil and gas production. This has become a huge issue in Texas with both production but, more so the disposal of waste water through injection.

This is a different oil and gas industry than was our, you know, our grandfathers' industry with the advent of hydraulic fracturing and a large amount -- large volume of waste water that's produced.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

So, I'd want you to keep in mind that we've got two new areas that are being developed, not necessarily directly in Andrews County but nearby, the Wolfcamp is a new oil discovery and then there's the Alpine High. All of that additional traffic and disposal could impact this site if it were licensed. So, I want to make sure you look at that.

As well as, and I think, obviously, you'll do this, but just look at the impact of the other facilities that are onsite there run by WCS and how they're going to, you know, manage all those different waste streams in close proximity.

And, I would hope you also look at the existence of sinkhole issues and subsidence areas which are common in Andrews County in that area of the world as part of this.

And, you know, we already mentioned the seismic activity, the potential for seismic activity.

And, then, just the environmental realities of very high winds at certain times of the day that could impact, you know, could lead to canister tip overs or other.

And, then, just what is the impact of the -- that's a great area for solar power because of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

high solar irradiation. So, looking at the impacts of many, many years of very intense sunlight on canisters and other equipment. I hope you look at that as well.

And, then, I know that you stated that you're looking really in the immediate area of the site and are not responsible for transportation. But, I think if you talk to the public, a lot of the concern is really about the transportation of the waste. And, in particular, who's liable, you know, during that transportation? How do we take care of that if there is, God forbid, an accident or some sort of emergency or terrorist attack?

Who's liable and could that actually impact, you know, the viability, the financial viability of WCS itself not being able to do their, you know, the other things they need to take care of?

So, I don't know what your laws are, but I hope you -- that's part of the analysis.

And, then, in terms of alternatives, you've got kind of two alternatives, give them a license, don't give them the license.

I guess everyone's sort of asking the question, well, what happened to the final resting

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

place that was -- there was supposed to be for this dangerous waste. And, I guess Yucca Mountain's off the table at the moment, but it seems like that should be part of the analysis, too.

Because, if we do license WCS for 40 years and it turns out there's no place to put it after, then we've just created an interim storage facility that, you know, has nowhere to go. And, I'm not sure how long those canisters are supposed to survive.

So, I think part of your analysis has to look at the likelihood that it may just end up staying there.

And, I'll probably be submitting more detailed comments, but that's -- I think that covers the high points for now.

MS. BROWN: Okay, thank you for your comments.

Next, we have Michael Ford.

MR. FORD: Hello, can you hear me?

MS. BROWN: Yes, we can.

MR. FORD: Okay, my name is Michael Ford, M-I-C-H-A-E-L F-O-R-D, spelled like the car. I'm the Vice President of Licensing and Corporate Compliance

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

for Waste Control Specialists.

I'd like to thank the NRC for the opportunity to speak today. During the course of these scoping meetings, the first two that we had, one in Hobbs and one in Andrews and also for today, you've heard a mixture of support and opposition.

And, while we're very thankful for the support we received from the local communities and the State of Texas. We don't take that support for granted. We work very hard every day to be able to demonstrate that the trust and support we continue to receive is well placed and rightly earned.

As for the concerns that you've heard during these scoping meetings, principally, again, today, groundwater at the site and the questions of geology along with transportation risks, we welcome the scrutiny of the NRC and encourage you to visit the site whenever you may need or the need may arise to investigate any matters that fall within the scope of the EIS.

As for groundwater and geology, our site in Andrews County, with over 640 borings that have determined the geologic characteristics of the site and confirmed WCS is not over any unconfined aquifer,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

is the most geologically investigated nuclear site in the country and also, likely, the world.

As the transportation of spent nuclear fuel, the safety record is not in dispute. In the USA, one percent of 300 million packages of hazardous material shipped each year contained radioactive materials. Of this, about 250,000 contained radioactive waste from nuclear power plants and 25 to 100 shipments involved spent nuclear fuel.

The spent nuclear fuel shipments, and that's on an annual basis, the spent nuclear fuel shipments are in robust, 125 ton Type-B casks carried by rail, each containing up to 24 tons of spent nuclear fuel.

Over the last 40 years, thousands of shipments of commercially generated spent nuclear fuel had been made through the United States without causing any radiological releases to the environment or harm to the public.

This is confirmed by both the NRC and the World Nuclear Association.

Finally, we are hopeful that the EIS will include the cost benefit analysis of enabling DOE to take title of the spent nuclear fuel, perhaps a decade

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

in advance of what might otherwise be possible with current government time lines.

This would save both taxpayers and the U.S. Treasury billions of dollars in avoided judgments.

And, we firmly believe that DOE has the right to do this in the current wording of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

Again, thank you very much for the opportunity to speak and we welcome your review of our using the proposed sites.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

Next, we have Chuck Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Hi, can you hear me?

MS. BROWN: Yes, we can.

MR. JOHNSON: Great. I am Chuck Johnson, Charles K. Johnson, and I'm representing Oregon and Washington Chapters of Physicians for Social Responsibility.

And, we would favor the no action option as it would be clearly the least environmentally damaging or dangerous of the two options that you are considering, especially because, as a previous speaker noted, this is not the permanent repository

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

proposal, but is an interim proposal and, therefore, would necessitate moving this high level radioactive waste more than once from its existing sites throughout the country to the interim site and then from the interim site to the permanent disposal site, where ever that ends up being.

Just inherently, the hazards involved with transporting this waste, which are not zero, and you will spend some time, I hope considering will be greater moving this -- packing this material and moving it more than once, particularly as a previous speaker also noted. If this material stays for a long time in West Texas, it may need to be repacked yet again due to the fact that some of this high burn up fuel will be hard on the structures that are containing it if left for long periods of time.

It's with regard to the waste that exists in Oregon and Washington where our chapters are located, we have three sites that would qualify for as high level waste sites.

One is the shutdown Trojan Nuclear Power Plant which has been fully decommissioned with the exception of the high level waste in canisters left at the site.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Also, the -- we have an operating nuclear reactor at Hanford, the Columbia Generating Station which is continuing to generate, at this point, high burn up fuel on a -- and putting it into -- actually, I don't believe they put any of the high burn up fuel into dry casks yet, but it's contemplating how to accomplish that.

And, then, of course, we have the left over high level radioactive waste from our nation's plutonium production for nuclear weapons at Hanford. And, that material is very, very far from being able to be transported any time soon. And, it's -- a large portion of it is in a liquid form and, as yet, it has not been decided how best to solidify that waste and make it -- put it in a form that could even be transported.

We don't see the end of the issues related on the sites in our region or really anywhere would be such that they would require an interim site.

If you have a problem at a given individual site that's currently storing high level radioactive waste, that issue can be addressed at the local level and dealt with in a way to secure and make that waste more safe and secure rather than going

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

to the addition danger of transporting it across the country to a site in West Texas.

And, any waste that is currently not in a form or in a storage facility that is considered to be a hazard is going to need to be put into a form and a storage canister that's transportable, even to go to the proposed consolidated storage site.

And, if that, you know, if it requires some sort of repackaging or some sort of different method or placement for storage at site, it's going to need to have that requirement regardless of whether it needs to be -- whether you intend to approve transporting it or not.

So, the only thing that it seems to save is the concern that some people have at each of these local sites, and that's a legitimate concern that they have. But, it should not outweigh the concern that we all should have in transporting this material unnecessarily more than once.

And, that concludes my comments. Thank you very much.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

Next, we have Kevin Kamps who is in the room.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MR. KAMPS: Good afternoon, my name is Kevin Kamps, that's K-A-M-P-S. Sorry about that.

My name is Kevin Kamps, K-A-M-P-S here on behalf of Beyond Nuclear. And, this is my third set of comments, I spoke in Hobbs, New Mexico and Andrews, Texas last week. And, we will be making more comprehensive written submissions as well.

I'd like to focus my comments today on environment justice issues.

So, there is a significant or a large percentage of Latin American residents in both Andrews County Texas as well as Lea County New Mexico, which is very much impacted by this Texas located facility, as has been mentioned.

There's also a significant or large percentage of low income residents in both counties. And, it's important when speaking about environmental justice to not only raise those demographics, but also the fact that disproportionately, these communities are impacted already by polluting industries, polluting energy industries, specifically, a large number of nuclear and radioactive waste activities as well as a large number of fossil fuel activities, oil extraction and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

natural gas fracking activities.

So, the list of nuclear and radioactive waste activities in the immediate vicinity of this proposed site include WCS's own so-called low level radioactive waste dumping.

As was mentioned by a previous speaker, that includes Department of Energy wastes as well as Class B and C so-called low level radioactive wastes from 39 states. These are the -- among the hottest categories, the most radioactive categories of low level radioactive waste already.

Under that Department of Energy category, you have such significantly radioactive wastes as the Fernald, Ohio, Belgian Congo, K-65 uranium ores from the Manhattan Project and a very telling category is the potentially bursting barrels from Los Alamos that were rushed to WCS in a great big hurry after the incident at WIPP three years ago on Valentine's Day 2014.

And, I would point out that that single barrel that burst in the WIPP underground, the current price tag for recovery from that incident is \$2 billion. And, that was several thousand feet below the surface of the Earth that did release

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

radioactivity to the atmosphere and to the environment at the surface.

So, just imagine if one of the barrels were to burst at the WCS site?

And, I learned on a tour from a Department of Energy official at Los Alamos this past October that Los Alamos had to intervene at the WCS site because WCS, in its wisdom, had put these potentially bursting barrels in concrete overpacks that were painted black on the exterior and set out to bake under the hot Texas summer sun that summer.

So, this begins to suggest something about the competence of WCS.

In addition to what WCS is already doing at the site, you have immediately next door in New Mexico, just a mile or so away, Uranium Enrichment Corporation which is a major uranium enrichment facility which significantly was not built in Louisiana because of objections over environmental justice that were raised by organizations like Nuclear Information and Resource Service and others in Homer, Louisiana in an African-American community.

That proposal was also chased out of the State of Tennessee but found a home in New Mexico

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

very near to WCS, despite efforts by NIRS and other organizations to stop it.

And, in fact, WCS was initially largely established to take wastes from this URENCO facility.

So, this is a listing of some of the hazardous and polluting activities already taking place in this community, in this area.

But, if you go further, and a previous speaker on the call -- a number of previous speakers already started to point at some of these other impacts in the State of New Mexico which, again, is very impacted by this facility located right on its border.

Also, the transportation and some of those include the Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance proposal to do the very same thing with high level radioactive waste in New Mexico.

You also have the WIPP dump site. You also have Los Alamos itself. You have Sandia and Kirtland Air Force Base, you have the Trinity Blast Site, you have other nuclear detonation sites like the Project Gasbuggy Site in New Mexico.

You have uranium mining as was mentioned and other front end facilities. You even recently

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

have proposals by the U.S. Department of Energy to do test deep borehole disposal for radioactive waste at multiple sites in Texas and New Mexico.

So, as you can see, it's not just the demographics of race and income, it's also the issue of disproportionate impacts by polluting nuclear radioactive waste, fossil fuel and other hazardous activities in these places.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

Next we have Tony Leshinskie.

MR. LESHINSKIE: Good afternoon, I'm Tony Leshinskie. I'm the State Nuclear Engineer for the State of Vermont.

And, my comments will be fairly brief, just in considering the environmental impact of this proposed facility, I think I'm now echoing comments that have been heard elsewhere.

But, please do consider the facilities that are operating here already. Consider their operating experience. Consider what they have learned regarding environmental impact as these facilities operate.

One area that I would emphasize as well,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

particularly with the low level waste facility that is already here, do consider and do encourage a state consultation in addressing issues as they come up and, certainly, allow the host state, Andrews County and the surrounding areas, you know, to provide the feedback, because they will be impacted.

And, also, from prior considerations of prior efforts, I recall about two years ago, there was a question raised, actually I believe by WCS, regarding the disposal of Greater Than Class C low level waste.

I'm sure that there was a fair amount of environmental impact evaluation done from that. It may even be ongoing. I lost track on whether that is still underway or it has concluded. But, do consider those areas.

And, lastly, do consider the fact that the Department of Energy did open a consent-based siting criteria effort. And, with that, the comments provided for that effort provide a lot of information regarding environmental impact and potential environmental impact. So, please do consider those.

And, one last item I would like to emphasize, now, early on, it was described here that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

the environmental impact would only consider, at this point, would only consider the first phase of this project that, ultimately, there will be eight phases.

And, that's, you know, what that means is that, at some point, you know, either we or our predecessor or successors will be here again to consider the environmental impact and safety evaluation review of this facility.

Yet, it's human nature that when a job has been completed once that, if you need to repeat a job for whatever reason, you look at that first job and you see what was done there.

And, so, based on that element of human nature, I would say that of the environmental impact assessments that will follow this one for this facility, this is key because this is the most important one because it is the first one.

And, very likely, the latter assessments will hopefully not be a carbon copy of this first one, but chances are, they will be very close. So, it is important that we get this job right now.

So, thank you very much for your time.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

Next, sorry, thank you for your comments.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Next, we have David Schonberger.

MR. SCHONBERGER: Hello, can you hear me?

MS. BROWN: Yes.

MR. SCHONBERGER: Hi, my name is David Schonberger and speaking as a member of the public, calling in from the State of Michigan in the Midwest Great Lakes Region.

So, this proposed facility itself would be a unique and unprecedented operation and, therefore, it requires an equally unique and unprecedented Agency review since it would be a unique and unprecedented operation.

But, I don't see that happening here and Exhibit A would be the Agency's treatment of transportation issues.

So, the associated rail and barge transportation plan involves a national transportation corridor map which would include states in NRC Region III, specifically, the Midwest and Great Lakes region where I live.

The Agency's environmental review is already deficient and unreasonable under the Administrative Procedure Act for failing to schedule a public meeting at a location within the territory

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

of NRC Region III and most other regions as well.

So, because of this limited public opportunity, the entire purpose of the scoping process as described today is undermined. It sounds to me like the environmental review is being siloed to prevent a real discussion.

The scoping for the facility itself in West Texas should include consideration of unique and unprecedented modeling for severe accident consequences and cost beneficial mitigation alternatives given that the proposed facility would potentially store an unprecedented amount of spent nuclear fuel in one single consolidated location without hardened structural primary and secondary containment.

This analysis is irrespective of safety and security considerations or emergency planning. That's within the scope of an EIS.

And, so, within the scope, a new and unprecedented list of potential severe accident mitigation alternative candidates would be appropriate, not the least of which would be consideration of cost benefit for widespread pre-distribution and stockpiling of potassium iodide

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

tablets for every resident of the States of Texas and New Mexico.

The facility -- storage facility is proposed with no technical specifications in place now or for the foreseeable future for a permanent repository disposal solution. So, therefore, it is all the more important for EIS scoping to consider the indefinite long-term storage scenario for waste management oversight and institutional control.

If it is the case that a license renewal application is subject to less rigorous review than an original construction and operating license application as in the case of the electricity generating stations, so that this might be the most important opportunity to do a fair EIS.

And, to that end, I have yet to see an NRC issued Environmental Impact Statement which fully complies with the CEQ's guidance for NEPA consideration.

I've yet to see an HOP issued EIS which fully complies with the CEQ's guidance for NEPA consideration of greenhouse gas emissions and the effects of climate change.

Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

Next, we have Sheila Parks.

MS. PARKS: Can you hear me?

MS. BROWN: Yes, we can.

MS. PARKS: Okay. My name is Dr. Sheila Parks. I'm the founder of On Behalf of Planet Earth which is a grassroots group working to close all nuclear power plants yesterday in the entire world.

I just am trying to get rid of the sound from the webcast and move away from that, so excuse me.

So, I was most interested in what the woman, I'm sorry I didn't catch her name, from the Navajo Nation had to say.

The per capita income -- the average per capita income of Andrews County is \$15,916. So, we want to talk about not only environmental justice and look at what DAPL is happening about.

I understand the NRC has nothing to do with DAPL, but it's the same kind of issues of agencies, federal agencies overrunning the will of the people in this country. And, especially with Native peoples. We came here and slaughtered them all, still continuing genocide by bringing this waste

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

now to Texas.

I can't -- I wonder who asked for the waste to be brought there? Did the people want it to be brought there or was it the Agency that's going to make all the money from doing it?

I do suggest that you people all see the film, Containment, if you were talking about -- if the NRC was also talking today or tomorrow or yesterday about closing all nuclear power plants and not producing anymore of the most toxic stew in the entire world, then I would take seriously this conversation and all the other ones that I've been hearing and listening to and speaking to by the NRC.

But, while you are talking about a temporary and interim place for this waste that lasts 240,000, hundreds, thousands of years, millions of years, you are still producing this waste all over the country. That makes no sense to me.

I feel like I'm in an asylum sometimes when we talk about these issues.

So, you know, the question is why aren't you closing them? Why aren't you putting them in your own front and back yards? Why doesn't the NRC volunteer their own homes to bury the waste? How

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

about the President? Not only this one, but all the other past Presidents? All the people in Congress who are looking for better nuclear power plants and get lots -- nuclear power plants.

So, none of this makes any sense to me. I leave you with this question. What are you going to say when somebody says to you, when your children, grandchildren, nephews and nieces say to you, mommy and daddy, grandmother and grandfather, auntie and uncle, you knew how unsafe all the nuclear power plants were, why didn't you do something about it?

Dr. Ian Sally told us in 2014, 2-0-1-4, that there's a real incidence between children who have leukemia if they live near nuclear power plants and Dr. Helen Caldicott calls them cancer factories.

Thank you, I'm done.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

Next, we have Donna Gilmore.

MS. GILMORE: Can you hear me okay?

MS. BROWN: Yes, we can.

MS. GILMORE: Okay, great.

I've been studying the nuclear waste containers that are proposed to be transported and I've met with Mark Lombard at the NRC, listened in to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

numerous technical meetings. I even talked to the former chairman of the NRC, MacFarlane and John Kotek at the DOE as well as corrosion experts.

The fact is, each one of these thin-walled canisters are about a half-inch thick. They contain about as much cesium-137 as was released by Chernobyl.

And, according to Mark Lombard and his technical staff, even the outside of these thin-walled canisters cannot be inspected, but are subject to cracks.

And, once a crack starts in stainless steel, according to the NRC, it can grow through the wall of the container in 16 years.

This WCS proposal has not addressed how they're going to take canisters that may have cracks, transport them and how are they going to inspect them when they don't have the way to inspect them?

And, they have no contingency for anything goes wrong once they get them. They're not planning a spent fuel pool. The only approved NRC method to deal with a failing canister or failing fuel is to put it back in a pool.

And, you can have a problem with a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

canister sit right now, in transport, once they get there, once they're loaded, after they're -- you're -- are you going to have a pool all along the way to deal with this?

I mean, this is insane. The NRC should not be wasting their valuable time on this folly, dealing with a situation where the Emperor has no clothes. But, I found that our elected officials, to give them the benefit of the doubt, I have spoken to many of them and they have been told, they have been misled that these canisters are safely stored now, which they aren't.

They are not aware of this cracking issue. They're not aware that even Holtec president, Dr. Singh, who manufactures these canisters says they can't feasibly be repaired. And, he also says, even a microscopic through-wall crack will release millions of curies of radiation.

Until you address these issues, you've got no business wasting the NRC's time or our time or anybody else's moving forward with this whole process.

There is a Sierra Club comments that were submitted to the NRC, I'll give you the ML number,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

ML-16082 A as in Apple, 004. It identifies these issues and more. And, please include those issues in your evaluation.

And, if you have any questions, you can contact me through my website, sanofresafety.org.

Also, regarding that it's not even legal yet because you don't have a law change, this proposal doesn't even meet the current Nuclear Waste Policy Act requirements for monitored retrievable storage. And, the pending legislation sponsored by Darrell Issa in California in my district, would in essence remove monitored retrievable storage requirements from the Act. And, I hope the NRC could be an advocate to make sure that that doesn't happen.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

I want to remind the folks that are on the webcast, if you want to speak, please press star one.

Next, we have David Rosen. David, we can't hear you.

Okay, perhaps we'll come back to David. I'm going to move on to Cody Slama.

MR. SLAMA: Hello, I'm here, can you hear

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

me?

MS. BROWN: Yes. Did I have your name correct?

MR. SLAMA: Yes, you said it right. My name is Cody Slama.

MS. BROWN: Okay.

MR. SLAMA: And, I'm from Albuquerque, New Mexico.

And, I'm calling today just to give my public input being a citizen from Albuquerque.

I've dealt with a lot of nuclear waste our here. We have a lot going on considering how much waste we have to deal with. Like, for example, we have WIPP which had a bad accident a few months ago, or in 2014, actually, that caused a release of radioactive material into the environment.

So, that concerns me because, although I'm not super close to WIPP, it's still in the vicinity of my area and I'm not sure whether I actually received radioactive doses.

Not only that, I have to deal with uranium in my drinking water every day. We try to get clean water, but we don't always have it and whenever we don't, we drink from the tap water, which

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

actually had uranium in it.

My point is, though, is that, even though the WCS site is in Texas, it borders New Mexico and it will go either through Eunice or very near to Eunice. And, I have a friend in Eunice which I would really hate for her to be affected in any way by this if an accident were to occur.

And, it doesn't only concern me here in New Mexico, it concerns the entire nation because this nuclear waste is all around the country. And, if you expect to get it to one location, you're going to be transporting it.

And, as it's been brought up a lot in this call, transportation is extremely dangerous, especially pretty much some of the most dangerous waste on the planet.

And, even though large accidents occurring during transportation have not occurred, that doesn't mean that they won't occur. And, whenever one does happen, it's going to create a sacrifice zone, and many people are going to be affected, the land's going to be affected.

A ton of people are going to be in trouble, depending on where it happens. If it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

happens in a very populated urban city, like here in Albuquerque, if it happens to go through here, then who knows what that could mean to me and my neighbors here.

It could mean super high rates of cancer. It could mean a river that we can't drink from. It could mean a contaminated aquifer for hundreds of years.

So, I just want to point that out that it's extremely dangerous to transport this stuff. And, it's better to just leave it where it is or guard it, make sure the casks are safe and secure. And, in areas where it can't stay there because it's very dangerous to stay in the area, you can move it a little bit. You don't have to move it across the country to near a place that doesn't even have nuclear power plants like New Mexico.

It's kind of ridiculous how much nuclear stuff we have to deal with here already, how much nuclear waste we have to deal with. We have to deal with the nation's nuclear defense waste and now on our borders, we're going to have to deal with the nuclear commercial waste.

So, I absolutely do not agree and I know

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

many people here who do not consent at all to this waste coming anywhere near us.

And, lastly, I'd like to say that it's currently against the law. There is a law in place that says we can't have a centralized interim storage because there's no permanent repository. So, what happens when that repository is never built? Does that waste just stay there? Is it going to stay there?

So, something definitely to keep in mind that this isn't even legal at this point.

But, that concludes my comments, thank you for listening.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

Next, we have Sarah Fields.

MS. FIELDS: Yes, I know these are for comments on the scope of the environmental impact statement, but there's also a need for an opportunity to comment on the application itself and any perceived inadequacies in the application or the information contained in the application.

There's a need for opportunity to comment on the technical aspects and the technical review by the NRC and also on the legal aspects of this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

proposal.

An example of technical issues was discussed a little while ago by Donna Gilmore. And, during the introduction, Ms. Diaz-Toro mentioned that when the canisters or the casks arrive in Texas, they would be checked for leaks and damage.

However, there is no mention that of whether they're checking the outside, that's the cask, or they're checking inside the cask to look for leaks and damage inside.

This is important because, apparently, there, for some of these canisters, there is no means to actually check for leaks and damage to the canister. And, there's no -- the NRC did not mention what happens if there are leaks and damage to the canisters or casks. Do they get sent back? Does Waste Control Specialists have the ability to deal with these issues?

Apparently, there is not going to be a spent fuel pool also being constructed at the site. So, that's a very important issue.

So, you really need to expand the scope of the public comment and hold additional opportunities for oral comments, not only on the EIS,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

but on the application, technical and legal issues.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

Next, we have John LaForge.

MR. LAFORGE: Hello, can you hear me?

MS. BROWN: Yes, we can.

MR. LAFORGE: Thank you very much.

I work with Nukewatch in Wisconsin. I'd like to bring attention to 1999, August 7th, preliminary Environmental Impact Statement produced by the Department of Energy. This was specifically with regard to moving this highly radioactive waste fuel to Yucca Mountain.

But, the point made in this EIS applies in this condition, too, where declared that leaving the waste reactor fuel in storage at reactor sites where it is is just as safe as moving it to Yucca Mountain, or in this case, I would say NRC should consider leaving it where it is, being just as safe as moving it to Texas.

As long as the waste is repackaged every 100 years or so, according to the Department of Energy.

Given the uncertainties about WCS's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

application and the risks of moving waste fuel over thousands of miles, it makes sense to leave this material where it is generated at the reactor sites while developing alternatives including the no action alternative, which I recommend.

Independent scientists including those at the Institute for Environmental Energy Research in Tacoma Park, Maryland suggest that on site above ground monitored hardened storage along with additional measures for safety and security is the way to proceed.

There is no need to move this waste to an interim storage site whatsoever. So, I agree with Mary Olson who spoke earlier that the NRC is wasting its resources and our time by considering this application at all.

It can remain where it is for at least a hundred years and should be left there until safe alternatives are discovered.

Thank you very much.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.

Next we have Karen Hadden.

MS. HADDEN: Hi, this is Karen Hadden, can you hear?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MS. BROWN: Yes, we can.

MS. HADDEN: This is Karen Hadden in Austin, Texas with SEED Coalition.

I agree with many of the comments that have been made so far. They're very good comments, especially Mary Olson, Kevin Kamps and many others, and Donna Gilmore.

We share those concerns and we hope that the Environmental Impact Statement will look seriously at the issue of water at the site. Our own research has shown, based on documents submitted by Waste Control Specialists to our state environmental agency, the TCEQ, that for some periods of time, as many as 40 percent of the wells were shown as saturated. This is the company's own data.

So, we don't think the site is dry. And, the company's own geologists have cited the fact that the OAG formation and the Dockum Aquifer are beneath the site. The Ogallala Aquifer is nearby.

And, while this region may not have many people living there in the Andrews area, the aquifer nearby goes under eight states and that could eventually impact millions of people should that water body become contaminated.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

We are concerned about the transport of this waste. It's unprecedented as others have pointed out.

The frequency of these shipments, the length of time required, 20 years or longer to conduct all these shipments is unprecedented.

Each train car would hold as much plutonium as the bomb dropped on Nagasaki. Some of these casks may already be in questionable condition when they get put on the highway or on the railway and we don't know if they're going to arrive cracked.

It's been pointed out that there is no hot cell. There is no spent fuel pool planned for the site. The only thing that WCS could do is put a cracked canister into the transport pack. Well, then what? Can you ship it back?

This site is not set up for permanent disposal. It is not scientifically viable. And, yet, you're creating a scenario where some of the waste could get there and never could be move. That means you're creating a de facto permanent disposal site and this should be prevented in this location or any other.

We are concerned about terrorism. The

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

thin canisters are of concern, both in terms of leaking and also in terms of attack and how they would hold up.

We have had train accidents already that have been very risky in Texas that exceed the bounds of testing done on these casks.

We've had a 65 mile per hour two trains coming head on at that speed in the Panhandle just last year and my understanding is that the casks are tested theoretically up to 60 miles per hour on a train crash. This is head on collision that's already happened.

The fire burned for a long, long time out there and we understand that, you know, the casks are designed to withstand 30 minutes of burning. But, further research shows that beyond that time, they have melted down.

So, there's no guarantee that the fire is going to be put out in 30 minutes. We are very concerned about all of these factors.

In Andrews County, there is a volunteer fire department, not a paid professional full-time fire department. And, the county is being asked to take on these huge risks.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

When we talk to people in Andrews County and in Eunice and the surrounding region, nine out of ten people that we talked to on the street say they do not want this waste there.

A lot has been made of the fact that they county commissioners did approve a resolution saying they want the waste and they support it. However, the county has economic benefits. For all the rest of the 254 counties in Texas, all we get is risk and no financial benefits.

And the risks could be incredibly expensive. Homeowners would be at risk because no insurance covers damage from a radioactive exposure. And, we seriously doubt that the Price-Anderson Act would come through if people were impacted by a leak or a serious accident.

So, we encourage further looks at many of these factors, the earthquakes are of concern. We also worry about the fact that some canisters that would already come to the site are rated 101 degrees. The site get to 110 degrees.

So, we will write up many more additional concerns. And, thank you.

MS. BROWN: All right, thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

So, I understand that some of you on the webcast have joined late after the last time I mentioned that you need to press star one in order to provide comment. So, if you're on the webcast and you wish to provide comment, please press star one now.

Next, we have Alfred Meyer.

MR. MEYER: Yes, can you hear me?

MS. BROWN: Yes, we can.

MR. MEYER: Thank you.

I have five points that I wish to mention that I believe must be considered in the scope of this investigation, some of which have been mentioned already.

First of all, I think in order to be honest about calling this an interim storage site, that you need to provide an ironclad guarantee of how this will be decommissioned after the 40-year duration of the license.

In other words, if you're saying it's interim storage, the license is for 40 years, then you must tell us how this waste will be moved and to where it will be moved at the end of the 40 years.

Number two, you need to fully assess the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

security risks of having such a large amount of spent nuclear fuel stored in such a small area.

Any and all conceivable methods of attack must be investigated, including, but not limited to, something like a shoulder fired munition, attack by aircraft or missile or a truck bomb.

These threats must be assessed and adequate methods of prevention provided.

Number three, as an alternative, the hardened on site storage at the existing sites must be considered.

Number four, there needs to be real time monitoring and reporting of the canister performance and you have to have proven facilities and procedures for repair and replacement of any problematic canisters.

Lastly, I believe that in line with the Blue Ribbon Commission, their work on this topic of storage of nuclear waste, but you need acquire the consent of all major populations at risk from the transportation routes and hold open public comment meetings in the geographic areas that represent the populations effected.

And, I also neglected to mention that I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

am a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility.

Thank you very much.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.

I want to remind everyone on the webcast to press star one if you want to speak.

And, also, if there's anyone in the room that wishes to speak, please let us know. Give your name to Miriam who's down front here.

So, next, we have Ace Hoffman.

MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.

MR. HOFFMAN: Can you hear me okay?

MS. BROWN: Yes, we can.

MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. I have a few quick points.

First of all, I don't hear anyone discussing the idea of neutralizing the uranium-235 and the plutonium-239 before transporting the waste. The idea has a patent pending by Peter M. Livingston to use lasers in the 10 to 15 megavolt range, million electron volts, to do the neutralization.

And, this would prevent the possibility or any criticality events happening either during transport or during storage. It also would eliminate

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

the possibility of proliferation.

Second, why doesn't the WCS take legal possession of the waste instead of giving it to the U.S. government? They are, after all, handling it. So, why won't they take the liability? I'm sure if they did, they would make much stronger containers.

Also, we've been told that leaving the waste on the current sites is safe. That's certainly not true for San Onofre which has earthquake and tsunami risks.

And, also, we've been told that the stranded waste such as at San Onofre would be moved first. But, there's nothing in the -- in Darrell Issa's bill that says that. And, the operating pools, the pools at the operating sites are dangerously overpacked. So, it seems that that's really not going to happen.

And, why won't the utilities be charged for the cost of this interim storage? Why are they taking money from the interest that's accruing in the not enough money already for the permanent repository fund?

And, lastly, why would a company which has made so many mistakes in handling nuclear waste

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

be allowed to do this project at all?

Thank you very much. That's all I have.

MS. BROWN: All right, thank you.

Next, we have Maureen Headington.

MS. HEADINGTON: Yes, I'm Maureen Headington. I'm President of the Stand Up/Save Lives Campaign in Illinois and also a past Director on the Board of the Illinois Environmental Council on which I served for six years.

With regard -- a lot of this is certainly repetitious of what you've heard, however, I think it bears repeating.

Regarding transport issues, the condition of our roads, our expressways, our railways, our bridges, our barges on which this waste would be transported on our waterway is deplorable. And, any contemplation of putting this highly deadly material on to these roadways, et cetera is ridiculous.

The reality of the act of terrorism, the dynamics of human error and mechanical error, who in their right mind would spend \$28 billion to erect a wall to supposedly keep us safe and at the same time allow us to engage in the transport of high level

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

nuclear waste lethal to anyone exposed to it causing life-changing health consequences to survivors.

There is no good explanation for why the National Institute of Health Study which had been approved on the impact of reactors in our communities was cancelled. The health study previously approved likely was cancelled because the government was afraid to find out yet again that nuclear reactors, energy production and the disposal of its waste are not safe.

There are no protections for the homes and businesses that the transport will pass. We don't have homeowners insurance to cover radiological disasters.

Price-Anderson Act, yes, that continues to protect industry. All of the bogus promises of jobs, are you including job of morticians and doctors in that list? No provision of potassium iodide.

The foolish project of a few years ago was a scheme to make money at the expense of our lives and we felt that here in Illinois.

Illinois has more reactors than any state, more radioactive waste stockpiles at these reactors than any other state.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

We're an agricultural state that endures tritium leaks and a litany of other emissions and violations. For us and our neighbors, it would be preferable to bury it on site using the best canisters and casks available, not Holtec with no capacity for inspection of contents and the distinct possibility of lasting a mere 16 years. This is a waste of our taxpayer dollars.

In addition to the clean-up costs which are just phenomenal.

I consider Illinois, at this point, one of the nuclear toilets of the world. It's a dereliction of your duty in serving this country and not the bottom -- and not to -- in serving this country to give priority to the bottom line of an industry on life support that relies for its very existence on government loans, taxpayer and rate payer subsidies in keeping it lucrative for its investors.

Notably, this does not include Wall Street because these ventures are too risky for Wall Street and apparently not for Main Street, thanks to hefty campaign contributions to our elected officials and what has become a vicious cycle of corruption and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

public welfare.

You need to stop generating the waste and you need to stop running the reactors and then you won't have a waste problem to deal with.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.

So, that was the last speaker that has asked to speak today. If there's anybody else on the webcast or anybody else in the room that wants to speak, please make yourself known.

If you're on the webcast, please press star one.

Okay, we did have someone raise their hand on the webcast. Actually, we had a couple people raise their hands. So, let's open the phone line to Regina Minniss.

MS. MINNISS: This is Regina Minniss.

MS. BROWN: Regina, we're having trouble hearing you.

MS. MINNISS: Yes, this is Regina Minniss on the phone. Can you hear me okay?

MS. BROWN: No, we can't hear you. But, just barely.

MS. MINNISS: Is now good?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MS. BROWN: No.

MS. MINNISS: Now?

MS. BROWN: A little better.

MS. MINNISS: Okay, I'll go with what I have.

Regina Minniss, that's M-I-N-N-I-S-S. I'm a private citizen but also a member of Crabshell Alliance which is a local anti-nuke group in Baltimore, Maryland.

Just recently, the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists increased the theoretical doomsday clock to 2.5 minutes before --

MS. BROWN: Regina, you're breaking up.

MS. MINNISS: Just recently, the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists increased the theoretical doomsday clock to 2.5 minutes before midnight which indicates how close we are to global catastrophe.

One of the reasons for this moving the clock closer to midnight our present unstable administration.

The transportation along with the open air end storage is extremely susceptible to terrorists. This alone, to me, would be the reason

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

to deny the permit for Andrews, Texas, not to mention all the other scientific environmental concerns already expressed.

I just want to give a P.S. to what I'm saying, is that I can't believe that the NRC violated its own public notice period for an issue that is extremely dangerous.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.

So, we have Donna Gilmore, who is on the webcast that's asked for a second opportunity to speak and I want to open that opportunity to anyone in the room if they would like that and please let Miriam know.

Okay, so we do have Kevin Kamps who would like to speak again in the room.

So, with that, let's open the phone to Donna Gilmore.

MS. GILMORE: Okay, can you hear me okay?

MS. BROWN: Yes.

MS. GILMORE: Okay, great, thank you for doing that.

There was a comment earlier, I think by Karen, that the industry has told her that if they

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

have a problem, they're going to take the thin canister that leaking and cracking and put it in another container, be it a transport cask or some other kind of container.

That scenario has not been approved by the NRC and Mark Lombard told me nobody has even requested such a thing.

There would need to be a thermal analysis and all kinds of other NRC evaluations to even determine the feasibility of that. And, I hope in your EIS that you don't make any assumptions based on promises, but on approved NRC safety evaluations.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.

Next, we'd like to have Kevin Kamps come to the microphone.

MR. KAMPS: Thank you.

Kevin Kamps, K-A-M-P-S, with Beyond Nuclear and also Don't Waste Michigan, Board of Directors representing the Kalamazoo Chapter.

So, I would like to request a significant time extension on both the environmental scoping deadline of March 13th as well as the legal intervention deadline of March 31st, several months

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

in duration is the request.

And, I would also like to request additional public comment meetings in hard-hit shipping corridor communities and the follow list is not exhaustive, but simply an example of where these hearings could take place, Dallas-Fort Worth, Texas, St. Louis, Missouri, Chicago, Illinois, Baltimore, Maryland, Western Michigan, Brattleboro, Vermont.

And, a part of the reason for these requests in these specific places, in addition to the rail transport involved in these places bound for WCS, also the potential for barge shipments on surface waters.

And, so, in Baltimore, you have the potential for barge shipments on the Chesapeake Bay from Calvert Cliffs. In West Michigan, you have the potential for barge shipments from Palisades to Muskegon as well as from the Wisconsin reactors to Milwaukee, so Milwaukee is another place where a hearing could take place.

And, the additional barge shipments that come to mind, and so, potential extra hearings could take place in places like the Florida coastline, the California coastline, the James River, Virginia,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Delaware Bay, metro New York City given Hudson River and Long Island Sound shipments as well as Atlantic seaboard shipments in the metro New York City area.

Boston is another place. I mentioned Lake Michigan already, the Mississippi River in Louisiana and Mississippi, the Tennessee River in Tennessee and Alabama, the Missouri River in Nebraska, Kansas and Missouri.

And, where these come from is from the Department of Energy's final Environmental Impact Statement for the Yucca Mountain proposal dated February 2002.

And, the reason that all of those were listed by the Department of Energy is because the reactors in question, some 26 across the country, lack direct rail access.

And, so, those reactors, to ship these rail sized containers that are proposed to WCS, would either have to use heavy haul trucks which raises its own safety and security issues or barge shipments. And, that's why those maps were explicitly included in DOE's FEIS in 2002.

The reason that I mentioned Brattleboro, Vermont is because a speaker at the Andrews hearing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

last week said that public meetings happen on a regular basis in Brattleboro and that the folks want it out of there.

And, I think that was a mischaracterization, actually, because I have colleagues, in fact, members of our organization who have taken the high moral ground that they don't wish their problems on anybody else.

They're fully familiar with how dangerous this material is at the Vermont Yankee site, not to mention the Yankee Rowe site, but organizations like Citizens Awareness Network for decades have taken the high moral ground.

In fact, they hammered out the hardened on site storage principles.

And, so, you had asked earlier during the intro, what is a reasonable alternative to what's being proposed?

And, I would point out, yet again, for the umpteenth time to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that hardened on site storage, as close to the point of origin as possible, as safely as possible is the reasonable alternative likely for decades to come.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Because, even if WCS were to open today or to open in 2019, it would take years or decades to move the waste the 40,000 metric tons proposed, out to West Texas.

So, for all those years and all those decades that it would take, the waste would remain vulnerable, at risk at the reactor sites.

And, so, hardened on site storage at the reactor sites is the reasonable alternative, regardless of any other developments.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.

So, we understand that David Rosen has rejoined. Can we open the phone line for David?

MR. ROSEN: Yes, this is David Rosen, can you hear me this time?

MS. BROWN: Yes.

MR. ROSEN: Excellent, thank you.

I am a geologist and I've become re-familiarized with the seismic activity around Andrews. While some people may think it is negligible, there was a 4.7 earthquake in Andrews, Texas in 1992 and it's been fully documented by a well-known local geologist, by the name of Pat

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Bolden. He's no longer with us, but, meaning he's dead.

But, if there is written material on it, if he's written any papers, I will do my best to get those papers and get them to the NRC.

This was wrench faulting. Mr. Bolden was well-known scholar in that. And, he spoke about the fault that was essentially parallel to the New Mexico-Texas state line.

And, a 4.7 is getting to be significant. So, I hope that you will take the seismicity into account and records of this earthquake should be available from the seismograph station that might be at Texas Tech in Lubbock as well as the University of Texas El Paso.

So, that's my comment today and I hope that it will help you all in your Environmental Impact Statement.

MS. BROWN: Okay, thank you for your comments.

Next we have Leona Morgan.

MS. MORGAN: Hi, I just wanted to reiterate the request for additional time in hearing, especially along the transportation route where

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

communities are at risk in Albuquerque, New Mexico and the different communities that will be impacted as well as to give -- I'm requesting that DOE also send notice to any Tribal Nations that will be impacted along the transportation route.

I think they should have the opportunity to comment and be consulted with as well, especially for my Tribe, the Navajo Nation and some of the Tribes along the Rio Grande, the Pueblos of New Mexico as well as the Mescalero Apache Nation, and, of course, Tribes in other states that will be impacted from any transportation as well.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.

Next, we have Bonnie Blustein. Are you there, Bonnie?

MS. BLUSTEIN: Oh, I'm sorry, can you hear me?

MS. BROWN: Yes.

MS. BLUSTEIN: Okay. I'm Bonnie Blustein. I'm a retired public health professional and I live in Chicago.

I am concerned about all aspects of this proposal for the waste from the casks to the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

transportation to the final resting spot in Texas, even though it's supposed to be interim, it could end up being the final resting spot.

I am most concerned about this transportation infrastructure. I have personally toured infrastructure in Chicago, which is one of the main spots that the rail will be going through. And, I have seen crumbling viaducts. I have seen the ability to walk up to the tracks, the trains would be going through heavily populated areas here.

We already have a lot of oil trains going through. They are very heavy in weight and these containers would be going through on the train tracks. And, the infrastructure is deteriorated. It is not safe, it is not secure.

There's a lot of places where you could just walk right up to the tracks. There's also been a history of derailments of trains and we know that accidents do happen.

There's been oil train accidents. One of them was in Galena, Illinois. Luckily, it wasn't by a population area.

So, my concerns would be the crumbling infrastructure, derailments, security and public

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

health accidents. I've seen some emergency planning for what would happen with an accident on a railroad track and I live near, within a mile, of a railroad track and it can wipe out a large area. But, that mile in diameter is the most vulnerable.

And, I think that this is a very poorly planned solution. And, I'm done.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.

So, if there's anybody else on the webcast that wishes to speak, please press star one.

With that, we'll go to Maureen Headington.

MS. HEADINGTON: Thank you.

I'm Maureen Headington, Stand Up/Save Lives Campaign.

I think to take further Kevin's list of towns and states that would require, I think, public hearings, I'd like to comment on the actual notice and the way it's provided.

It seems to me that there's a reliance by government on grassroots activists such as myself and other organizations that are not for profit to do the work of notifying those who would be impacted.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Because they don't know to look at your website.

Most people are incredulous when they hear that there's a hearing and, quite -- it's too onerous a task to put on us when the government does have the ability to provide adequate notice.

So, I am requesting that all cities, towns and counties within a 25 mile radius, and that's being generous to you, it should be at least 50, be notified of all hearings as well as the prospect of the transport, whether it's by truck on our roadways or by the rail or by the barges regarding City of Chicago into Will County, so that they have the ability to know of this, notify their residents of it and to attend.

And, I know that you've got the email addresses for all of our elected officials and our state governments. And, it would be a simple thing for you to do.

And, I think that this idea of just letting us know about this is just totally inadequate.

The other thing is that, when you conduct these meetings and hearings in a downtown area such as Chicago where I know I drove in to attend a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

hearing, this is important to me, I also had to pay \$40 to park the car because it was in a hotel in Chicago.

I think you need to plan these things so that they are readily available to people without having the expense added. Many people can't afford to pay that kind of money to sit and wait for their time to speak.

And, it should be also during a time that working people can attend. And, I think you'd find that you would have far greater participation than what you are currently getting.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: All right, thank you.

So, if there's anyone else in the room that wants to speak, is anybody on the webcast that wants to speak, please press star one.

And, now, we'd like to open the phone line to Sarah Fields.

MS. FIELDS: I live in Utah very close to the only operating conventional uranium mill in the U.S. But, I also have family that lives on one of the transportation routes from Humboldt, California reactor, that's in Northern California.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

And, I want to reiterate the call for hearings and notice of communities on the proposed transportation routes.

There's certainly many people who are not aware that this process is going on or aware of the many issues related to the transportation of this type of waste to either Texas, New Mexico or any other site whether for temporary storage or permanent storage.

I'd like to also request that you extend the period for comment, for submitting comments and comments on the application and the technical review and the time in which to request an adjudicatory proceeding, putting together, reviewing all the pertinent documents and putting together acceptable contentions is an onerous length and lengthy process.

And, the communities and organizations should be given a fair opportunity to review the pertinent documents and to be able establish standing in any proceeding.

I'd also like to point out that the Department of Energy has still not determined its relationship to any type of private fuel storage application or site. They don't know what their

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

relationship would be and the public doesn't know the relationship.

They don't know who will take actual responsibility. Who's going to accept the liability? Who will own the waste during transportation and during the long-term storage that's proposed in Texas and New Mexico?

And, these are some of the threshold issues and they need to be explored. They need to be explored publically. The NRC must lay out in a website all these issues and links to the applicable statutes and regulations that they're operating under at this time.

Okay, thanks for the opportunity for a second round of comment.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

Okay, is there anybody else in the room or on the webcast? If you're on the webcast, please express your interest to comment by pressing star one.

If you've just joined the webcast, you can press star one to comment.

Okay, we'd like to open the phone line to Linda Lewison.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MS. LEWISON: Yes, this is Linda Lewison, can you hear me?

MS. BROWN: Yes.

MS. LEWISON: Yes, I would just like to call your attention to the fact that Senator Bingaman from New Mexico a few years ago refused to support any kind of interim storage legislation unless it was tied to a permanent geological repository.

This project should also be required to have that tie. And, there should be much more attention given to finding the permanent geological repository in a scientific manner before anything like this is carried through or even proposed.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.

Okay, if we can open the phone line to Stephanie Bilenko.

MS. BILENKO: Hello, can you hear me?

MS. BROWN: Yes.

MS. BILENKO: Just a couple of comments from listening to other people's comments.

I hope that the NRC takes all these comments very seriously to heart. It's just not taking people's time up and it costs a lot of money

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

to travel to your hearing sites and give testimony, et cetera.

I also like -- I know this has nothing to do with the interim storage, but to me, it makes so much sense, just to keep them on the site that they are on right now in HOSS containers, in really good containers.

I also like the comment from Kevin earlier regarding those communities that already have this storage taking a high moral ground and saying, yes, let's keep them here but let's make them safe not only from a health issue, but from terrorist issues as well.

And, lastly, this also has nothing to do with interim storage, but the nuclear industry is telling that they are -- they don't have a carbon footprint.

Well, all this moving around of the waste has a huge carbon footprint. So, I think they should really just forget about telling the public that they are green.

That's all.

MS. BROWN: Okay, thank you.

Again, if you're on the webcast and you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

wish to speak, please press star one. Here in the room, just let us know if you want to speak. Miriam's down front here, she'll be glad to take your name.

MR. KAMPS: Thank you, Kevin Kamps, Beyond Nuclear.

And, I did have additional comments, so I appreciate the third time at the microphone today.

I wanted to address another issue that I hope will be included in the environmental scoping, and that has to do with collusion, C-O-L-L-U-S-I-O-N, collusion between regulators, industry and government officials.

And, just as by way of preamble, the Japanese Parliament in 2012 after a year-long investigation of the Fukushima nuclear catastrophe, the first independent investigation in the history of the Japanese Parliament concluded that the root cause of the Fukushima catastrophe was collusion between the regulatory agency, Tokyo Electric Power Company and government officials.

That was the reason that the three reactors were so vulnerable to the natural disasters that led to their meltdowns and catastrophic radioactivity releases which continue, actually.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

And, I wanted to point out that this proposal is rife with just such collusion. So, regulators, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, some of this has already been pointed to, but the rush job that this proceeding represents is an indication of just such collusion.

The tight deadlines, the lack so far of hearings along transportation routes.

But, worse than that, if you go back to the end of 2015 to a spent fuel project office regulatory conference that I attended just across the street here in Rockville where an acting director of the Division of NRC in charge of these matters concluded the entire event with leading a cheer that, together we can do this. Together we can license a centralized interim storage facility. And, that was so highly inappropriate.

NRC's role is supposed to be safety regulation and security regulation, not policy setting or industry promotions.

And, so, that was a very dark moment, actually, for the NRC and has cast a shadow over this entire proceeding.

The industry players in this collusion

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

include Waste Control Specialists itself, the Department of Energy should be included in the industry category.

The Department of Energy is a promoter of nuclear energy, its Office of Nuclear Energy.

And, I just have to point out that the gentleman who, at DOE, as a leader of the Office of Nuclear Energy, John Kotek, who not only served as Staff Director at the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future, but also at DOE, itself, directly presided over the public comment proceedings on defining consent-based siting of centralized interim storage facilities, just recently, went to work for the Nuclear Energy Institute.

So, the revolving door, the bad faith is abundantly clear to the public what's happening. The nuclear industry, of course, itself, the nuclear utilities, what's really driving this entire process, this entire motivation behind this is to transfer ultimate liability for these wastes onto the public, onto the taxpayer and it's a bad motivation.

And, then, finally, the category of government and elected officials. Incredibly enough, Rick Perry, former Governor of Texas, has

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

been nominated, will soon have his confirmation vote on the Senate floor for Energy Secretary.

Rick Perry was a beneficiary of \$1.25 million in campaign contributions from the owner of Waste Control Specialists, Harold Simmons, whose family still owns this facility.

And, Rick Perry, his administration, his appointees, gave WCS every license they ever asked for. And, he's about to return that favor in a big way by adding some zeros on the end.

Taxpayers will be implicated to the tune of billions of dollars if Rick Perry, as Energy Secretary, signs a contract for centralized interim storage at WCS.

Another elected official, U.S. Representative Conaway from this congressional district in Texas, as well as Representative Darrell Issa from San Onofre country, with their legislation that would do away with the linkage between a final repository and centralized interim storage could well doom Andrews County Texas to be a de facto permanent parking lot dump for high level radioactive waste for the indefinite future. We're not just talking years or decades, but perhaps centuries, perhaps beyond.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

And, if you look back, again, at that 2002 Final Environmental Impact Statement by the Department of Energy, I would point you to where the Department of Energy warned that if these wastes remain on site at reactors, granted, that was the context of that FEIS, that eventually, those containers will degrade and catastrophically release their contents. And, that very well could happen at WCS.

And, I would, you know, hasten to rebut any reliance on NRC's Nuclear Waste Confidence policy, now called Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel, which applies both on site at reactors, but also at away from reactor storage, the notion that dry transfer systems will save the day at some future point is fictional.

No such facility has ever been built. NRC does not know where the funding would come from to do that.

And, so, as was mentioned earlier in the film, Containment, the new documentary that's just out aired on PBS recently, the former chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Allison MacFarlane pointed out that loss of institutional control, by

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

definition, can be counted on.

And, in fact, she voted that way as chairman at NRC, warning that institutional control will be lost some day over these containers and containment will be lost and catastrophic radioactivity releases could occur at a place like WCS.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

Okay, if we can open the phone line to Clay Turnbull.

MR. TURNBULL: Could you turn that off now?

Hello there. This is Clay Turnbull, I'm with New England Coalition in Brattleboro, Vermont.

And, today, my comments are given -- I'll limit them. I must admit, the subject is far more than I could try to encompass in any comments and I do want to just echo so many of the comments from the public today. It demonstrates folks have been thinking about this in a serious way and have done their homework.

So, it is hard to just peel out one tiny little subject. But, I would say, in terms of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

scoping, I don't know if it's appropriate in an Environmental Impact Statement to look at the consent of future generations, that if it does fall into that Environmental Impact Statement, then I think I would really like to see the ideas explored both, if future generations do not wish to consent as their forefathers and mothers did, what recourse do they have to have this waste removed?

And, I suppose you need not even look at it in a multi-generational aspect. It could be 40 years down the line. What happens if the host community decides this isn't really what we thought it would be or the terms aren't what we thought they would, we would like to end this relationship?

So, I'd like to see that addressed in the scoping.

Thank you for your time today.

MS. BROWN: All right, thank you for your comments.

So, if you're on the webcast and you'd like to make a comment, please press star one.

I do know that there's another individual that is trying to get through. And, while we're waiting for that individual to get connected, if

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

there's anybody else either in the room or on the phone that wants to speak, please let us know.

If you're on the webcast, please press star one.

We know that the individual is trying, so we'll give her a few moments.

Okay, if we can open the phone line to Karen Hadden, please?

MS. HADDEN: Hi, this is Karen Hadden. I appreciate the opportunity to raise an additional point.

Again, it was pointed out earlier that moving forward on this license application right now is premature because, currently, it's illegal to have such a facility under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

So, we feel like the whole process should be halted for starters.

Also, the transportation routes have not been designated or even in draft form and will not be presented to the public until 2022, potentially after this license is issued.

People throughout the country could be impacted if they're along transport routes and they are not being given an adequate opportunity to be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

represented and to know even for sure where those routes would go.

We would like to request additional meetings in Dallas and El Paso and also San Antonio where, just on Tuesday, they county commissions in Bexar County where San Antonio is, approved a resolution that said they do not want the transport of high level radioactive waste through their community.

While it's not legally binding, it certainly is an expression of their concerns.

We would like to request an extension of 60 days on the deadline on scoping comments because a lot of people haven't even heard yet what's going on and especially people along transport routes.

And, we would like to request a 120 days of extension on the opportunity to submit conventions and intervene.

It takes a lot of time, energy and effort for nonprofit groups to raise money, find attorneys, find expert witnesses and fund them. And, we would like a fair opportunity to do so.

We also would like to have limited appearances allowed at all of the hearings. And,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

basically, that seems to be minimized according to the Federal Register Notice.

We would like that opportunity to be there because sometimes an individual would like to comment on the license application, but not necessarily be a party. And, their input is still valid and viable.

Today's Notice for today's meeting was inadequate. We object to that and would like to see that avoided in future meetings. And, I hope there are some.

And, finally, I'd like to say that, a major concern that we have is that this would become a permanent de facto disposal site. It would not be scientifically viable. It would not be designed to last for the millions of years that this waste needs to be isolated. And, we would create a disaster of untold, unimaginable consequences.

The political pressure to move the waste would be off after this stuff gets into one location, whether it be in Texas, New Mexico or elsewhere. And, we would like to see, instead of wasting resources on consolidated storage, that the focus be shifted to finding a scientifically viable system and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

location for permanent disposal of radioactive waste and the chance of actually isolating this waste for generations to come.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for your comments.

And, now, if we can open the phone line for Maureen Headington, please?

MS. HEADINGTON: Thank you for this opportunity to yet again speak.

With regard to Karen's excellent request on the extension, I would ask that it be more than 60 days. And, the basis for that is, in fact, the DOE and NRC will go with my recommendation of notice to the cities and towns that would be impacted within 25 miles radius or possible transport, for them to be able to act, they only meet twice a month and in the summer once a month here in my town.

And, this would be a legal proceeding. It has to be run past their attorney in terms of getting a resolution of support or lack of support for a project that would impact us potentially.

So, I think that it should be at least a 120 day notice to allow for the input of our communities.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

And, let's see here, I think we'll leave it at that. Thank you.

MS. BROWN: All right, thank you.

If there's anybody else on the webcast that wasn't to speak, please press star one and we'll open the phone line for you.

We are winding down here. We're going to probably go for another five minutes looking for comments before we wrap up with final comments from the NRC.

So, if you have just joined the webcast and/or you've just decided that you want to comment, please press star one so that we can open the phone line for you.

Okay, if we can open the phone line for David Schonberger, please?

MR. SCHONBERGER: Hello?

MS. BROWN: Hello.

MR. SCHONBERGER: Yes, so, my name is David Schonberger speaking again as a member of the public from the State of Michigan.

I spoke earlier about suggesting that the scope, that for scoping the EIS, since this is an unprecedented proposed facility that an unprecedented

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

consideration should be given to coming up with a list of potential severe accident mitigation candidates.

And, the type of thinking involved for scoping this unprecedented facility would involve consideration of severe accident mitigation installations or procedures which would be off site rather than just limited to only on site mitigation alternatives.

And, by scoping off site candidates, that would bring into consideration the possibility for a cost beneficial mitigation alternatives that might otherwise not be considered.

Mitigation, the concept of mitigation, as defined by NEPA, includes actions to avoid impacts, to minimize impacts, to rectify impacts, reduce or eliminate impacts and to compensate for impacts according to 40 CFR Part 1508.

So, it is not a legitimate Environmental Impact Statement to discuss mitigation in that without discussing off site mitigation alternatives in this analysis.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Okay, once again, if there's anybody on the webcast that wishes to speak, please press star one. We'll wait just a few more minutes to see if anybody joins late perhaps or determines that they do want to provide comments.

So, if you are interested in providing comments, please press star one so that we can open the phone line for you.

Okay, so, last call, if you're interested in speaking and you're on the webcast, please press star one. If you're in the room and you wish to speak, please let Miriam know.

Okay, so, thank you all for coming either here in the room today or virtually through the webcast.

The NRC is always looking for ways to improve its public meeting process. And, so, if you're present here today, you can pick up a public meeting feedback form from the hallway.

Or, you can go to the information on this public meeting on our website and you can find a link to the public meeting feedback form in two places on that site that has information for this specific meeting.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

You can go to the link for the specific meeting and press more and find the link and you can also go to the meeting feedback link on the meeting details page, again, that's specific to this meeting and find the form.

So, we would appreciate if you have any comments about how we can improve these meetings, we'd appreciate hearing from you.

With that, I'd like to turn the meeting back over to Brian Smith for some closing comments.

MR. SMITH: All right, thanks, Cris.

Also, thank you to everyone who provided comments today. We really appreciate those. We will take each and every one into consideration.

As I mentioned earlier today in response to a question, we are considering additional meetings. No decisions have been made on that yet. We will take the comments we heard today as well into consideration as part of that decision-making process.

With respect to requests for extension on the comment period for the EIS as well as for the additional time for the hearing, we would request that you submit those requests in writing. There may

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

be a specific process you have to follow for the hearing. I'm not familiar with what the requirements for are in the Federal Register Notice, but that may require specifics for that.

You will get an additional chance to provide comments when the draft EIS is published. We will be conducting initial meetings once that's out and give you some time to look at it to take comments on that. So, you will see us again out in the communities at least around Andrews and Hobbs.

So, once again, thank you very much for your time and your comments.

Thank you.

And, with that, that closes the meeting.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:51 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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