

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: Thursday, April 6, 2017

Work Order No.: NRC-3001

Pages 1-124

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

+ + + + +

CATEGORY 3 PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

APRIL 6, 2017

+ + + + +

The Scoping Meeting was convened in the
Commissioners' Hearing Room, 11545 Rockville Pike,
Rockville, Maryland, at 7:00 p.m., Andrey Korsak,
Meg Gold and Cris Brown, Co-Facilitators, presiding.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

PRESENT

CRIS BROWN, Co-Facilitator, Office of Nuclear
Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS)

MEG GOLD, Co-Facilitator, NMSS

ANDREY KORSAK, Co-Facilitator, NMSS

MAUREEN CONLEY, Office of Public Affairs

KELLEEE JAMERSON, NMSS

JOHN McKIRGAN, NMSS

JOHN-CHAU NGUYEN, NMSS

JAMES PARK, NMSS

CINTHYA ROMÁN, NMSS

BRIAN SMITH, NMSS

ANTOINETTE WALKER-SMITH, 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

Opening Remarks and Introductions.....4
Welcome and Meeting Purpose6
NRC Mission and Regulatory Role.....9
NRC Licensing Review/EIS Process.....14
Question and Answer Period.....28
Receive Public Comments.....49
Closing Remarks.....123
Adjourn.....124

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

7:02 p.m.

1
2
3 MS. GOLD: Hello and welcome. My name
4 is Meg Gold, and I am a co-facilitator for this
5 evening's meeting, and my co-facilitators are Cris
6 Brown and Andrey Korsak. As the NRC staff here
7 tonight will make clear, the primary purpose of this
8 meeting, to which the vast majority of the meeting
9 time will be devoted, is to accept public comments
10 on what should be the scope of NRC's Environmental
11 Impact Statement, otherwise known as an EIS,
12 regarding Waste Control Specialists' application to
13 build and operate a spent nuclear fuel consolidated
14 interim storage facility in Andrews County, Texas.

15 The meeting tonight will be broken into
16 several parts. We will begin with a presentation by
17 NRC staff intended to broadly cover the
18 environmental review process, and when that
19 concludes, we will have about 10 or 15 minutes for
20 process and procedure questions related to the NRC
21 presentations. And after that, the rest of the
22 meeting will be devoted to hearing comments from
23 members of the public.

24 There is a registration table in the
25 hallway with a sign-up list for those here in the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 room who would like to offer their comments tonight,
2 and if you would like to offer comments tonight and
3 have not already done so, please feel free to step
4 outside to speak -- or to sign up. And if you are
5 attending virtually, you have the opportunity to
6 sign up to speak by pressing star 1 at the
7 appropriate time.

8 So if I could just run through some
9 quick ground rules: while we have no expectation
10 that such will occur, threatening gestures or
11 statements will not under any circumstances be
12 tolerated, and if you feel that you have been
13 threatened, please alert any of the NRC facilitators
14 or staff that are here tonight. And a few minor
15 housekeeping matters: the bathrooms are outside and
16 down the hallway to the left, and the exits are each
17 corner of the room. Cameras are permitted, but
18 please try not to obstruct the view of other
19 audience members, and if you have not already done
20 so, please silence your cell phones at this moment.

21 So at this point, we would like to offer
22 elected officials or their representatives an
23 opportunity to be recognized. Note that during a
24 later period of the meeting tonight, there will be
25 an opportunity for elected officials to give

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 prepared remarks. For those elected officials or
2 their representatives on the phone, please press
3 star 1 so that you can introduce yourself, and for
4 those in the room, please raise your hand and we can
5 bring a microphone to you. So at this point, do we
6 have any elected officials or their representatives
7 in the room?

8 (No audible response.)

9 MS. GOLD: Okay. Operator, are there
10 any on the phone that would like to introduce
11 themselves?

12 THE OPERATOR: At this time, I am
13 showing none.

14 MS. GOLD: Okay. At this point, then,
15 thank you very much, and we will turn the meeting
16 over to Brian Smith.

17 MR. B. SMITH: Good evening, everyone.
18 My name is Brian Smith. I am the Deputy Director of
19 the Division of Fuel Cycle Safety, Safeguards, and
20 Environmental Review in the Office of Nuclear
21 Material Safety and Safeguards. My division is
22 responsible for performing all the environmental
23 reviews within the Office of Nuclear Material Safety
24 and Safeguards, including the review of the
25 environmental aspects of the Waste Control

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Specialists license application.

2 Within my branch is -- or within my
3 division is the Environmental Review Branch, which
4 will be responsible for performing an EIS. We have
5 two folks from that branch here tonight: James Park,
6 who is the lead project manager for the EIS, and
7 Cinthya Román, his branch chief. Also with us
8 tonight is John Nguyen, who is from the Division of
9 Spent Fuel Management, who is the lead project
10 manager for the safety aspects in the overall review
11 of the WCS license application.

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

22 Our presentation -- in our presentation,
23 we will be discussing WCS's proposal and NRC's
24 process for reviewing WCS's request. We encourage
25 and welcome your comments tonight on the scope of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the NRC EIS, and I can assure you that we take each
2 and every comment very seriously.

3 The NRC's job is to protect the public
4 health and safety and the environment by thoroughly
5 reviewing each license application we receive before
6 deciding whether or not to grant an applicant's
7 request. We understand that in the audience and on
8 the phone tonight, there are those who may oppose
9 WCS's license application for the storage facility
10 as well as those who may support it. I want to
11 assure you -- to assure you that we want to hear
12 from both sides.

13 However, I want to remind you that the
14 purpose of this meeting is to gather comments for
15 the scoping of our EIS. We want to know what
16 important information and issues we need to consider
17 and analyze in our EIS. We want to try to hear from
18 as many of you as possible about any environmental
19 issues related to this proposed project in the time
20 we have allotted, so I would appreciate it if you
21 could focus your comments only on matters related to
22 the appropriate scope and content of the EIS that we
23 will be preparing.

24 Otherwise, we may not get to everyone who wants to
25 speak.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 We treat all the comments we receive the
2 same, whether a comment was made by one person or by
3 100 people. We give each comment we receive the
4 same careful consideration during the preparation of
5 the EIS. The NRC will consider all the oral and
6 written comments we receive as well as those we
7 receive via letter, email, or through the federal
8 rulemaking website.

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

14 Looking at the -- what we would like to
15 achieve tonight, Cinthya Román will describe NRC's
16 roles and responsibilities. Following that, Jim
17 Park will describe the NRC's licensing review, which
18 includes both the safety and environmental review,
19 including the preparation of an Environmental Impact
20 Statement, and Jim will walk us through the process
21 of preparing that.

22 After that, the meeting will turn back
23 over to Chris -- or, I'm sorry, to Andrey, who will
24 lead us in a short or brief question and answer
25 period, and then we will receive your public

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 comments on the appropriate scope and content of the
2 EIS. And with that, I will turn it over to Cinthya.

3 MS. ROMÁN: Good evening. As Brian
4 mentioned, I am Cinthya Román, Chief of the
5 Environmental Review Branch. Staff in my branch is
6 working on the NRC environmental review of the Waste
7 Control Specialists license application. Today, I
8 am going to discuss the NRC mission and the
9 regulatory role. Next slide, please.

10 So, who we are. Our agency is charged
11 by federal law to be the nation's only regulator of
12 commercial nuclear materials, independently ensuring
13 these materials are used, handled, and stored safely
14 and securely. Specifically, the NRC mission is to
15 license and regulate the nation's civilian use of
16 radioactive materials to protect public health and
17 safety; promote common defense and security; and
18 protect the environment. Next slide.

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

8 Along with the Agreement States, we
9 license hospitals, clinics, and other medical
10 facilities. We also regulate radioactive materials,
11 uranium recovery facilities, and fuel cycle
12 installations. In addition, NRC is responsible for
13 transportation of nuclear materials, decommissioning
14 of nuclear facilities, storage and disposal of
15 nuclear materials. That is why we are currently
16 reviewing the WCS license application for a
17 consolidated interim spent fuel storage facility.
18 In addition, we have responsibility for physical
19 security of nuclear material to protect it from
20 sabotage or attacks. Next slide.

21 The NRC regulations are designed to
22 protect both the public and occupational workers
23 from radiation hazards. Our primary
24 responsibilities include establishing rules and
25 regulations; issuing licenses; providing oversight

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 through inspection, enforcement, and evaluation of
2 operational experience; conducting research to
3 provide support for regulatory decisions; and
4 responding to emergencies.

5 As part of our regulatory and licensing
6 processes, we also conduct environmental reviews.
7 Particularly, my branch is involved with
8 environmental reviews covering, for example, uranium
9 recovery and milling, uranium enrichment, fuel
10 fabrication, and spent fuel. Next slide, please.

11 There are several nuclear-related
12 activities that do not fall under NRC jurisdiction.
13 For example, we do not promote or build nuclear
14 facilities. We do not own or operate nuclear power
15 plants or other nuclear facilities. We do not
16 regulate or own nuclear weapons, military reactors,
17 or space vehicle reactors. And lastly, we do not
18 regulate naturally occurring radioactive materials
19 or radiation-producing machines such as x-ray
20 equipment. Next slide.

21 The NRC views nuclear regulations as a
22 public business, and as such, it believes it should
23 be as open and transparent as possible.
24 Stakeholders will have many opportunities to
25 participate in the regulatory process before

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 issuance of a license. To continue its practice of
2 communicating clearly and frequently on important
3 issues, the NRC holds meetings with the public or
4 other external stakeholders, both in the vicinity of
5 the nuclear facilities and its Headquarters and
6 regional offices, just like this scoping meeting.

7 In addition, documents and
8 correspondence related to licensing actions and
9 inspection findings, with the exception of certain
10 security-related or other sensitive information, are
11 made publically available through the Agency's
12 website. Next slide.

13 Open communication is key, and public
14 involvement is critical in conducting the NRC's
15 regulatory and environmental review process. You
16 will hear more details on this in the environmental
17 review later during this presentation. The NRC
18 engages in active communication with stakeholders to
19 ensure meaningful stakeholder participation, mutual
20 understanding, and timely response. We will
21 continue to coordinate with a wide range of federal,
22 tribal, state, and local authorities on issues
23 related to the regulatory and licensing process.
24 Next slide.

25 So to conclude my remarks, I want to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 tell you why we are here. As part of the regulatory
2 and licensing review process for projects like WCS's
3 license application, the NRC conducts safety and
4 environmental reviews. NRC's environmental reviews
5 are required by the National Environmental Policy
6 Act of 1969, also known as NEPA. The environmental
7 review of the WCS application involves the NRC
8 preparing an Environmental Impact Statement in
9 accordance with the NRC regulations for
10 environmental protection and applicable NRC
11 guidance.

12 As stated previously, the NRC licensing
13 process is open and transparent, and we are
14 interested in hearing from you. Your input for our
15 Environmental Impact Statement is vital. Your
16 comments will be used in developing the appropriate
17 scope and content of the Environmental Impact
18 Statement. The NRC has just started the licensing
19 review process for WCS's license application, and no
20 decision has as yet been made. This is why we are
21 here: to listen to you and for you to help us inform
22 the licensing process, and particularly, the
23 Environmental Impact Statement in support of this
24 process.

25 This concludes my remarks. I will turn

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the presentation over to James Park. Thank you.

2 MR. PARK: Good evening. My name is
3 James Park. I am the lead project manager for the
4 preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement
5 that will look at the application, the impacts from
6 the construction and operation of a consolidated
7 interim storage facility as proposed by Waste
8 Control Specialists.

9 I am being assisted by my colleague,
10 Diana Diaz-Toro, and also staff from the Center for
11 Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses which are located
12 in San Antonio, Texas. They are helping us in the
13 preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement.

14 In my presentation, I will discuss the
15 licensing review that NRC conducts, then, in detail,
16 the Environmental Impact Statement process, and as
17 you will see, there are two aspects to the licensing
18 review. One is the safety review, which goes in
19 parallel with the environmental review.

20 I would like to begin by providing a
21 very brief summary of the application that we
22 received from Waste Control Specialists. They are
23 proposing to construct the facility on approximately
24 320 acres of the site that it owns in Andrews
25 County, Texas. WCS is currently licensed by the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 State of Texas under an agreement with the NRC to
2 approve the storage of certain types of radioactive
3 materials at the site, which is currently being
4 conducted.

5 In its application, WCS proposes to
6 construct the consolidated interim storage facility
7 in a series of eight phases over a period of 20
8 years, with each phase designed for the storage of
9 up to 5000 metric tons uranium of spent nuclear
10 fuel. Next slide, please. Back one, please. Yes,
11 please.

12 WCS has stated their intent to store up
13 to 40,000 metric tons uranium if all eight phases
14 were constructed. However, the initial licensing by
15 NRC would be only for that first phase. Any
16 subsequent expansion of the facility would need
17 approvals by NRC.

18 The figure that you see is a drawing of
19 the consolidated interim storage facility after the
20 full expansion into eight phases and its location
21 just north of the existing storage facilities at the
22 site. The spent fuel that WCS anticipates would be
23 stored there would come from shut down and
24 decommissioned nuclear power plants that are located
25 around the country, and if future phases were

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 approved, they would take fuel from other sites that
2 would either be decommissioned or shut down in the
3 future as well as from, possibly, operating nuclear
4 power plants.

5 WCS has requested a license for 40
6 years, and over that 40-year period, if that was
7 approved, the full complement of the 40,000 metric
8 tons were moved there, that would involve
9 approximately 3000 casks to be shipped by rail to
10 the site. Once a cask would arrive at the site, it
11 would be taken off the rail car. It would be then
12 inspected for any leaks or damage, and if found to
13 have none, it would be stored at the site on
14 concrete pads, either in a vertical arrangement or
15 in horizontal storage modules.

16 The figure that you see in -- in this
17 slide involves the rail lines that are located near
18 the site. The line in blue is the Texas-New Mexico
19 Railroad that goes north from Monahans, Texas and
20 through and into Eunice, New Mexico, and then the
21 spur across to the WCS site, and that is the route
22 the fuel would take on the rail cars once it gets to
23 Monahans. Next slide.

24 This slide from WCS shows the conceptual
25 drawing of what the first phase of this consolidated

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 interim storage facility could look like, both the
2 vertical casks in their storage arrangement as well
3 as those horizontally placed into modules for their
4 protection. Next slide, please.

5 On January 30th, the NRC published a
6 notice in the Federal Register to indicate that it
7 had accepted, NRC had accepted the application from
8 Waste Control Specialists, and that is known as
9 docketing an application. This was done following
10 an initial acceptance review of the application
11 wherein NRC requested more information from WCS and
12 finally came to a decision in January that there was
13 sufficient information to begin our detailed
14 technical review.

15 In the same January 30 Federal Register
16 notice, we also provided the public an opportunity
17 to request a hearing on this particular application.
18 The Federal Register notice gives instructions of
19 how someone might submit a petition for formal
20 hearing, and as noted, these requests are to be
21 filed by May 31st. Next slide, please.

22 This slide schematically shows and
23 illustrates the review process that NRC goes
24 through. In this case, we have an application from
25 Waste Control Specialists that we received in April

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of last year. Then it comes to the middle of the
2 figure, where NRC had to make a decision whether to
3 accept this application for detailed review. As I
4 said earlier, we requested additional information
5 from Waste Control Specialists in order to make that
6 decision, and we came to docket the application on
7 January 30th.

8 That decision kicked off and began the
9 safety review that you see goes down the left side
10 of the figure, for which NRC looks at the ability of
11 WCS to meet the regulations in Title 10 of the Code
12 of Federal Regulations Part 72, which address the
13 storage of this type of fuel at a facility, as well
14 as also showing in the middle the NRC's
15 environmental review process.

16 The safety review ends with the issuance
17 of what NRC calls a safety evaluation report. The
18 NRC review process also will end with the issuance
19 of a final Environmental Impact Statement. However,
20 before that, in that process, we will issue a draft
21 document for public comment, and even before that,
22 the purpose of why we're here tonight is to
23 determine what should go into that Environmental
24 Impact Statement.

25 The figure also shows on the right in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 blue what is known as the adjudicatory hearing, and
2 this refers to the opportunity for the public to
3 request a hearing on the application. In order to
4 get a hearing, the public individuals or
5 organizations have to demonstrate that in some way,
6 their interests would be affected by the action, and
7 that they have standing in this, and a board is set
8 up by the NRC that is separate from the NRC staff
9 that involves three judges who take evidence on each
10 of the different contentions that were admitted into
11 the hearing process.

12 So at the end of the process, if a
13 hearing goes into place, you will have both the
14 staff's safety review findings, the staff's
15 environmental review findings, and the results of
16 the hearing process, which all enter into the final
17 decision that affects the licensing or not, the
18 granting of the license or not, to WCS in this case.
19 Next slide, please.

20 NRC's safety review is a comprehensive
21 analysis which again is documented in a safety
22 evaluation report. The focus here is on the safety
23 analysis report, or SAR, that WCS filed as part of
24 its application, and the staff reviews that against
25 the requirements in 10 CFR Part 72. The staff can

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 request additional information to come to their
2 determinations regarding safe and secure storage of
3 the fuel and then issue the safety evaluation report
4 to the public that documents the final findings by
5 the staff. Next slide, please.

6 This slide provides some of the
7 requirements that NRC addresses as part of its
8 safety review to ensure that the storage facility
9 maintains the confinement of the radioactive
10 material, provides adequate shielding for the
11 workers who work there as well as for the public,
12 prevents nuclear criticality from occurring, and
13 also maintains the retrievability of the spent fuel.

14 The applicant, in this case Waste
15 Control Specialists, would need to demonstrate that
16 the storage system designs that they have or have
17 proposed would operate and meet these safety
18 objectives under a range of conditions: normal
19 operation and what is known as off-normal. These
20 are unusual events that could happen at the site as
21 well as accidents, for example earthquakes, fires,
22 or tornadoes. WCS has to demonstrate that they are
23 -- that it would meet those safety regulations under
24 all these various conditions. Next slide, please.

25 This slide provides the preliminary

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 schedule we have for the review. We are in the
2 midst of the EIS scoping process, which will
3 continue through the end of April to the 28th. This
4 will inform the scope of the Environmental Impact
5 Statement, and that is why we are here tonight, to
6 accept comments on what should be in the EIS. As I
7 indicated before, by letter to WCS on January 26th,
8 we notified the company that NRC had accepted the
9 application for detailed review, and we published
10 the Federal Register notice on January 30th.

11 A draft Environmental Impact Statement,
12 one that would be issued for public comment, will
13 come out roughly in the spring of 2018, to be
14 followed by a public comment period on the draft
15 EIS. The safety review would be completed in about
16 21 months, which would be currently in the fall of
17 2018. The draft EIS would come out in the spring of
18 2018, and the final EIS somewhere around the spring
19 of 2019, which is about 26 months from the
20 acceptance of the application for detailed review.

21 Certainly, there are many reasons why
22 this schedule may not be met, and that can involve,
23 for example, the hearing process that I discussed or
24 the completeness of responses to NRC's requests for
25 additional information. Next slide, please.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 This slide addresses what is an EIS.
2 Basically, it's a comprehensive document that
3 provides the decision-maker, in this case the NRC,
4 the information whether to license or not the
5 facility, and the public with a detailed and
6 thorough evaluation of the significant environmental
7 impacts that may result from the proposed action by
8 WCS. It provides evidence to the NRC in support of
9 its final record of decision, which refers to the
10 environmental impact findings, as well as supports
11 any final NRC licensing decision.

12 We prepare the EIS in accordance with
13 regulations found in 10 CFR Part 51, which implement
14 the National Environmental Policy Act, as well as
15 applicable staff guidance that the staff has
16 developed for how we prepare environmental impact
17 statements. Next slide, please.

18 This flow diagram shows that process,
19 and I would like to point out two of the bubbles
20 which are in blue, which is the place where the
21 public has input into how the Environmental Impact
22 Statement is developed. The first is to accept
23 scoping comments to help determine what should be
24 part of the analysis in the EIS. The second
25 opportunity comes after we issue the -- a draft EIS

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and again come out to seek public comments on the
2 preliminary findings for the Environmental Impact
3 Statement.

4 So these are the opportunities for
5 public involvement in our EIS. We began the scoping
6 period in November of last year, and it extends
7 through the 28th of April. Next slide, please.
8 Thank you.

9 We're in the midst of the scoping
10 meetings, and to date, we have held three meetings:
11 one in Hobbs, New Mexico; the second in Andrews,
12 Texas; and the third here at NRC Headquarters,
13 which, like this meeting, was available to the
14 country through the internet and over a phone line.
15 As I indicated previously, following the draft EIS,
16 there will be a public comment period, and we will
17 come back again for public meetings to collect
18 comments on the draft EIS. Next slide, please.

19 Scoping comes early in the EIS process.
20 It helps to guide where the EIS will go, and that is
21 why we are seeking public comment. It helps us to
22 identify significant issues that are important and
23 focuses on issues of genuine concern to the
24 community and the evaluation of impacts to that
25 community, so in that way, we meet the goals of the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 EIS scoping process to ensure that important issues
2 and concerns are identified early and properly
3 studied; that reasonable alternatives to the
4 proposal are examined and evaluated; and to
5 eliminate things that don't really matter.

6 In this way, we can focus on significant
7 issues and concerns and not on things that in the
8 end are not material to the findings we need to make
9 with the Environmental Impact Statement. Next
10 slide, please.

11 This slide shows the basic contents of
12 what is in an EIS. The introduction basically
13 provides a brief description of what WCS is
14 proposing and why they are doing that. The second
15 chapter provides a more detailed description of
16 WCS's proposal and any alternatives that we will be
17 evaluating in the EIS. The affected environment is
18 those aspects of the environment that are -- that
19 will be affected or potentially affected by the
20 proposed action.

21 We also look at environmental impacts,
22 mitigation that can reduce those impacts, talk about
23 the -- the measurement and monitoring programs that
24 WCS will have in place to evaluate ongoing impacts
25 to the environment. We also look at the costs and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 benefits of the proposal as well as document all the
2 coordination that NRC has conducted with local,
3 state, federal, and tribal agencies as part of our
4 independent evaluation. Next slide, please.

5 Currently, this slide presents what we
6 are considering as the proposed action from WCS. As
7 proposed, NRC would grant a license for a period of
8 40 years for the construction and operation of a
9 consolidated interim storage facility for spent
10 nuclear fuel. That construction again would occur
11 over eight phases and over 20 years. NRC is looking
12 at the evaluation of the full complement of 40,000
13 metric tons, as requested or intended by WCS, as
14 part of our analysis.

15 We also look at what is known as the no
16 action alternative. In this case, NRC would not
17 grant the license to WCS, but it also means that
18 whatever is occurring at the WCS site -- for
19 example, the storage of various waste under its
20 license by the State of Texas -- would continue.
21 Other alternatives to these are part of the EIS
22 scoping process, and that is where your input is
23 essential. Next slide, please.

24 Talking about the affected environment,
25 one way to think about it is to look at various

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 resources that are aspects of that environment that
2 could be affected. For example, changes in the land
3 use from its current usage; transportation, not only
4 of the spent fuel by rail to the site, but also the
5 materials and the workers that have to be there in
6 order to construct and operate this facility;
7 effects on the local geology and soils; water
8 resources, both surface water and groundwater, that
9 may be present at the site; impacts to the ecology,
10 both animals and plants, in the region; air quality
11 impacts; socioeconomics, to include jobs and money
12 and other things that affect the community; the
13 impact to the public's health, and also those who
14 work there; and other areas to be identified through
15 our scoping process. Next slide, please.

16 This figure is intended to -- to
17 demonstrate the various aspects in a different way,
18 and also to indicate that these aspects are seen
19 also holistically and not separately in the
20 analysis. Next slide, please.

21 To provide comments to the NRC on the
22 scope of its Environmental Impact Statement, there
23 are various ways. Members of the public can speak
24 tonight. There also is a rulemaking website, which
25 is www.regulations.gov, in which the -- search for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 NRC-2016-0231, the number given to the WCS
2 application, where you can find documents related
3 and a place to provide your comments. Comments can
4 also be mailed through the regular mail, and we also
5 have an email site that has been set up. Comments
6 are accepted through April 28th to ensure that we
7 will consider them in our process. Next slide,
8 please.

9 For additional information, this slide
10 shows different places and manners in which you can
11 find more about the project as well as contacts at
12 the NRC, myself and also John Nguyen. And if you
13 have any other further questions, our contact
14 information is provided there. Thank you for your
15 attention, and I will turn it back to Andrey.

16 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your
17 presentation. At this time, we will move on to the
18 question and answer portion. Before we start with
19 the public comments tonight, we have reserved a
20 small portion of time to see if anyone had any
21 questions regarding the environmental review process
22 discussed by the NRC, questions such as why we're
23 here tonight, how this meeting fits into the whole
24 process. The intent here is to address process and
25 procedure questions.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 If you have comments regarding the
2 contents of the Waste Control Specialists
3 applications, you will be able to provide them
4 during the public comment portion, which will follow
5 immediately after. At this time, I would like to
6 invite members of the public to ask process or
7 procedure questions about the environmental impact
8 review process that was discussed earlier. To ask
9 your question, for people on the phone, if you have
10 a process or procedure question, please press star 1
11 so that you can be recognized. Again, press star 1
12 so that you can be recognized.

13 For people here in the room, if you have
14 a process and procedure question, I invite you to
15 either come to the podium, or, if you need an
16 assistant, please raise your hand and we will bring
17 the microphone to you. I would like to remind you
18 that this meeting is being recorded. When it is
19 your turn to ask a question, please state and spell
20 your last name.

21 At this time, I invite people in this
22 room first to come to the microphone, and then we
23 will go to the phones after that. Are there any
24 questions in the room?

25 MR. KAMPS: Yes, thank you. Hello, my

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 name is Kevin Kamps with Beyond Nuclear, and my
2 process question has to do with a new application
3 filed with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
4 yesterday.

5 I attended a press conference held by
6 Holtec International and Eddy/Lea Energy Alliance
7 regarding a centralized interim storage facility in
8 southeastern New Mexico, just 35 miles from the
9 proposed WCS site, so my process question is how
10 will the NRC be handling the simultaneous nature of
11 these two proceedings going forward that are
12 separated by only about 11 months?

13 MR. KORSAK: James, Cinthya, or Brian?

14 MR. B. SMITH: This is Brian Smith. It
15 is my understanding that we are going to go forward
16 with the review, starting with the acceptance
17 review. That is the period that we're in at this
18 point in time. I am not sure I understand your --
19 your question as to --

20 MR. KAMPS: I guess, you know, just some
21 specific questions would be are the exact same panel
22 of people from NRC going to be handling both
23 proceedings? Will we have the same points of
24 contact? Can we expect -- and this kind of delves
25 into more content of comments, but, you know, so

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 far, we have been denied hearings along
2 transportation routes in this proceeding, which is a
3 precedent we have a problem -- a problem with, and
4 so you can expect the same suggestions and demands
5 from the public for the upcoming proceeding, so, you
6 know, some of the bad precedents in this WCS
7 proceeding like that example of not holding
8 transport corridor community public meetings across
9 the country, that's of concern.

10 MR. NGUYEN: Yes, thank you, Kevin. My
11 name is John Nguyen. I am the project manager for
12 the WCS project, but I can talk sort of on behalf of
13 the Holtec application. To answer your question
14 talking about who is responsible for doing this,
15 it's going to be the same group, same division, but
16 it's going to be different folks. And for the time
17 being, if you have a question regarding who is the
18 safety PM and who is the environmental PM, you can
19 contact me. Again, my name and information is on
20 the -- on slide 31. But as we are going through the
21 acceptance review process, there will be further
22 communication in terms of who is going to be the
23 contact person.

24 MR. KAMPS: Okay. And in terms of
25 acceptance review, what is the minimum time period

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 before NRC would declare it complete enough to go
2 forward?

3 MR. NGUYEN: Right. So following the --
4 the NRC Division of Spent Fuel guidance, we are
5 going to be pursuing -- assuming the acceptance
6 review process is going to be 60 days.

7 MR. KAMPS: So you could --

8 MR. NGUYEN: And --

9 MR. KAMPS: -- declare it at 60 days?

10 MR. NGUYEN: -- similarly --

11 MR. KAMPS: Okay.

12 MR. NGUYEN: Yes. So -- so within the
13 60 days, then we're going to go through a process
14 similar to the WCS in the event that we need
15 additional information, so we're going to request
16 for supplemental information.

17 MR. KAMPS: Okay. Thank you.

18 MS. ROMÁN: In terms of the
19 environmental review, both reviews are going to be
20 conducted under my branch, so if you have questions,
21 you can contact me. It is going to be different
22 project managers, but if you need anything, you can
23 contact me as well.

24 MR. KAMPS: Great. Actually, that
25 reminds me of a question that was raised at the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Andrews hearing on WCS, but applies to this one as
2 well, the Holtec, and it has to do again with
3 Spanish language. I know that you attended those
4 hearings down there, but even bigger than that, I
5 think written materials by NRC for Spanish speakers
6 in -- in this very concentrated area with a large
7 Latin American population.

8 MS. ROMÁN: So we heard the concerns. We
9 translated the slides that we used. These slides
10 are in Spanish on the website. We also translated
11 background material, and we also translated the EIS
12 scope description, and those are available on the
13 NRC website. You can just go to the public meeting
14 section and you will find the Spanish version of the
15 documents.

16 MR. KAMPS: So -- so that is NRC, but
17 what about the applicants? Because I have not seen
18 any Spanish language materials by the applicants.

19 MS. ROMAN: That we don't have
20 available.

21 MR. KAMPS: Yes. See, that is kind of a
22 problem because people living in this area are
23 supposed to be taking part in this to protect
24 themselves and their families, and if they don't
25 speak English, then they are largely excluded, and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the burden is on them to try to get over that
2 obstacle. So that is a problem. Thanks.

3 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your
4 question. Are there any other questions in this
5 room?

6 (No audible response.)

7 MR. KORSAK: For people on the phone, I
8 want to remind you that if you have a process or
9 procedure question, please press star 1 so that you
10 can be recognized. At this time, operators, do we
11 have any questions?

12 THE OPERATOR: Yes. The first question
13 comes from Karen Hadden. Your line is open.

14 MS. HADDEN: Hi. This is Karen Hadden
15 with SEED Coalition in Texas. We have had thousands
16 of comments submitted under the scoping process now,
17 most of which have requested additional hearings, a
18 scoping meeting along the transportation routes, the
19 likely routes, including Dallas and San Antonio,
20 Atlanta, and other cities. Are those being
21 considered at that time -- at this time, or will
22 this be the last scoping meeting that you hold?

23 MR. B. SMITH: This is Brian Smith.
24 This is going to be the last scoping meeting that we
25 plan to hold for the WCS license application. The

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 reason for having this meeting today in the way that
2 we're having it, conducting it starting at 7 o'clock
3 on the East Coast via webinar, via teleconference,
4 was to allow any participant within the United
5 States or wherever they are to be able to call in
6 and participate in the scoping meeting.

7 Just because we are not going to have
8 meetings throughout the United States does not mean
9 they cannot submit their comments on the scoping of
10 the EIS. There's various ways of doing that: in
11 writing, written comments by mail, electronically,
12 website, email. There's -- there's numerous ways of
13 being able to submit comments.

14 MS. HADDEN: I would like to just point
15 out that I think that is inadequate in the -- in
16 terms of process. You have probably heard that
17 Burke and Bexar County, where San Antonio is
18 located, and in Dallas County, the county
19 commissioners have just passed resolutions that say
20 they oppose the transport of high-level waste
21 through the communities for the purpose of -- of
22 storage or -- or permanent repositories.

23 So I think that this is very inadequate.
24 And I have one other question, which is where was
25 this notice published other than on the NRC website,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 notice of this meeting today?

2 MR. PARK: This is James Park. We also
3 sent out notices through email addresses that we had
4 available to us, and so that was -- it was also
5 through a Federal Register notice process that we go
6 through, and having it on our website.

7 MS. HADDEN: Okay. I would like to say
8 that, you know, a lot of people -- say you're in
9 West Texas. How do you know to go to the Federal
10 Register to find out if a teleconference is being
11 held? And it's not in Spanish, and when you read
12 the first page of the public meeting, you get the
13 number for James Park, which I called and never got
14 a return call, even like a week later. So how are
15 people supposed to know and be able to sign up and
16 participate? I really think that notice for tonight
17 was incredibly inadequate. This should be in
18 newspapers of affected communities, especially in
19 West Texas and across the border in New Mexico.

20 I think that there needs to be a do-
21 over. And since Texas and New Mexico are the
22 targeted states here, there really should be written
23 notice that goes out to major newspapers. A lot of
24 people, millions of people, are potentially at risk,
25 and they are not being told what is happening and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the opportunities to comment.

2 MR. B. SMITH: Thank you for your
3 comment. We will -- we will definitely consider
4 that for future meetings.

5 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your
6 question. Operator, are there any more questions on
7 the phones?

8 THE OPERATOR: Yes. Our next question
9 comes from Rose Gardner. Your line is open.

10 MS. GARDNER: Yes, this is Rose Gardner,
11 that is R-O-S-E G-A-R-D-N-E-R. I am from Eunice,
12 New Mexico. We would be home to this high-level
13 waste for an indefinite period of time, and I am
14 really kind of confused.

15 Earlier, I was under the impression that
16 the Department of Energy had gone around the country
17 and asked different areas of the country what
18 criteria is required, how can we get consent from
19 communities involved in this project?

20 Well, I attended one of those Department
21 of Energy meetings in Arizona, so far away from home
22 it was unreal, and expenses basically out of my
23 pocket. This is so important that I feel like it
24 needs to be addressed. What difference does it make
25 if I oppose this project if the NRC doesn't accept

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the DOE's comments? And I -- what I am referring
2 to, I was told by -- by people at the DOE that no
3 community would have to take the waste if they did
4 not give consent, and my community is not giving
5 consent.

6 I have approached the city council.
7 They have not given consent. In fact, they have
8 many questions regarding this procedure, and WCS has
9 not --

10 PARTICIPANT: Okay.

11 MS. GARDNER: -- answered for their
12 questions.

13 The other question I have is that, as
14 Mr. Kamps has indicated, there is no Spanish
15 literature to give to people in this area. Now, we
16 are more than 50 percent Hispanic. We need
17 materials that exactly spell out procedures to our
18 community. It is very important that we get
19 information because we will be fighting this
20 project. Thank you.

21 MR. B. SMITH: This is Brian Smith. The
22 consent-based process that you're talking about is
23 an approach that the DOE was considering for -- for
24 their future projects. The consent-based process is
25 not part of the NRC's process.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I don't know what else to -- with
2 respect to the Spanish literature, Cinthya went
3 through some of the documents that have already been
4 translated and are now available on the website. I
5 know that two additional brochures, one on
6 transportation and one on storage, have also been
7 translated into Spanish, and those are available now
8 as well. You may remember from the meetings that we
9 had there in Hobbs and Andrews, the fancy-looking
10 brochures, so those are now in Spanish as well and
11 available on our website.

12 MS. ROMÁN: And we're going to do the
13 same in Spanish for the -- once we publish a draft
14 EIS and we have the public meetings, we will have
15 material in Spanish, and we will have people
16 available to translate and answer questions.

17 MS. GARDNER: Well, I definitely feel
18 that needs to be done because that was a big, big
19 thing, and people won't be involved if they don't
20 understand. And they are American citizens. It
21 just happens to be that English is their second
22 language.

23 MS. ROMÁN: I understand.

24 MR. KORSAK: Okay. Thank you for your
25 question. Operator --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. GARDNER: Thank you.

2 MR. KORSAK: -- are there any more
3 questions?

4 THE OPERATOR: Yes. Our next question
5 comes from Donna Gilmore. Your line is open.

6 MS. GILMORE: Hi. Can you hear me okay?

7 MR. KORSAK: Yes.

8 MS. GILMORE: Okay. Great. Now in this
9 environmental study you are doing, are you going to
10 be basing it on assumptions for future technology
11 solutions? For example, currently, these thin-wall
12 canisters cannot be inspected on the outside, cannot
13 be inspected for depth or cracks, and that comes
14 into play in aging management after the 20th year of
15 the license. So since that technology does not
16 exist, and obviously if you can't find a crack, you
17 can't repair it, are you going to be making some
18 assumptions that it will exist in your EIS?

19 And also, the same would apply for the -
20 - the concrete, and the same would apply given the
21 fact that you're saying that when the canisters show
22 up, you're going to see if they are damaged, you're
23 going to see if they are leaking. I am not sure how
24 you can possibly do that. And then what do you do
25 if it is leaking? It doesn't appear as though there

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 is those kind of provisions. So how -- are you
2 going to make some assumptions about all that? I
3 would like to get some clarification on that.

4 MR. NGUYEN: Hi, Donna. This is John
5 Nguyen, the licensing project manager.

6 So in terms -- to answer your question,
7 so in terms of, you know, future technology
8 solutions and how do we go about doing -- evaluating
9 whether or not the cask is acceptable, as you know,
10 we have regulations that we are going to use to --
11 to -- and we follow those regulations to make a
12 determination or make the safety finding on that.

13 So anything that -- that we do, we're
14 going to follow those regulations. And in terms of
15 the aging management program, you are -- I am sure
16 you are very aware that, you know, when the casks
17 reach their 20 years -- licensed for 20 years, then
18 when they want to renew those casks, they have to
19 demonstrate that they have an aging management
20 program that complies with our regulations.

21 MS. GILMORE: Can I ask a follow-up?

22 MR. NGUYEN: Sure.

23 MS. GILMORE: Well, the NUREG-1927 Rev.
24 1, which is the aging management, requires if a
25 canister is -- has a 75 percent crack, it needs to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 be taken out of service. This system has no --
2 design has no mechanism for doing that, and saying
3 it complies with regulations, that's in the
4 regulation even though there is no current
5 technology to even measure cracks. So your answer
6 really does not address my question.

7 MR. McKIRGAN: So Donna, this is John
8 McKirgan. I am Chief of the Spent Fuel Licensing
9 Branch. Thank you. You know, I appreciate the
10 question. I think that question really is better
11 addressed during public meetings on the safety
12 review. We will be having a number of public
13 meetings on the safety review with WCS. They will
14 be noticed. They will go through -- and you can
15 catch those on the website.

16 I think I would like to bring us back to
17 the purpose of this portion of the meeting, where I
18 think we are looking for process questions, and then
19 we will be moving on to the period where we can have
20 public comments. I think you have my contact
21 information, Donna, and you can call me or call
22 Meraj Rahimi, who is the Chief of the Renewal
23 Branch. I think either of us would be very happy to
24 talk with you further on those topics, but I would
25 like to move us back to the portion where we are

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 asking process questions because we very much want
2 to move on to the portion of the meeting where we
3 are receiving comments on the EIS, on the scope that
4 we should be undertaking. So if you would contact
5 me at any time, and we can talk about that further.

6 MS. GILMORE: No, I am clear on that. It
7 is just that it sounds like you're going to have to
8 be designing impact based on assumptions. The
9 technology does not exist. I am very clear on the
10 issues, so I will just take that as really a non-
11 answer to my question.

12 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your
13 question. Are there any other process and procedure
14 questions? I think we do have one in the room.

15 MS. CONLEY: This is Maureen Conley with
16 NRC's Office of Public Affairs. I just wanted to
17 respond to the question about how else we advertised
18 this meeting.

19 We did put out a press release on March
20 16th that discussed the extension to the deadline
21 for submitting comments and the details for this
22 meeting. We also tweeted that. We are fairly
23 active on social media, so people who are looking
24 for information about this project can certainly
25 follow us on Twitter. We do try to put out

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 information, you know, as we can.

2 And -- and on the brochures, just to
3 clarify, we have translated them into Spanish. We
4 are still going through the process of producing
5 those and getting them onto the website, so they are
6 not there at the moment, but they should be within
7 the next week or two.

8 MS. ROMÁN: We did add some background
9 material to the public website. It's not all of
10 them, so yes.

11 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.
12 Are there any more procedure and process questions
13 here in the room?

14 (No audible response.)

15 MR. KORSAK: Are there any more process
16 and procedure questions on the phone?

17 THE OPERATOR: Yes. Our next question
18 comes from Barbara Warren. Your line is open.

19 MS. WARREN: Hello. Can you hear me?

20 MR. KORSAK: Yes, we can hear you.

21 MS. WARREN: Okay. I don't believe I
22 heard the -- the number of years that the license
23 would be for.

24 MR. NGUYEN: Yes, this is John Nguyen,
25 licensing project manager. Yes, so the application

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that WCS submitted, they are requesting for a 40-
2 year license.

3 MS. WARREN: Okay. Thank you. And then
4 I -- I wanted to ask another question. I am not
5 sure the federal government does this, but do you
6 invite other cooperating agencies or agencies you
7 feel should contribute to the EIS to -- to sort of
8 assist you in -- in the review?

9 MS. ROMÁN: Yes, we do. We invite other
10 federal agencies.

11 MS. WARREN: And -- and do you envision
12 any other particular agencies that would be
13 participating?

14 MS. ROMÁN: Yes.

15 MS. WARREN: Can you tell me --

16 MR. PARK: This is James Park, and two
17 that we are reaching out to are the U.S. Department
18 of Energy, and also the State of Texas and its
19 Commission on Environmental Quality.

20 MS. WARREN: But actually, I was
21 thinking of Homeland Security because of the -- you
22 know, the terrorism risk. I thought they might have
23 something to say about it.

24 The -- the other issue is I was going to
25 suggest that the -- I don't know if you work much

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 with the Environmental Justice Advisory Group. I
2 don't know if NRC participates much with that, but
3 that would be a way of maybe following, you know,
4 their procedures and how they work with EJ
5 communities.

6 MS. ROMÁN: Thank you.

7 MR. KORSAK: Okay. Thank you for your
8 question.

9 MS. WARREN: Thank you.

10 MR. KORSAK: Operator, are there any
11 more process and procedure questions?

12 THE OPERATOR: We do have additional
13 questions. Our next question comes from Cynthia
14 Peil. Your line is open.

15 MR. PEIL: Hi. Can you hear me? This
16 is William Peil, Cynthia's husband. We're both
17 registered for the meeting here. Can you hear me
18 okay?

19 MR. KORSAK: We can hear you, William.
20 Go ahead.

21 MR. PEIL: Okay. Will the same process
22 and procedure that you're thinking about applying
23 here be the same procedure process that was applied
24 for Yucca Mountain, and will that EIS procedure
25 include all nuclear plants individually that might

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 be participating in shipping waste to this
2 particular facility? In other words, will it
3 address the -- all the unique concerns that various
4 companies throughout the country might involve in
5 any part of this process, again to assure safety and
6 health and protected and that the individual
7 transportation needs and requirements are also
8 considered as part of the EIS process to evaluate
9 it?

10 And a third part of that question: will
11 a QRA be done as part of this, a quantitative risk
12 assessment, again so -- so societal risk involved
13 with all of this can be made known to the public
14 that the risk to health safety will be part -- part
15 of the record and public knowledge before anything
16 is begun?

17 MR. PARK: My name -- this is James
18 Park. I can respond to some of your questions.

19 The process here is different than it is
20 for Yucca Mountain. This is a specific application
21 from WCS, and the NRC is preparing its own
22 Environmental Impact Statement. As I understand it,
23 for the Yucca Mountain project, it would be the
24 Department of Energy that prepares that
25 Environmental Impact Statement, and the NRC has to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 make a decision whether or not to adopt it, and that
2 certainly has gone down a separate process, and --
3 for that project to this date.

4 Questions about the quantitative risk
5 assessment societal impact is something that we can
6 take as a scoping issue, and as to whether fuel to
7 the WCS site could come from various plants around -
8 - located around the United States, various nuclear
9 plants, that is a possibility. Currently, WCS is
10 envisioning the fuel coming from shut down
11 decommissioned reactors at the moment.

12 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for the question.
13 We have time for one more question. Operator, are
14 there any more questions on the line?

15 THE OPERATOR: Yes. Our next question
16 comes from Tom Smith. Your line is open.

17 MR. T. SMITH: Good evening. This is
18 Tom Smith, or "Smitty," in Austin, Texas.

19 I wanted to ask you a couple of
20 questions. The first is with these two applications
21 to take the entire amount of high-level radioactive
22 waste in the nation, 110,000, I believe, why is it
23 we're doing them separately and not taking --
24 looking at them at the same time, given that they
25 are adjacent to one another? Or could we? Why not

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 just say, make sure you gave everybody a bunch of
2 them and look at the cumulative impacts of all the
3 transportation and all the waste, all of the other
4 impacts that you're going to have if you have got
5 all this waste within 30,000 -- or 30 miles of each
6 other, wouldn't it make sense to do a consolidated
7 Environmental Impact Statement?

8 MR. PARK: This is James Park. The
9 applications have been filed separately by different
10 companies, and the applications are for separate
11 licenses. NRC, under its process, does not conduct
12 a consolidated interim Environmental Impact
13 Statement, but prepares separate EISs for each
14 application. Certainly, within the two
15 applications, there will be a recognition of the
16 other facility that is proposed to be nearby, and
17 that is part of the cumulative effects that you just
18 discussed.

19 MR. T. SMITH: Okay. And then secondly,
20 will you be looking at the -- at the transportation
21 impacts? The impacts from an accident or a spill in
22 West Texas and eastern New Mexico could be
23 significant, but the impact of an accident or a
24 spill on San Antonio, Houston, Dallas would be far
25 greater in terms of populations impacted, and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 similarly, the impact of the various congestion on
2 the -- the rail lines in major metropolitan areas
3 are going to be significantly higher than it is
4 likely to have, say, in Eunice, New Mexico, where
5 there is far less rail traffic.

6 Are you going to be looking at the
7 transportation impact on a metro area like that? How
8 many people get killed if one of the things pops?
9 How many miles get contaminated? What are the
10 cleanup costs going to be? And if not, why not?

11 MR. PARK: I think that's an excellent
12 comment to be made under scoping, something to be
13 considered by NRC in its scoping process. Thank
14 you.

15 MR. T. SMITH: Well the question I asked
16 was a procedural question: are you going to do it?

17 MR. PARK: That is a scoping issue.

18 MR. T. SMITH: All right.

19 MR. PARK: It is something --

20 MR. T. SMITH: I will bring it up again.

21 MR. PARK: -- for NRC to consider --

22 MR. T. SMITH: Thank you --

23 MR. PARK: -- as part --

24 MR. T. SMITH: -- very much.

25 MR. PARK: -- of its process, you know,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 if and how to conduct the transportation analysis,
2 and that's the part of what you are -- I believe you
3 are getting at in your comment.

4 MR. T. SMITH: All right. I will bring
5 it back up when the time is right. Thank you.

6 MR. KORSAK: Okay. Thank you everybody
7 for your questions.

8 At this time, we will now proceed to the
9 public comment period. Before we begin, I would
10 like to go over the process that we're going to use.
11 First, I am going to invite the handful of
12 individuals who previously expressed the desire in
13 advance of the meeting to offer comments. After we
14 hear from those individuals, I will then turn to the
15 sign-up list from today, which will include those
16 participating virtually and in the room.

17 Public speakers on the list will be
18 called in ascending chronological order. The first
19 to sign up will be the first one to be called. We
20 are going to alternate between speakers on the phone
21 and in the room. For example, we will have three
22 people speak from the room, and then three people
23 from the phone.

24 If you're on the phone and want to
25 provide comments, please press star 1 so we will

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 know that you want to speak. You -- your line will
2 be unmuted by the Operator when it is your turn.
3 For those here in the room, when your name is
4 called, please come up and queue up at the
5 microphone. If you need to have a microphone
6 brought to you, please raise your hand when I call
7 your name.

8 Be aware, this meeting tonight is being
9 recorded, and the transcript will be generated after
10 the meeting, so in light of that, I would ask that
11 when it's your turn to speak, that you please
12 identify yourself, spelling out your last name. I
13 would also ask for the sake of the audio recording
14 that people not speak over each other.

15 In an effort to give as many people as
16 possible an opportunity to speak tonight, please
17 limit yourselves to four minutes when speaking. Know
18 that I am going to try to hold people to that. My
19 co-facilitator Meg Gold will use a timer with an
20 alarm sound. When you hear the tone, I ask that you
21 wrap up quickly so that we allow time for the other
22 speakers to provide their comments tonight.

23 At this time, I would like to invite any
24 elected officials or their representatives who would
25 like to speak or to give a prepared statement. If

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you're on the phone, please press star 1 so that the
2 Operator can unmute your phone. If you're in the
3 room, please make your way to the podium or raise
4 your hand to have a microphone brought to you.

5 Do we have any elected officials or
6 their representatives here in the room?

7 (No audible response.)

8 MR. KORSAK: Operator, do we have anyone
9 on the phone that expressed interest in speaking?

10 THE OPERATOR: One moment.

11 (Pause.)

12 THE OPERATOR: And excuse me, this is
13 the Operator. Just to let you know, we do not
14 currently have any elected officials who wish to
15 speak, but we do have those on-line who wish to make
16 public comments.

17 MR. KORSAK: Okay. Thank you.

18 Next up, we will invite those who pre-
19 signed up and expressed desire to -- to make a
20 comment in advance of this meeting. Now I am going
21 to call those folks that signed up to speak in
22 advance. First up is Rose Gardner. Operator, do we
23 have a Rose Gardner on the line?

24 THE OPERATOR: Yes. Ms. Gardner, your
25 line is open.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. GARDNER: Thank you very much. This
2 is Rose Gardner, G-A-R-D-N-E-R, from Eunice, New
3 Mexico.

4 I have several concerns, one being the
5 container integrity. I certainly know that there's
6 many, many brands of containers that could be used.
7 I would have to insist that only the top of the line
8 and the most robust containers, Cadillac, whatever
9 you want to call them, be used for transport and
10 storage, not only because it is so important due to
11 the terrorist risk, but also if this stuff is going
12 to be stored indefinitely in my hometown, I insist
13 that it be of the most quality materials possible.

14 The second concern I have is the
15 railroad integrity in and around this state. Just a
16 couple years ago, in 2015, there was a derailment of
17 a train, and it would be the same rail line that
18 would bring the waste to my town. So certainly,
19 railroad integrity in this area as well as around
20 the country needs to be scrutinized.

21 Again, my community of Eunice has not
22 given any type of consent for this, since we are
23 just five miles from Waste Control Specialists'
24 site, which is on the other side of the state line
25 in Texas. I insist that if this project goes

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 through, that they come in and absolutely inform
2 this community of what is going on. Half of the
3 people who I have talked to don't even know who
4 Waste Control is, if you can believe that. It's
5 amazing, but it's true.

6 Another thing is that my sister
7 community south of here, Jal, New Mexico, where that
8 same rail line will go through, I visited their
9 church there, but they didn't even know that it was
10 coming through their community. And their motion on
11 this project has not been very thorough, and it may
12 be because we're just a small community and we
13 probably are not interviewed in the Dallas
14 newspaper, San Francisco newspaper, New York
15 newspaper. Whatever excuse you want to use, we were
16 not well-informed, and WCS needs to do a better job
17 of informing this community, as well as the NRC.

18 Other communities have shown opposition
19 by passing regulation saying they do not approve of
20 this transportation of materials around their
21 communities. I want to know and make sure that
22 these communities are taken into consideration
23 because that is important. As was stated earlier in
24 the process questions, if Dallas and San Antonio are
25 not important enough to listen to, then I don't

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 understand what the NRC is doing by just, you know,
2 having meetings here in Hobbs and in Andrews, Texas.

3 We know southern Texas is obviously
4 very, very concerned as well as the rest of the
5 country. So I definitely think there's a lack of
6 information being put out, and there's also a lot of
7 important information out there that needs to be
8 taken into consideration.

9 And finally, because of the second
10 project, the Eddy-Lea Alliance, having put in their
11 license application, it leads me to think that this
12 is --

13 (Alarm ringing.)

14 MS. GARDNER: Okay. All of this
15 material, all of this horrible nuclear waste from
16 around the country will be located within just a few
17 miles of where I live. My whole family lives here,
18 my son, my community that I was born and raised in.
19 This is very, very dangerous. How can we not say
20 something in opposition to this?

21 I feel like the whole United States is
22 kicking this community and this area because they
23 think we're remote. We are not remote from
24 anything. People live here. There is --

25 MS. BROWN: Rose?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. GARDNER: -- people --

2 MS. BROWN: Rose? Rose? This is Cris
3 Brown. I am one of the facilitators. The sound
4 that you heard was your four-minute signal. I need
5 you to wrap up within the next few seconds so that
6 we can allow people to speak.

7 MS. GARDNER: As I was saying, this is a
8 frightening situation, all this high-level waste
9 being transported to this area, all the people that
10 live in these small communities that do not have a
11 voice, representatives in the government that don't
12 seem to care about what is going on. I will have
13 you know that I do care, and I will be opposing this
14 project and the Eddy-Lea project, and I would like
15 you all to know that I feel like you have targeted
16 this Hispanic community, and I believe that is
17 illegal and it is a serious, serious -- and racial
18 discrimination and environmental discrimination.

19 MR. KORSACK: Rose, thank you for your
20 comments. We would like to continue with the list
21 so other people have a chance to speak as well.
22 Again, thank you for your comments.

23 At this time, do we have Stephen Greiner
24 in the room? Operator, do we have Stephen Greiner
25 on the line?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 (Pause.)

2 THE OPERATOR: Not at this time.

3 MR. KORSAK: Do we have Linda Lewison
4 here in the room?

5 (No audible response.)

6 MR. KORSAK: Operator, do we have Linda
7 Lewison on the phone lines?

8 THE OPERATOR: Linda is not on the phone
9 lines.

10 MR. KORSAK: Okay. Do we have Ace
11 Hoffman here in the room?

12 (No audible response.)

13 MR. KORSAK: Operator, do we have Ace
14 Hoffman on the phone lines?

15 THE OPERATOR: Yes. Ace, your line is
16 open.

17 MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you. Can you hear
18 me?

19 MR. KORSAK: Yes, we can hear you.
20 Please go ahead.

21 MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. I would like to
22 know if -- or I would like you to consider the
23 proposal by Peter Livingston for neutralizing the
24 uranium-235 and plutonium-239 using lasers in the 10
25 to 15 megavolt range, million electronvolts. If the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 waste is neutralized, and it does not take very long
2 to do that, then the criticality events become an
3 impossibility.

4 Reprocessing also becomes an
5 impossibility, and proliferation becomes an
6 impossibility, and the storage time is reduced from
7 hundreds of thousands of years for the plutonium-
8 239, for example, and the uranium-235, billions of
9 years, to more like 600 years for the fission
10 products, which are increased by the process, but
11 the storage time and the removal of the criticality
12 possibilities make up for that.

13 So is neutralization going to be
14 considered as an alternative besides the no-
15 alternative alternative? And if it's not going to
16 be considered, why not? Thank you.

17 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.
18 Next up, do we have Kathryn Barnes here in the room?

19 (No audible response.)

20 MR. KORSAK: Operator, do we have
21 Kathryn Barnes on the phone lines?

22 THE OPERATOR: Not at this time.

23 MR. KORSAK: Do we have William or
24 Cynthia Peil here in the room?

25 (No audible response.)

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KORSAK: Operator, do we have
2 William or Cynthia Peil on the phone lines?

3 THE OPERATOR: Yes. Your line is open.

4 MR. PEIL: Hello? Hello?

5 MR. B. SMITH: Yes, we hear you.

6 THE OPERATOR: Please go ahead --

7 MR. PEIL: Hello?

8 THE OPERATOR: -- your line is open.

9 MR. PEIL: Hi. This is William Peil.
10 Thank you. Can you hear me okay?

11 MR. KORSAK: Yes. Go ahead.

12 MR. PEIL: Okay. I have big concerns
13 about all of this, and the fact that, again, a lot
14 of information has not been forthcoming to the
15 general public. I am concerned about all aspects of
16 moving this material to a central site. The place,
17 the hospital, emergency personnel, security staff
18 all have to be put in place, and people have to know
19 about this, and I don't believe that that is
20 anywhere currently in the design or planning
21 process.

22 The quantities of plutonium, cesium,
23 strontium, I would like to know exactly how much of
24 that material is moving and under what conditions
25 that material will be stored such that in the case

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of plutonium, it may remain dangerous for over a
2 quarter of a million years, as I understand.

3 Also, the costs incurred should a
4 disaster happen: who will bear those costs? Will
5 local governments, citizens bear the cost, which
6 could run anywhere from \$620 million in a rural area
7 to estimates as high as I have seen \$9.5 billion to
8 raze and rebuild the most heavily contaminated
9 square mile. And in terms of health effects, who
10 will absorb the cost that may be lingering for years
11 afterwards anywhere along the route, and especially
12 in Texas, where this material will be in the ground
13 for a long time? Who will absorb those costs in
14 Texas? The citizens throughout the country, or
15 those locally?

16 I live here in Calvert County. We have
17 a large two-reactor site down at Calvert Cliffs.
18 Sitting right next to that is, going in, currently
19 under development and scheduled to open, a massive
20 LNG plant, a \$3.8 billion project within three miles
21 of the plant. Will that be analyzed in terms of
22 possible impacts one way or another, the LNG plant
23 impacting the nuclear power plant or the nuclear
24 power plant impacting this large LNG plant? Should
25 something happen during that transport process, we

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 are talking about a massive plant with 14.6 billion
2 cubic feet of LNG gas sitting right there within the
3 three-mile window of this nuclear power plant.

4 You have catastrophic cascading
5 potential events in this process. I don't think you
6 can look at one thing at a time. You have to look
7 at it holistically from start to finish in terms of
8 the -- as I asked before, a quantitative risk
9 assessment so that a true analysis of societal risk
10 can be developed and the public be made aware across
11 the transportation routes and within the
12 jurisdictions there in Texas. Thank you. Go ahead.

13 MS. PEIL: Hi. This is Cynthia Peil.
14 May I speak now?

15 MR. KORSAK: Yes, go ahead.

16 MS. PEIL: I share many of the same
17 concerns that have already been raised, and again,
18 we thought things should be included in the EIS. It
19 is absolutely critical that for all the routes from
20 the current shut down and decommissioned plants and
21 including plants such as the one we live near here
22 in Calvert County, Calvert Cliffs plant, there has
23 to be the transportation issues, the medical issues,
24 these security issues, terrorism attack issues, all
25 of these things need to be included for those

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 transportation hubs. We can't only look at that
2 facility in Texas, dangerous as it is, as if the
3 stuff is going to just fall out of the sky into the
4 place there.

5 We have to look at the rail
6 transportation from the site. For example, down
7 here where the nuclear casks are stored onsite,
8 there are no railroad tracks within a long distance.
9 We would be looking at a horrendous trip to where
10 the casks would get on a rail on roadways that are
11 already dangerous and congested, or you're looking
12 at the possibility of going in the Chesapeake Bay.

13 So another thing that I would like
14 included in the EIS is the impacts to food.
15 Anywhere along here where you have any danger of
16 spillage or accident or leakage, you're putting a
17 huge amount of pressure also on the food supply of
18 everyone in the country, and you're looking at the
19 possible contamination of water. It is too
20 frightening to even think about, but those all do
21 have to be talked about in the document that you're
22 writing.

23 Again, it needs to include a cleanup
24 plan for all the urban areas and the rural areas and
25 the small communities, however those places are

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 identified. Everything needs to be included, and
2 particularly, the idea of transportation and
3 storage, how is this going to be handled, again, all
4 along the route and in that one place where so much
5 stuff would be stored?

6 Population data please needs to be
7 included, weather patterns from the site to where
8 any potential radiation leaks would happen, where
9 would they be spreading, how many people would be
10 impacted, and what would be the plan if there was
11 compromising and radiation leakage? I think that
12 the EIS should include a history of how the
13 radiation release problems already in our country
14 and in other places where there have been problems,
15 how have they been handled? And take a look at what
16 the outcomes are where there are still difficulties
17 at places around the world such -- such as Japan is
18 still having.

19 Concerning the no-action alternative,
20 since this is part of what you're considering, then
21 I would say have each state and each nuclear power
22 plant take a look at what their plan is for storage
23 onsite and make sure that that storage is decent,
24 and see if -- how that impacts the idea of needing a
25 centralized storage place, which sounds horribly

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 dangerous to me.

2 So those are some things I would like to
3 bring up, and I am not sure it's appropriate, but
4 concerning the contact in the community, this has
5 been a huge issue here for the hearings that were
6 had both concerning the nuclear power plant and the
7 LNG terminal. In addition to notices and papers,
8 notices need to be put up along the road signs.
9 They need to be big enough that people can read them
10 when they're driving by. We need to have posters
11 put up in places where people congregate, whether
12 that is community centers, grocery stores, public
13 buildings. We need to have it on TV and on radio so
14 there is absolutely no, no, no excuse for not
15 everyone knowing what is happening: TV, radio,
16 multimedia, and I am talking the major networks,
17 ABC, NBC, CBS, as well as all the local affiliates.

18 People need to know and people need to
19 be able to weigh in. I am frightened by this whole
20 idea of the facility, but if you're doing an EIS,
21 then include all those things please. Thank you
22 very much.

23 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.

24 Next up, Jay Levy. Operator, do we have
25 Jay Levy on the line?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 THE OPERATOR: Not at this time.

2 MR. KORSAK: Okay. Next up we have
3 Kevin Kamps. Kevin? We have Kevin in the -- Kevin
4 Kamps in the room.

5 (Pause.)

6 MR. KAMPS: Hello. Thank you. My name
7 is Kevin Kamps with Beyond Nuclear, based in Takoma
8 Park, Maryland, and also a board member of Don't
9 Waste Michigan representing the Kalamazoo chapter.
10 And I have spoken at previous meetings, so I will
11 just refer to those comments and incorporate them as
12 if written herein, as they say.

13 But tonight, I wanted to focus right now
14 on this press conference I mentioned yesterday at
15 Capitol Hill, Holtec and Energy -- I'm sorry, Eddy-
16 Lea Energy Alliance, this sister proposal. Dr. Kris
17 Singh, the CEO and founder of Holtec, gave the
18 figure of 35 miles distance between these two
19 facilities, and as Tom "Smitty" Smith said during
20 the process questions, this is one grand scheme.
21 And as Rose Gardner said just now in her comments,
22 essentially, this is creating a nuclear sacrifice
23 area in this very small radius. And for that reason
24 alone, these two proposals should be one proposal
25 under the National Environmental Policy Act.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I mean, phrases that came to mind as I
2 listened to those comments and those questions,
3 thought about these twin proposals would be
4 programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, so
5 there's real legal questions here about these
6 processes being parallel but different. They are
7 not, actually. In fact, there was a recording made
8 of the Holtec press conference yesterday, and
9 perhaps we can even get a transcript off of that,
10 where those very words almost verbatim were said by
11 Dr. Kris Singh: yes, we're capitalist competitors
12 with each other, but we really see this as a
13 cooperative endeavor, and we complement each other.
14 So that is a problem under NEPA, legally, actually,
15 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

16 And with the rest of my time right now,
17 to end that thought, the cumulative impacts of these
18 two projects coming together, and one of those that
19 I will focus on right now that I mentioned in
20 previous testimony is environmental justice as a
21 contention in the licensing proceeding, but as
22 comments in this environmental scoping.

23 So just to give some specifics, I have
24 the U.S. Census data for these counties that are
25 implicated in both of these projects because they

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 are so close. Whichever project you're talking
2 about, these counties are implicated by it,
3 especially if both happen. Andrews County, Texas,
4 population-wise, 55.8 percent Latino or Hispanic,
5 and a 10.4 percent persons in poverty rate. This is
6 U.S. Census data.

7 Eddy County, New Mexico, a 47.3 percent
8 Latino or Hispanic population, and a 12.3 percent
9 persons in poverty rate. And then Lea County, New
10 Mexico, 56.6 percent Latino or Hispanic population,
11 and a 14.3 percent persons in poverty rate. So this
12 is very significant.

13 I wanted to -- and I will look this up
14 on the documentary film Containment about
15 radioactive waste that appeared on PBS in February -
16 - there was footage from what I believe was the Blue
17 Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future
18 holding a meeting -- I believe it was in
19 Albuquerque, and I will have to look back to confirm
20 that -- but there were speakers in the film, and I
21 will try to get the transcript onto this record.

22 One of the speakers from New Mexico who
23 was a woman, a resident of New Mexico, referred to
24 both sides of her family as having lived in New
25 Mexico for 800 years, so there must be Native

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 American content there in her family line, and she
2 essentially said, enough of this. How much more are
3 we supposed to take in the State of New Mexico?

4 And that gets to that question I made
5 comments in this very room last time around about
6 the impacts that New Mexico and now West Texas are
7 facing, just on the nuclear front, let alone the
8 fossil fuel front, and I gave a long list of those.

9 And one last thing I would like to say
10 for now is the issue of climate change. So the
11 average temperature criteria that these casks are
12 supposed to be able to withstand, Dr. Singh
13 yesterday mentioned and I assume it applies to WCS
14 as well 125 degrees extreme temperature, or an 80
15 degree average annual temperature. Well, we are
16 facing catastrophic climate change. The
17 temperatures in these places could increase
18 significantly. Thank you.

19 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.

20 Next up we have Donna Gilmore.
21 Operator, do we have Donna Gilmore on the line?

22 THE OPERATOR: Yes. One moment.

23 MS. GILMORE: Hello?

24 MR. KORSAK: Hello, Donna?

25 THE OPERATOR: Ms. Gilmore, your line is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 open.

2 MS. GILMORE: Hi, can you hear me? Yes,
3 that is Donna Gilmore, G-I-L-M-O-R-E with San Onofre
4 Safety.

5 Each one of these -- each one of these
6 canisters contains about as much cesium-137 as was
7 released from the Chernobyl accident, and these
8 Chernobyl cans cannot be inspected, cannot be
9 repaired, cannot be maintained, cannot be monitored
10 to prevent a leak. Therefore, there should be an
11 alternative in this EIS that considers technology
12 that can meet all those requirements.

13 In France, Japan, Europe, pretty much
14 all other developing countries, they use thick wall
15 caps, 10 to 19.75 inch thick, but we're using about
16 0.5-inch thick canisters that are vulnerable to
17 cracking for numerous reasons. Our search found
18 they may already have cracks, and so please consider
19 the alternative of technology that was designed to
20 be maintained and that could actually inspect even
21 the insides of these canisters, the backfits that
22 are used to hold the fuel to keep from going
23 critical, the aluminum alloy baskets -- Japan has
24 banned those because they were able to inspect and
25 determine they won't hold up. The NRC has been

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 silent on this issue. Canisters with even partial
2 cracks have no seismic rating, so please consider
3 that in your evaluation.

4 That is all I have. Thank you.

5 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.

6 Next up, we have Mrs. Marida. Operator,
7 do we have Mrs. Marida on the phone?

8 THE OPERATOR: One moment.

9 MS. MARIDA: Items that need to be, that
10 I would like to see under the scoping that need to
11 be talked about: the first is exactly what Donna
12 Gilmore just talked about, the casks that -- or
13 excuse me, the canisters, the thin-walled canisters
14 that cannot be monitored, inspected, repaired, or
15 maintained, and part of the scope has to be looking
16 at are these canisters really adequate to be stored
17 for 100 or however many years they are planning to
18 be stored? They certainly sound inadequate, very
19 inadequate to me, so that certainly needs to be part
20 of the scope.

21 The other thing in scope is the
22 whereabouts of the Ogallala aquifer, which at one
23 time was listed as being right underneath where the
24 Waste Control Specialists dump is now existing --
25 exists. And suddenly, when they wanted to put this

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 dump there, it got moved, the aquifer moved, and it
2 was no longer underneath there. So part of the
3 scope needs to be a real geologic survey of where
4 the Ogallala aquifer actually is. Thank you.

5 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.

6 Next up, we have Mrs. Karson. Operator,
7 do we have Mrs. Karson on the line?

8 THE OPERATOR: Not at this time.

9 MR. KORSAK: Next we have Mr. LaForge.
10 Operator, do we have Mr. LaForge on the line?

11 THE OPERATOR: One moment. Mr. LaForge,
12 your line is open.

13 MR. J. LaFORGE: Yes, can you hear me?

14 MR. KORSAK: Yes, we can hear you. Go
15 ahead.

16 MR. J. LaFORGE: I would like to urge
17 that the scoping process consider mandating that the
18 radiation monitoring data be made public at all
19 times, that is that waste handlers in Texas and New
20 Mexico should be required to monitor radioactive
21 emissions -- emissions of radioactivity at the fence
22 line at the receiving site where these casks are
23 transferred from trucks or railcars to their
24 position, and that this data be made available to
25 the public at all times.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I think -- I believe radioactive
2 emissions need to be recorded during transportation
3 process, either along rails or along the highways,
4 and that this data must also be made public, that
5 the handlers of these casks be required to wear
6 radiation monitoring equipment, and that the data
7 received by these badges be available to the public
8 at all times. And that's what I have got to suggest.
9 Thank you very much.

10 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.

11 Next up we have Mr. Kraft or Mr. Snyder.
12 Operator, do we have Mr. Kraft or Mr. Snyder on the
13 line?

14 THE OPERATOR: One moment. I am showing
15 we do have a Gail Snyder on the line.

16 MR. KORSAK: Yes, that is it.

17 THE OPERATOR: Thank you. Gail, your
18 line is open.

19 (No audible response.)

20 THE OPERATOR: Gail Snyder, your line is
21 open. You may want to check your mute button.

22 MS. SNYDER: Hello?

23 THE OPERATOR: Yes.

24 MS. SNYDER: Hello, can you hear me?

25 THE OPERATOR: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. SNYDER: Hi. I am sorry. I am
2 driving. I am going to pass on this.

3 THE OPERATOR: Thank you.

4 MR. KORSAK: Okay. Next up, we have Mr.
5 LaForge, Christopher LaForge. Operator, do we have
6 Mr. LaForge on the line?

7 THE OPERATOR: Yes. Mr. LaForge, your
8 line is open.

9 (No audible response.)

10 THE OPERATOR: Mr. LaForge, do you have
11 additional comments?

12 (No audible response.)

13 MR. KORSAK: Okay. We can go to the
14 next person. Do we have Mrs. Watson on the line?

15 (No audible response.)

16 MR. KORSAK: Operator, do we have Mrs.
17 Watson on the line?

18 THE OPERATOR: Not at this time.

19 MR. KORSAK: And finally, do we have
20 Mrs. Larson on the line?

21 THE OPERATOR: One moment. I am not
22 showing a Mrs. Larson in conference.

23 MR. KORSAK: Okay. Thank you.

24 THE OPERATOR: You're welcome.

25 MR. KORSAK: Okay. Now I am going to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ask Operator to allow three people to speak that
2 have joined the teleconference, and then we're going
3 to call on three people here in the room. So we are
4 going to alternate between the phone and the people
5 on the line -- here in the room.

6 For people on the phone, if you have
7 comments, if you would like to make a comment,
8 please press star 1 so that we know that you want to
9 speak, and your line will be unmuted by the Operator
10 when it is your turn.

11 THE OPERATOR: Our first comment comes
12 from Karen Hadden. Your line is open.

13 MS. HADDEN: Hi. I would like to add
14 some suggestions for what needs to be in the scoping
15 comments.

16 There needs to be a detailed look at the
17 record that WCS has on worker contamination. This
18 license application should be looking at that with
19 this consideration, and further than just what WCS
20 has provided in their documents. There was work
21 done by a Dr. Poston at Texas A&M who looked in
22 detail at the impact on the workers at that site. I
23 think that should be included because we need to
24 know whether this company in fact has the competence
25 to handle these materials securely and safely.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 The emergency preparedness, all of the
2 communities in the nearby area, we have heard from
3 the volunteer service in Midland that they are not
4 equipped, they are not prepared, and no, they do not
5 even own a Geiger counter. Now, that may not be
6 true of the full-time paid professional staff, but
7 there are many volunteers involved as well, and some
8 communities only have volunteer fire departments and
9 emergency responders. It needs to be an in-depth
10 research area.

11 We need to include the risks of de facto
12 permanent storage because if this waste stays in
13 place for 40 years, the likelihood of it moving
14 seems incredibly low. And we need to also include
15 looking at whether it stays for 100 years, which WCS
16 has publicly discussed on numerous occasions.

17 We need to look at emissions of
18 radiation as waste is transported because the NRC's
19 September 2014 study on spent fuel transportation
20 clearly points out that there are some emissions
21 routinely as a transport cask goes down the road.
22 Now, if somebody gets stuck next to that in a
23 traffic jam or if there is an accident, how much
24 does that increase the exposure? They claim it is a
25 very low level of exposure, but how does that impact

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 people who are already at risk health-wise? How
2 does that impact children who are more readily
3 impacted by radiation, particularly girls, who are
4 impacted even more so than boys?

5 We need to have the scoping comments
6 include the impacts of fracking, which is abundant
7 in the region. It needs to use the most recent data
8 because fracking is on the increase, and anything
9 old will not include all of the fracking that is
10 going on in the region, and combine that with
11 earthquake data. As pointed out earlier, we need to
12 include the effects of climate change because while
13 WCS claims that the high temperature is 110 degrees
14 at that site, I think that that has likely been
15 exceeded in the region already.

16 There needs to be cumulative impacts
17 looked at with the Holtec facility, and the fact
18 that the company is up for sale needs to be
19 considered in depth because this could be very
20 different if in fact a different company is at the
21 helm. The financial status of the companies
22 involved needs to be considered, the fact that WCS
23 in 2015 reportedly has lost \$26.5 million, and
24 whether that might impact safety in terms of cost-
25 cutting. Their partner AREVA also has been

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 basically bankrupt, but is being propped up by the
2 French government. These things need to be
3 considered in depth with full financial analysis.

4 Also, we need to have in the scoping
5 what full-scale testing, if any, applies to the
6 casks moved here. According to that September 2014
7 NRC report, there has basically been none, and that
8 needs to be assessed and examined. And thank you
9 very much.

10 Also, one last comment. The risk of
11 terrorist attack, especially by drones, needs to be
12 included and should be part of this study, other
13 attacks as well.

14 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.
15 Operator, could you please call the next -- the next
16 line?

17 THE OPERATOR: Yes, thank you. Our next
18 comment comes from Scott Kobach. Your line is open.

19 MR. KOBACH: Thank you. My name is
20 Scott Kobach with Nuclear Watch New Mexico. I would
21 like to request that you please examine the
22 cumulative impacts of the potential accidents and
23 releases on the various types of waste that are
24 present in the facility. We need an estimate of all
25 the waste that might be present in the facility, you

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 know, in 40 years from now, and the effects of a
2 release or a fire or a plane crash or something on
3 all of that waste as a cumulative impact.

4 I would say that all previous
5 environmental reviews must be reexamined and not
6 rubber-stamped, including the location of the
7 Ogallala aquifer. Maybe it is back.

8 I would also like to consider the
9 stormwater runoff needs to be analyzed because it
10 apparently flows into New Mexico, and so we need to
11 analyze the -- the effect of that. The EIS should
12 analyze what effects long-term drought and climate
13 warming might have on operations. Thank you.

14 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.
15 Operator, could you please call up the next line?

16 THE OPERATOR: Yes. Our next comment
17 comes from Gail Snyder. Your line is open.

18 MS. SNYDER: Hi. I have Linda Lewison
19 in my car, and she would like to make the comment.

20 MS. LEWISON: Can you hear me?

21 MR. KORSAK: Yes, we can hear you. Go
22 ahead.

23 MS. LEWISON: Included, you need to
24 consider the impact of the risk of an act of warfare
25 on the two facilities. WCS is supposed to take up

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to 40,000 tons. The other one is supposed to take
2 up to 100,000 tons. There will be surface storage.
3 It will be in plain sight. It could be bombed. It
4 could be targeted by suicide pilots a la the 9/11
5 attacks. One facility going up contaminates others
6 downwind. Releases if both facilities are attacked
7 or catch fire, all of this needs to be included in
8 your -- in your scoping and in the considerations
9 that you give as you examine this project. Thank
10 you.

11 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.

12 At this time, do we have anybody in the
13 room who would like to make additional comments? Mr.
14 Kamps?

15 (Pause.)

16 MR. KAMPS: Hello again, Kevin Kamps. I
17 forgot to spell my name last time. It is K-A-M-P-S.
18 I am with Beyond Nuclear and Don't Waste Michigan.

19 And I wanted to touch on something that
20 was raised by Karen Hadden. She was speaking about
21 the gamma dose that is allowed to stream out of
22 these shipping containers under NRC regulations, and
23 unless they have changed since the last time I
24 looked at them, the allowable dose rate for gamma
25 radiation coming out of these transport containers

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 is about a chest x-ray per hour at a distance of six
2 feet away. That is 10 millirem -- I am sorry --
3 yes, 10 millirem per hour. That would be a chest x-
4 ray per hour. But right at the surface of the
5 container, it is up to 200 millirem per hour, which,
6 depending on how you define a chest x-ray, that is -
7 - that is a much bigger dose, and of course, workers
8 and inspectors would be exposed to that surface dose
9 rate.

10 But something that I did raise in the
11 hearings in New Mexico and Texas included the risk
12 of contaminated shipments, and AREVA, which is a
13 full partner in this WCS scheme, has a very bad
14 record in France that was concealed for many years
15 on end that involved hundreds of contaminated
16 shipments. These were externally contaminated
17 shipments, so the dose rates of gamma radiation
18 coming off were on average 500 times permissible
19 levels, and in one case 3300 times permissible
20 levels, and there were many hundreds of shipments
21 that were contaminated above acceptable limits.

22 And I wanted to raise something from the
23 Yucca Mountain proceeding which NRC is also running,
24 and that is a recognized 1600-meter region of
25 influence involving this gamma radiation coming off

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of these shipping containers. That is 800 meters on
2 either side, and so that's a one-mile distance if
3 you -- if you add it up, on either side 800 meters,
4 half-mile in either direction, gamma radiation
5 region of influence. That needs to be looked at.

6 And I wanted to touch on something that
7 was just mentioned by Linda Lewison on the phone,
8 and that is a book that was written by Bennett
9 Ramberg in 1984 entitled Nuclear Power Plants as
10 Weapons for the Enemy. And this issue that Linda
11 raised about the -- the potential for an act of
12 warfare on these sites is a very serious one. Even
13 though Ramberg's book was focused on nuclear power
14 plants and reactors and onsite storage, this would
15 be -- and that figure was raised yesterday by
16 Dr. Singh at the Holtec press conference, 100,000
17 metric tons of irradiated nuclear fuel is what they
18 are proposing for their site. You add it all
19 together, that is WCS with 40,000, that is 140,000
20 metric tons of irradiated nuclear fuel just within a
21 35-mile radius.

22 And so a previous speaker, Barbara
23 Warren, during the process questions period, brought
24 up Homeland Security as a federal agency that should
25 be involved in this environmental and safety review,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and I wholeheartedly agree. And I think along the
2 lines of what Linda Lewison just raised, the
3 Department of Defense should also be an official
4 partner in this licensing proceeding.

5 And I will just bolster that point,
6 referring back to the Private Fuel Storage Limited
7 Liability Corporation centralized interim storage
8 facility proceeding that NRC also ran over a decade
9 ago and ultimately approved over the objections of
10 countless people across this country, and in that
11 very proceeding, the State of Utah, one of its major
12 contentions in the licensing intervention was the
13 risk of accidental aircraft crashes or accidental
14 bombings because it happens to be adjacent to Hill
15 Air Force Base in Utah.

16 And so in this proceeding we are talking
17 about right here, the risk of, as Linda Lewison
18 pointed out, 9/11-type suicide attacks by airplane,
19 but also the risk of accidental airplane crashes
20 into one of these facilities impacting the other one
21 downwind. Thank you.

22 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.

23 At this time, is there any -- does
24 anybody in the room have additional comments?
25 Please come to the microphone or raise your hand so

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 we can bring you a microphone.

2 (No audible response.)

3 MR. KORSAK: Okay. We don't have any
4 more comments in the room, so I will go back to the
5 phone lines. Operator, could you please call up the
6 next line?

7 THE OPERATOR: Thank you. Our next
8 comment comes from Cynthia Peil. Your line is open.

9 MR. PEIL: Yes, this is William Peil,
10 her husband. Can you hear me okay?

11 MR. KORSAK: We can hear you. Go ahead.

12 MR. PEIL: Okay. I am very concerned
13 too about what companies would be working on this.
14 I am assuming that they are all U.S.-based
15 companies, that no foreign companies will be
16 involved in any aspect of this. And, again,
17 security is of utmost concern here, that the NRC
18 itself has had problems with security. Down here at
19 Calvert Cliffs, we had an Al-Qaeda -- suspected
20 Al-Qaeda terrorist back in 2010 that was working at
21 that plant.

22 Not only that, but they also worked at
23 Salem Hope Creek in New Jersey and Peach Bottom,
24 Limerick, and Three Mile Island, all in
25 Pennsylvania. Somehow, workers that are potential

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 terrorists are not being screened properly. We had
2 a Fox News team -- crew a couple of years back too
3 that drove a van directly into Calvert Cliffs right
4 next to the -- and parked right next to the nuclear
5 power plant. There were no guards at the front gate,
6 yet we're told that we're being protected by
7 security at these facilities.

8 Now that is for the facilities that are
9 at rest. Now you start moving the material, you
10 have a whole 'nother game happening here, that the
11 level of security must be far beyond what we've got
12 at these facilities. And as we have seen, we don't
13 have the security we were told we had, even by the
14 NRC. I believe this has to be an independent
15 review, independently managed, independently
16 monitored. There is no way that we can trust anyone
17 at this point, and this is too dangerous not to be
18 absolutely positively watched and monitored
19 throughout any aspect of it.

20 If a TV crew can drive right next to one
21 of our nuclear power reactors or we find that
22 laborers working at these reactors are suspected
23 terrorists, that is -- the problem does not happen
24 at the plant. It happens throughout the rest of the
25 country when the trust of the American people is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 lost when the regulatory agencies that are supposed
2 to protect their health and safety are not doing so,
3 and it becomes obvious that this dangerous material,
4 that, again, it's bad enough sitting at the plant,
5 is starting to move across the country.

6 I suspect home prices are going to drop
7 in the areas where it's moving, and certainly there
8 in Texas, that whole area is probably not going to
9 be habitable, not because of -- maybe because of any
10 radioactivity, but because nobody wants to live
11 there anymore. This thing has serious side effects
12 that are not always obvious, and before anything is
13 moved, this has to be independently looked at. I
14 don't believe that NRC, given its track record of
15 not being able to manage and protect us at these
16 facilities, is not in the best position to do that.

17 So if the NRC is the one that is
18 conducting this, I think we have the fox in the
19 henhouse here, and again, that has to be changed
20 before anything is going to occur because anything
21 that does occur is going to be disastrous for this
22 country. Thank you.

23 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.

24 Operator, could you please call up the
25 next line?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 THE OPERATOR: Thank you. Our next
2 comment comes from Tom Smith. Your line is open.

3 MR. T. SMITH: Good evening, everybody,
4 and thanks for doing this and hearing from people.

5 We too wish that there were far more
6 hearings around the country, and point out that
7 you're really not hitting the most affected places,
8 which are the places through which this waste is to
9 be transported. We have grave concerns about
10 whether this is a good site. It is close to the
11 Ogallala aquifer. The proposal they are making is
12 to put this waste out on a cement pad unprotected in
13 the environment for 40 years. We heard Rob Baltzer
14 the other day say, well, maybe it will be 100 years,
15 and that's a long time for cement to withstand the
16 ravages of aging, of weather, and we have really not
17 ever designed or thought that these things might be
18 asked to last that long.

19 And then the question comes, well, if it
20 lasts that long, how are we doing to repackage them?
21 How are we going to put them in another container to
22 keep them safe from further degradation? And there
23 is no system in place at this site at this time that
24 would enable that to happen. And the question needs
25 to be asked: has it ever been done safely? Answers

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 we are getting is no. So why are we betting that we
2 can put this out and repackage it at some later
3 time?

4 Another question that we raised earlier,
5 but I think it is one that certainly needs to be
6 discussed further, is the whole question of
7 cumulative impact. It is not just the Hobbs
8 facility from the WCS site, but it's also about
9 issues having to do with the question of the WIPP
10 site and the repackaging site right next door.
11 Suddenly you're going to have all of that cumulative
12 waste that has to be dealt with as well, and it
13 makes it a very attractive target for terrorists, as
14 we heard from others earlier.

15 That has been going on down the laundry
16 list of concerns. One of the things that we ask you
17 to do is a really good job of looking at the no-
18 action alternative. What are the costs and benefits
19 of just leaving this waste where it sits? You have
20 already got people who are going to be guarding this
21 waste for 60 years on average as this stuff cools
22 off. They know what they are doing. You've got
23 security in place, going to have to have it in place
24 that entire period of time, and then how to monitor
25 it and how to deal with it if it does leak. That is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 -- the cost of that is already borne by the people
2 who have benefitted from the use of the radioactive
3 waste, and it may be far safer just to leave it
4 where it is right now as opposed to moving it half
5 across the country, and then having to move it again
6 another time, and the beefing up yet a second set of
7 railroads and so forth.

8 But the other question in the no-action
9 alternative is we're talking about what happens for
10 getting the waste out there, but what happens if
11 Congress never appropriates the money to finish the
12 long-term repository and this is it? And I think
13 that's an even more likely scenario than the fact
14 that we'll ever come to -- than this repository will
15 ever be finished.

16 Once this waste is transferred away from
17 the utilities and put into the WCS site, nobody in
18 the utility industry is going to ever lobby to have
19 this moved to someplace else. They are never going
20 to come up with the \$100 billion or so necessary to
21 finish Yucca Mountain. The only people who are
22 going to be lobbying to do that are you and the DOE
23 and a couple of us aging anti-nuclear activists, and
24 frankly, we ain't got no power in this Congress, and
25 it isn't ever going to happen.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And there has been an unbroken track
2 record from the beginning of the nuclear age about
3 the federal government and Congress -- I am putting
4 the blame really on Congress because you all are
5 pretty good people -- breaking promises to
6 appropriate the money to clean up the mess that you
7 made, or never building the sites adequately to
8 begin with, and that is the future we are facing.

9 This is not going to go away. It is
10 going to stay there in West Texas or New Mexico, and
11 we will have to be appropriating money for millennia
12 to clean up the mess that you guys have made with
13 this decision. So please, look at the cumulative
14 decision impact, look at the transportation, and
15 look at the alternative of leaking it where it is
16 and not moving it to some West Texas town where it's
17 likely never going to go away. Thank you for your
18 time.

19 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.

20 Operator, could you please call up the
21 next line?

22 THE OPERATOR: Yes. Our next comment
23 comes from Donna Gilmore. Your line is open.

24 MS. GILMORE: Thank you. Can you hear
25 me?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KORSAK: We can hear you. Go ahead.

2 MS. GILMORE: Okay. Great. Yes,
3 there's been assumptions by the NRC that waste can
4 safely be stored once it is in dry storage to the
5 point that you allow exemptions to end emergency
6 planning at the plant, and I spoke to a number of
7 NRC people, and they gave me the three documents
8 that that is based on.

9 I have found assumptions in those three
10 documents that have been proven false, and I will --
11 I will submit written comment about those. One
12 example is where they said, well, it will be
13 impossible for fuel to ever be loaded incorrectly.
14 Case in point, at Diablo Canyon, Holtec, who did the
15 loading over three campaigns, actually loaded the
16 fuel backwards. They put the hotter fuel on the
17 outside and the cooler fuel on the inside. So that
18 case in point, you know, kind of mitigates that
19 document. So please make sure that any assumptions
20 that are made based on -- there's three documents, I
21 don't have them in front of me right now -- that you
22 basically need to start over on those assumptions.
23 That is what worries me, is the assumptions you're
24 going to use.

25 And regarding emergency response, I

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 mean, the FEMA documents, training documents, just
2 tell the first responders to go in there, check the
3 radiation levels, and get the heck out if it's too
4 high. So I really don't feel like we have an
5 adequate emergency response if there was a problem.
6 That needs to be addressed in a document also.
7 Thank you.

8 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.

9 Operator, could you please call up the
10 next line?

11 THE OPERATOR: Yes. Our next comment
12 comes from Rose Gardner. Your line is open.

13 MS. GARDNER: Yes, good evening again.
14 This is Rose Gardner.

15 I just listened to all the comments. It
16 has been very enlightening in that it's very
17 difficult for me to explain, but just don't do this
18 to give them benefits. Think about the small
19 communities. We are so small, so -- call them
20 backward country, but there's a lot of people that
21 care what's going on, and talking me to submit
22 actual structural information.

23 But at the same time, don't do this to
24 Eunice. Don't run over us. There's so much going
25 on, and nobody else is speaking out, and I am here.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And that's what it's all about, certainly, I am
2 worried about safety. Thank you very much.

3 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.

4 Operator, could you please call up the
5 next line?

6 THE OPERATOR: At this time, we have no
7 additional comments.

8 MR. KORSAK: Thank you.

9 At this time, do we have any additional
10 comments in this room? Mr. Kamps?

11 (Pause.)

12 MR. KAMPS: Thanks. Kevin Kamps, Beyond
13 Nuclear and Don't Waste Michigan. That is K-A-M-P-
14 S. Thanks for a third bite at the apple.

15 Just to respond to Rose Gardner just
16 now, I am reminded of Margene Bullcreek of the Skull
17 Valley Goshute Indian Tribe in Utah. I mentioned
18 the Private Fuel Storage Limited Liability
19 Corporation proceeding that NRC oversaw and then
20 ultimately approved over a decade ago, and I know
21 that NRC will say we're just doing our job, this is
22 the law of the land, the Congress has made this the
23 law of the land, the President signed the
24 legislation, made it law.

25 Well, if the responsibility is not

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 NRC's, then it is Congress's and the White House's,
2 but the rules that apply, the communities that are
3 being targeted, these are environmental justice
4 violations on their face, and someone has to be
5 responsible for this. And I think NRC does share
6 responsibility in -- in these decisions because you
7 ultimately approve them.

8 I will just hearken back to President
9 Clinton's Executive Order 12898 of February 16th,
10 1994, Executive Order Regarding Federal Actions to
11 Address Environmental Justice in Minority
12 Populations and Low-Income Populations. And the
13 importance in this environmental scoping proceeding
14 of environmental justice as a major issue to be
15 addressed in this very proceeding, if you look at
16 what happened in Utah to the Skull Valley Goshute
17 Indian Reservation, a small community of 125 adult
18 members that was targeted by a Holtec-based design
19 and a consortium of nuclear utilities, the wounds
20 left over in that community between the pro-dump and
21 anti-dump members of that small Native American
22 nation will take a very long time to heal because of
23 the money that was being dangled in front of a low-
24 income community. And these are environmental
25 justice violations of their own, just from these

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 proceedings. So that needs to be addressed.

2 I did want to raise an issue of
3 something that Donna Gilmore raised during the
4 process questions, and that was assumptions,
5 optimistic assumptions of future technology. And it
6 very much applies to both WCS and, again, to the
7 Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance Holtec proposals. Under
8 NRC's nuclear waste confidence or continued spent
9 fuel storage rules and policies, there is an
10 optimistic assumption of dry transfer facilities,
11 and the reason I raise this is that we protested
12 that during the -- the nuclear waste confidence EIS
13 proceeding as unacceptable, to just assume safety
14 over the long term, that these dry casks, these
15 storage casks, can be replaced once every 100 years.

16 In fact, the dry transfer systems
17 themselves will be replaced. As we protested during
18 that proceeding, where will that funding come from?
19 There's a lot of very optimistic assumptions being
20 made. And the reason I raise this, both for this
21 WCS proceeding and for the closely affiliated Holtec
22 ELEA proceeding, is that just yesterday at the press
23 conference on Capitol Hill, Dr. Singh, CEO of
24 Holtec, said we're assuming that our facility will
25 only be open for decades, but it could go on for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 centuries. "Smitty" Smith, Tom "Smitty" Smith,
2 mentioned what Rob Baltzer of WCS has said. It
3 could be 100 years into the future that WCS
4 operates.

5 Yesterday, Dr. Singh even dropped the
6 "m" word. He dropped the "millennia" word. And it
7 turns out, I understood it, that Holtec asserts that
8 its containers can last for thousands or even tens
9 of thousands of years into the future, which I find
10 absurd and ridiculous. These are not magical metals
11 and magical materials that these containers are made
12 of. They are made of metal and concrete, and I
13 believe that those materials are vulnerable to
14 corrosion and erosion and eventual degradation and
15 eventual failure.

16 And I will just end on a warning that
17 the Department of Energy, in its final Environmental
18 Impact Statement for Yucca Mountain, put out there,
19 and that was surface storage of dry casks will
20 eventually fail over long enough periods of time,
21 and catastrophic radioactivity releases will result,
22 and the NRC's own Chairman, Allison Macfarlane, made
23 that same warning: loss of institutional control
24 over long enough periods of time can result in
25 catastrophe. And that very much applies to these two

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 proposals.

2 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.

3 MS. GOLD: Okay. So we don't seem to
4 have any new commenters in the room or on the line
5 right now, so we're going to take a ten-minute
6 break. Operator, we will reconvene at 9:15, so if
7 you can -- if anybody joins while we're on break, if
8 you can let them know that we will restart the
9 meeting at 9:15? Thank you.

10 THE OPERATOR: Thank you.

11 (Whereupon, the meeting went off the
12 record at 9:06 p.m. and resumed at 9:16 p.m.)

13 MR. KORSAK: At this time I would like
14 to continue the meeting and continue with the public
15 comments. First I would like to remind for people
16 who are dialing in, that if you have a phone and
17 wanted to provide comment, please --- please press
18 star one so we know that you want to speak, and your
19 line will be un-muted by the operator when --- when
20 it's your turn. At this time, Operator, could you
21 please call up the next comment?

22 THE OPERATOR: Yes, thank you. Our next
23 comment comes from Michael Ford. Your line is open.

24 MR. FORD: Hello and thank you for the
25 opportunity to speak tonight. I just very quickly

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and briefly, I'd like to cover a few of the things
2 that I've heard this evening. I understand it's ---
3 Waste Control Specialists ---let me back up. I'm
4 the vice president of Licensing and Corporate
5 Compliance with Waste Control Specialists. We put
6 comments on the record in the previous meetings.
7 Now it's unusual for us to continue to provide
8 commentary at these meetings but given the fact that
9 there's likely new participants in this final
10 meeting --- specifically from some of the locations
11 that have voiced concerns, I wanted to make a few
12 comments to respond to some of the issues that are
13 being raised tonight, and also to encourage the
14 environmental reviewers to include in the scope of
15 their reviews.

16 Two documents in particular are ---
17 would be very informative for the folks who have
18 expressed concerns in regard to transportation
19 issues. One has been published by the NRC in
20 January 2014. It's Spent Fuel Transportation Risk
21 Assessment. The document number is NUREG-2125.
22 There's also a DOE document. That's called the
23 Historical Review of the Safe Transportation of
24 Spent Nuclear Fuel. That's 88 pages. It's ORNL/SR-
25 2016/261.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 The NRC document has a few of the
2 conclusions that are --- that are fairly pertinent
3 to our discussions here this evening in particularly
4 to the scope of the review. And the issue of
5 collective doses from the transportation, it
6 concludes that the collective doses from routine
7 transportation are vanishingly small.

8 Would be the doses are about four to
9 five orders of magnitude less than the collective
10 background radiation doses --- or 10,000 to 100,000
11 times less than the collective background radiation
12 doses, which we all get right around 620 millirem
13 per year on average in the United States. So you're
14 talking significantly less than that. Much less
15 than --- if someone's talked about chest X-rays.
16 And that would not be an accurate statement.

17 The route selected for the study --- and
18 that's collective dose. That's the population dose.
19 That's not an individual dose. The route selected
20 for the studies are adequately represent the routes
21 for the spent nuclear fuel transport. There is
22 relatively little variation or risk per kilometer
23 over these routes.

24 And finally people talked about fire
25 accidents and none of the fire accidents

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 investigators in the studies in the NRC document
2 result in the release of radioactive material. And
3 it also includes, very importantly, a three-hour
4 immersion fires. There's been some comments about
5 the EIS including the scope of the location of the
6 Ogallala.

7 I can tell you that there have been over
8 640 borings that determine the geological
9 characteristics of the area, and WCS has confirmed
10 that it is not over an aquifer. The reason that the
11 aquifer -- the location of the aquifer was changed,
12 according to the Texas Water Resources Board, was
13 because of the fact that the WCS facility is the
14 most geologically explored nuclear facility in the
15 United States if not the world. And there is no
16 doubt about that.

17 Radiation fence line, there's some
18 concerns raised about the radiation fence line
19 monitoring. That information is made --- is
20 published in our annual environmental report and
21 that is a public document.

22 And then finally, there was a comment
23 about the review of our records and one of the
24 comments that we have made to the environmental
25 reviewers in person is that they're welcome to come

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and walk our facility, look at anything they choose
2 to look at. We have a very open and transparent
3 operation, and it --- whatever suits their operation
4 and their review, we are very happy to accommodate
5 them in their investigations of the facility
6 proposed consolidated storage facility.

7 In regard to a contamination event, that
8 was brought up by another caller, the one reviewed
9 by Dr. Posen that was an event ten years ago. That
10 event was investigated, the site. The issues --- or
11 the contamination issue was remediated and there was
12 an enforcement process that WCS went through with
13 the State of Texas. Everything was fully documented
14 and a matter of public record. And that is
15 maintained by the Texas Commissioner of
16 Environmental Quality. That's all the comments I
17 have for this evening, and thank you very much for
18 your time.

19 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your
20 comments. Operator, could you please call up the
21 next line?

22 THE OPERATOR: Yes, our next comment
23 comes from Donna Gilmore. Your line is open.

24 MS. GILMORE: Yes, this is Donna
25 Gilmore, San Onofre Safety. Regarding the last

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 caller that's trans for state --- transportation
2 study did not include high burn up fuel, which is
3 known to be unstable in storage and transport. It
4 also, I assume the canisters were perfectly intact
5 with not even partial cracks, which at this point
6 there --- no one can say that that is a reality.

7 The other thing is when Kevin Kamps was
8 talking about all these years, that these things are
9 going to be fine. Just to let you know, at San
10 Onofre, that Holtec system, he gave us a ten-year
11 warranty on the base structure, concrete structure,
12 and a 25-year warranty on the canisters. And then
13 if the base concrete structure failed after ten
14 years, it would void the canister warranty.

15 And if he was to load the existing ---
16 or even move all these canisters that have been
17 sitting there since as early as 2003, he would give
18 us a big two-year warranty if he put those canisters
19 in the Holtec holes. So yeah, I think it would be
20 good to see what kind of warranty these companies
21 are offering for this system. I haven't heard
22 anything about that issue in terms of that.

23 And also these should all be put in
24 buildings to give us additional environmental
25 protection. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.
2 Operator, could you please call out the next line?

3 THE OPERATOR: Yes, thank you. Our next
4 comment comes from Becky Halpin. Your line is open.

5 MS. HALPIN: Hello, thank you very much.
6 I --- after listening this evening, particularly
7 regarding the process of advising communities about
8 this whole process, I feel like the most important
9 thing that you have not done is to make sure that
10 every community is aware that this process is going
11 on. And I feel like you have done a good job, or
12 are doing that. I feel like you have depended on
13 email lists, or --- you have depended on people who
14 are already following this issue --- knowing what's
15 going on.

16 But really the general community has not
17 been advised that this process is happening. The
18 communities where this --- where these plants are
19 going to be --- where the storage facilities are
20 going to be --- it's communities where
21 transportation is going to occur through --- have
22 not been advised at all that this process is
23 ongoing. You cannot think that you have done your
24 job by depending on social media or a few email
25 lists or sending out some kind of --- some kind of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 press release and think that you've done your job,
2 because you haven't. We haven't heard anything
3 about that in our communities in Texas.

4 So we expect, and I hope, that you will
5 advise and advertise broadly this process. Because
6 I feel like you have done a very ineffective job of
7 doing it and it's done a great disservice to the
8 people who will be impacted by it. And people who
9 can be just as impacted by this whole thing who are
10 in the transportation corridors as the people who
11 are actually in the area where these very dangerous
12 nuclear wastes will be stored.

13 So that is my comment. I'm very
14 disappointed and I am --- yet I am hopeful that you
15 will pull it out and actually advertise to people
16 that this is going on. Thank you very much.

17 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.
18 Operator, could you please call out the next line?

19 THE OPERATOR: Thank you. Our next
20 question comes from Diane D'Ariggo. Your line is
21 open.

22 MS. D'ARIGGO: Thank you. I'm with
23 Nuclear Information and Resource Service. And I
24 have a couple of points. One, I missed the very
25 beginning of this, so I don't --- I'm assuming that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you haven't announced any other meetings or
2 hearings. And one of the things that many, many of
3 us have asked is that there be actual hearings in
4 communities along the transport route.

5 By holding a meeting one night at
6 headquarters, that means people who are going to be
7 potentially impacted --- like the person who just
8 called before me --- you know, people who don't
9 really know about this. It's somewhat unrealistic
10 to expect them to call in through a process and
11 listen to something on the phone or on the web and
12 then participate that way when the trucks --- the
13 trains, I guess there will be more through the
14 trains --- will be going right through communities.

15 And we've asked that, at least in some
16 of these major communities, that scoping meetings be
17 held there as well. So and I was one of the people
18 that asked for those in the beginning, and I don't
19 feel like this 7:00-10:00 thing on --- one night at
20 headquarters is the equivalent. So that's one
21 point.

22 Another point is that in the
23 presentation at the beginning of the scoping
24 meetings we're told that when the materials arrive -
25 -- when the radiated material arrives at the site,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that it'll be checked. And if it's fine, then it'll
2 be kept there. But there's not been anything said
3 about what happens if it's not.

4 We've been hearing that there are going
5 to be some kind of helium tests and I want to know,
6 on those helium tests, that each canister's going to
7 undergo to find out if there's a leak --- if those
8 really, really work. Or if that's just something
9 that's being done so that there's the illusion that
10 they can test.

11 And then what kind of testing will be
12 done? Will that be done when the canisters leave
13 the site as well --- at the reactors around the
14 country? And then when they arrive at WCS, well,
15 really it seems like they ought to do it before they
16 put it on the roads and rails for hundreds ---
17 potentially thousands of miles.

18 And it's not clear to me from what I've
19 read so far whether the --- how much --- the
20 environmental impact statement and the licensing
21 process are going to include the transport issues.
22 But strongly encourage that those be incorporated in
23 a very detailed way with regard to the kinds of its
24 containers. We just had some dispute here over how
25 much radioactivity can be given off.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I'd like to point out that when the ---
2 Mr. Ford was speaking about the collective dose to
3 people --- well, the collective dose is the dose to
4 the whole country. And so you can give a dose --- a
5 huge dose to a kid that's next to the truck that's
6 parked at the McDonald's for an hour, but then you
7 average it over the population of the United States,
8 and it looks like it's not very much.

9 Collective dose is an important thing.
10 Collective dose --- the dose to the entire
11 population from the nuclear power industry would be
12 really good to figure out, but you can't --- if it's
13 completely immoral to take the individual doses and
14 then average them over time, over --- over the
15 larger population to say that it's okay.

16 And it's not even right, because some of
17 the radioactivity, it goes to specific organs. And
18 unless it takes the average amount over the whole
19 body to go to this number, but that's something
20 that's done as well.

21 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.
22 Operator, could you please call up the next line?

23 THE OPERATOR: Yes, our next --- excuse
24 me, our next comment comes from John LaForge. Your
25 line is open.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. JOHN LaFORGE: Can you hear me all
2 right?

3 MR. KORSAK: We can hear you. Go ahead.

4 MR. JOHN LaFORGE: I'm having a hard
5 time hearing the moderator. Can you hear me?

6 MR. KORSAK: We can hear you. Go ahead.

7 MR. JOHN LaFORGE: All right, thank you.
8 My comments about scoping has to do with the
9 ownership and liability for accidents along the
10 route. Now I understand this highly radioactive
11 material that's owned by utility companies, when
12 it's put in casks on site, those casks are supposed
13 then going to be transformed into transportation
14 casks and put on trucks and trains that are
15 evidently --

16 I want to suggest that the scoping
17 hearing delineate legal liability and ownership
18 during the transportation process so they --- which
19 unit of ownership is legally liable while the
20 material is en route? Would that be the Department
21 of Energy? Would that be the railroad doing it --
22 or the trucking firm transporting? Would it be the
23 cask producer who produced the container in which
24 the transportation is taking place?

25 And at what point does legal liability

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 transfer from one body to another? These questions
2 have to be identified and clarified and answered so
3 that in the event of an accident --- and of course
4 government studies by the NRC and DOE have
5 established that accidents along the transportation
6 route are inevitable. They will happen.

7 When these happen, the victims of
8 radiation disasters along the route will have
9 presumably some legal right to sue those who are
10 legally liable for their contamination. So the
11 scoping hearing should be required to consider a
12 chain of evidence, you might say, in the
13 prosecutorial terms --- that is, when a crime is
14 committed, a chain of ownership needs to be
15 identified and clarified. So the transportation
16 route and the transfer points where ownership goes
17 from one unit to another.

18 A case in point, at Fukushima, a golf
19 course sued the company for the destruction of its
20 business, that the fallout from the Fukushima
21 disaster destroyed the golf course. The company,
22 Tokyo Electric Power Company, claimed in court that
23 the radiation on the golf course wasn't theirs
24 because it had left the property of the Fukushima
25 Daiichi Reactor complex. This sort of preposterous

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 legal argument has to be avoided in the event of
2 accidents when transporting waste to these potential
3 sites. Thank you.

4 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.
5 Operator, could you please call up the next line?

6 THE OPERATOR: Yes. Our next comment
7 comes from Cinthya Peil or William Peil, your line
8 is open.

9 MR. PEIL: Yes. This is William Peil.
10 Can you hear me okay?

11 THE OPERATOR: We can hear you. Go
12 ahead.

13 MR. PEIL: Okay. I want to comment two
14 things here. One is that the format of this process
15 that we're going through now is really confusing.
16 I'm getting breaking up on my cell phone --- or, on
17 my regular house phone here and when I watch things
18 go across the screen, many misspellings --- many
19 incomplete sentences.

20 I'm not sure what people are saying at
21 times, and I'm not sure how this is going to be
22 unraveled after the fact -- how you're going to make
23 any sense of this -- because there's so much being
24 said that I really consider very important in the
25 decision-making process, but I have no idea how you

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 will ever make sense out of these short snippet
2 statements, which are critical. But the media is
3 not supporting the delivery of those statements.

4 And I would also like to say something -
5 - and I think it's either Mr. Ford or LaForge, I'm
6 not sure what his name is, but he was speaking to
7 how safe this material is. If it is that safe, why
8 aren't we leaving it where it's at. If it's only
9 the decommissioned sites, leave it where it's being
10 decommissioned at those sites. Leave it there.

11 Or is this an attempt to extract
12 something that is risky from those sites and move it
13 to somewhere else where these --- locations where
14 these power plants have been for years now, they
15 just don't want to have it in their neighborhood.
16 It seems inconsistent to me that any analysis could
17 possibly say that this is safe and at the same time
18 be contemplating moving this dangerous material.

19 I look at it as being dangerous, and I
20 don't care how much paper is put out trying to
21 justify that it is safe --- they wouldn't be moving
22 it, or you wouldn't be considered moving it unless
23 it wasn't safe. So there is a big inconsistency in
24 what is being proposed here by the people who are
25 proposing it and by, again, the people that will

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 have to suffer if something goes wrong, whether it's
2 there in Texas or elsewhere along the route. I find
3 this very inconsistent.

4 And something needs to be done to put
5 this in perspective as to why we're doing this in
6 the first place. It's --- the --- a lot of the
7 stuff has sat there for 40 years or more. Leaving
8 it set there for the next thousand years --- it
9 seems to me, leave it there, spend the money at
10 those locations to guard it. You're going to have
11 to do that no matter what.

12 But do not risk the danger of moving
13 this across country and exposing people who never
14 thought that that would ever happen in their locale.
15 But there is a probability that something might
16 happen in their locale that they never counted on,
17 never knew about, and all of the sudden everybody's
18 wondering about it.

19 We just had an F-16 jet go down here in
20 Maryland, right next to Andrew's Air Force Base in a
21 neighborhood. Nobody every expected that to happen.
22 So things do happen. And fortunately in this case,
23 there was nobody underneath that jet when it went
24 down. But there very well could have been.

25 And who's to know when the next

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 unfortunate event happens? There is a probability
2 of these things happening, and that's why earlier I
3 asked for a QRA that does the probability analysis
4 and engineering analysis and then produces a
5 societal risk graph that shows what the likelihood
6 of various casualties, deaths from an incident might
7 be.

8 It's essential that that be done, and it
9 must be done independently from the organization
10 that's promoting this. That --- the big fear is
11 that that will not be done correctly because
12 ulterior motives will enter into the decision making
13 process. Money will enter into the decision making
14 process.

15 And locales that have had this stuff in
16 their neighborhoods, they needed to know this early
17 on before they went in. That was not part of public
18 record --- when decisions to put nuclear power
19 plants in neighborhoods --- which was done. And now
20 everybody's wondering, well, how did that happen?
21 And they're just trying to shove it down the road to
22 somewhere else, not their neighborhood. Do not let
23 this happen, please. Thank you.

24 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.
25 I do want to remind that if people calling in, if

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you're on the phone and want to provide comment,
2 please press star one and --- so we will be able to
3 recognize you and be able to take your comment.

4 I also want to remind that tonight
5 meeting is being recorded and transcript will be
6 generated after the meeting. So at this time,
7 Operator, could you please call up the next line?

8 THE OPERATOR: Yes, our next comment
9 comes from Richard Halpin. Your line is open.

10 MR. HALPIN: Hi, thank you. And thank
11 you all for having this meeting tonight and
12 listening intelligently to these comments. Can you
13 hear me?

14 MR. KORSAK: Yes, we can hear you. Go
15 ahead.

16 MR. HALPIN: I've been listening
17 throughout the meeting tonight and I'm profoundly
18 concerned about several aspects of this. First of
19 all, the Ogallala aquifer seems to me to be under
20 discussion as to where it's actually located. Vis a
21 vis this potential storage site.

22 So I urge the committee in the strongest
23 recommendation to have an independent review ---
24 geography --- geographical survey of where the
25 aquifer actually is, vis a vis this site. And

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 studies have been done, and those studies have
2 manipulated this site to say it is somewhere it
3 shouldn't --- it isn't, and I think that needs to be
4 investigated as well.

5 Number two is with this being as
6 potentially as dangerous as it sounds like it could
7 be, I'm surprised that there haven't been
8 publications of this hearing all across the country,
9 all along the transportation routes in every city
10 that this material --- this dangerous material might
11 go to. It seems like it ought to be in the
12 newspapers and on the public service announcements.
13 I'm a member of the faith community and I found out
14 about this tonight by accident.

15 So I know members of the faith and
16 energy community question that it states are all
17 profoundly concerned about these questions on our
18 group, but none of them --- but very few of them
19 have heard about these meetings. My next concern is
20 that the WCS lost \$23 million last year and is close
21 to --- is up for sale and close to bankruptcy. Is
22 this the model of a financially secure company that
23 we can have confidence in and be able to take ---
24 risk critical harm under their responsibility?

25 My next concern is where will you be

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 answering all of these comments and questions that
2 have been brought up tonight. I haven't heard any
3 responses so far, so I'm presuming you're going to
4 tally all these questions and comments and then make
5 response --- intelligent responses to them, as I
6 heard Mr. Smith say that you are a very professional
7 group of folks, and you take your responsibility
8 seriously. So I look forward to the publication of
9 your responses to this area --- to these concerns
10 and questions.

11 It's been brought up tonight that this
12 will also be Homeland Security question. They
13 placed under these materials and the transportation
14 of these materials, therefore it seems to me that
15 not only national but states and Homeland Security
16 offices should be met with and notified and have
17 public hearings about all this material, as well as
18 local, county and city governance --- should at
19 least be notified that you are considering
20 transporting this incredibly dangerous material
21 through their communities. And they should be
22 invited to have responses, particularly having
23 potential disaster relief plans ready to go should
24 there be, God help us, some sort of mistake here.

25 And finally, as the material has been

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 identified as --- I can't --- if it's safe, why not
2 leave it where it is and use these millions of our
3 tax dollars to put it in protective custody where it
4 is. Thank you all very much for taking my
5 questions.

6 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.
7 Operator, at this time, could you please call up the
8 next line?

9 THE OPERATOR: Yes, our next comment
10 comes from Michael Ford. Your line is open.

11 MR. FORD: Yes, thank you. This is
12 Michael Ford again. I --- I would not have
13 commented again, but there's a couple things that
14 came up in terms of --- that need to be clarified.
15 It's very important that people who may not
16 understand some of these technical concepts be
17 afforded the opportunity to be provided a
18 counterpoint to some of the information they've been
19 hearing especially on the issue of radiation dosage
20 and some of the fear that's being engendered in some
21 of these conversations.

22 And so let's be clear. The collective
23 dose in a report of a NUREG report is --- is ---
24 there's a way to calculate collective dose on an
25 average basis if you look at a population. If you

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 say 1,000 people got a certain dose and you divide
2 that by 1,000 --- that dose by 1,000 as an average
3 collective dose, that's not what this is talking
4 about here.

5 So it talks about the entire --- let me
6 --- let me just get some specific numbers here. The
7 entire population that's affected by the
8 transportation --- these are for truck shipments ---
9 is a 756 person rem. And then the total shipment
10 dose, in contrast to that, is 370 person rem.
11 That's taken over the entire population of affected
12 individuals.

13 Excuse me, person millirem. And so that
14 does look at residents near the truck stops, it does
15 look at residents near the route, it looks at
16 traffic on the route with the truck crews and
17 escorts. It looks at inspectors. And it looks at
18 persons sharing stops: if a truck's stopped in
19 traffic and a person's sitting next to that truck.

20 And now this is a truck and this is a
21 much higher likelihood of proximity because trucks
22 will be in traffic. We're talking real shipments as
23 part of this EIS scoping, so this would not be one
24 and the same comparison.

25 But just so that people understand ---

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 there was talking about, you know, how immoral ---
2 or something along these lines. These are very,
3 very low doses. And they're lightly compared to the
4 background doses that we all receive, and it's a
5 very small fraction of the background doses that we
6 receive on an annual basis.

7 I'm a certified health physicist, 30
8 years' experience in the industry. I can tell you
9 with the utmost certainty that these are extremely
10 small doses, and not something that people should be
11 terrified about or engendering fear about. And it's
12 unfortunate that certain folks are doing that.

13 In terms of why are we moving this
14 material? I would encourage people to go and read
15 the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear
16 Future. It's a very extensive document. It goes
17 into exact details as to why consolidated interim
18 storage is being recommended, and certainly that
19 certain groups can follow up on those
20 recommendations and take actions as necessary. And
21 that's the extent of my comments. Thank you.

22 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.
23 Operator, could you please call up the next line?

24 THE OPERATOR: Yes, our next comment
25 comes from Gail Snyder. Your line is open.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. SNYDER: Hi, this is Gail Snyder.
2 I'm with Nuclear Energy Information Service. We are
3 in Illinois, based out of Chicago.

4 So Chicago and the six collar
5 communities hooked around in Chicago are surrounded
6 by the most stored nuclear waste from nuclear
7 reactors --- more waste than any other state is
8 storing in the nation is from operating reactors in
9 our state as well as, we have one facility in
10 Morris, Illinois that has waste that was shipped to
11 it from other reactor sites, which just remains
12 there in storage. And if you include two reactors
13 in Michigan, that adds to the mix --- which sit
14 right across Lake Michigan --- the Palisades and
15 Cook reactors.

16 So nobody wants this waste around them,
17 including us and including the people in --- in
18 Texas and New Mexico. What I'm struggling with is
19 why there are not more hearings along the route
20 line. If we talk about just moving the nuclear
21 waste out of the state of Illinois, we won't be the
22 most impacted state by shipments --- the
23 transportation of nuclear waste --- just from the
24 waste that comes from our state. That's not to
25 mention all the waste that would come to or through

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 our state as it gets shipped across the nation
2 because we are so centrally located.

3 And Oak Ridge did a study on this and if
4 you look at the map, it's coming through Illinois
5 one way or the other most of the time. So, quite
6 frankly, as a resident of Illinois, I'm insulted
7 that there isn't more being done to notify the
8 public here that waste could be shipped on roads and
9 rails all around the states. And barges, I guess.

10 Currently I have three board members and
11 our director and we're driving back from our state
12 capital tonight where we have been notifying our
13 state legislature about this plan to ship waste, and
14 we're telling them where it might end up coming
15 through Illinois. And it's raising quite a few
16 eyebrows. And so I --- I just don't know, as this
17 plan goes forward, and states --- and legislatures
18 start to realize the real impact to their state,
19 what is going to happen to these plans?

20 I know that these facilities want to get
21 licensed, but I'll tell you, in the State of
22 Illinois, it is going to raise some real eyebrows
23 when people realize this waste is coming through.
24 And we are doing everything we can to notify people
25 of its passing. Once the press gets a hold of it,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 people are going to wonder why nobody is telling
2 them about this. Why haven't they heard about it?
3 Why isn't the NRC, which has a regional office right
4 here in ---

5 (Telephone connection interrupted)

6 MS. SNYDER: And so I hope the NRC
7 reconsiders how it's approaching the topic. Thank
8 you.

9 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your
10 comments. Operator, could you please call up the
11 next line?

12 THE OPERATOR: Yes, our next comment
13 comes from Ace Hoffman. Your line is open.

14 MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you, can you hear
15 me?

16 MR. KORSAK: Yes, we can hear you. Go
17 ahead.

18 MR. HOFFMAN: Okay, I'd like to add some
19 comments to --- somebody mentioned the danger of
20 drone attacks on --- these are particularly a danger
21 during transport, and especially the idea that there
22 would be a multitude --- not just one or two, but a
23 multitude of drones attacking at the same time.
24 That's what we have to look forward to. And you
25 need to make sure that some defense against that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 possibility is included in your plans. Thank you.
2 That's all I wanted to say.

3 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your
4 comments. Operator, could you please call up the
5 next person?

6 THE OPERATOR: Yes, our next comment
7 comes from John LaForge. Your line is open.

8 MR. JOHN LaFORGE: Thank you. I forgot
9 to mention that I'm with Nukewatch Wisconsin, N-U-K-
10 E-W-A-T-C-H, comments about two speakers earlier.
11 Just a few moments ago a health physicist repeated
12 it several times, that these are very low doses that
13 are being proposed to be given to the general public
14 near these trucks as they're transporting things
15 around the country -- doses given to people without
16 their knowledge or consent.

17 The question of the danger of low dose
18 exposure needs to be addressed in your environmental
19 impact statement. There is a long-standing
20 controversy over the relative risks, low doses given
21 over long periods of time and --- for the health
22 physicist to give the impression that low doses are
23 inconsequential is dishonest, corrupt and doesn't do
24 a good service to anybody on this conference tonight
25 because we know that exposure to radiation is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 cumulative. In the human body, its effects are
2 irreversible and that the consequences are health,
3 problem, cancers, birth abnormality and other
4 disease.

5 Before that comment I believe there was
6 a speaker from one of the companies involved here,
7 talked about how radiation monitoring will be
8 conducted at the fence line by the company, and that
9 data collected at those monitoring sites will be
10 published annually in the annual report. This is
11 wholly inadequate. I hope the NRC will agree. And
12 that real-time public data collection, monitoring
13 and availability of this data to the public has to
14 be made available because of spikes that happen ---
15 radiation emission spikes that could occur in the
16 event of a broken cask or an accident at the site.

17 This happens frequently at nuclear power
18 plants where, during refueling outages, the top of
19 the pressure vessel is removed and there's a big
20 spike in emissions. But in the annual report, those
21 emissions are averaged over the course of the year
22 to give the impression that overall it's ---
23 emissions are very low, when in fact during the
24 outages, emissions spike enormously. This is what -
25 -- this would also be the case at the fence line in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the event of accidents or emissions spiked conducted
2 by the --- or, happened upon during accidents at the
3 --- at the WCS sites.

4 So the fact is, I think people on this
5 call might be well aware that the nuclear industry
6 in this country and around the world is quite well
7 known for being dishonest, corrupt, for hiding
8 information, for lying in court and for hiding
9 exposures, even to their own workers, from the
10 workers themselves, and so we can't rely on the
11 company's annual report to give us any reliable
12 information about emissions.

13 This data has to be available to the
14 public in real time especially during accidents.
15 And again, please take into consideration the long-
16 standing controversy over the relative risks of
17 exposure to low dosing, and come to some conclusion
18 about these risks.

19 With the health effects in mind, at
20 least in regards to women and children whose bodies
21 are affected much more severely by a given dose than
22 those of men. Thank you.

23 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your comment.
24 We have time for one more comment. Operator, could
25 you please call up the next person?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 THE OPERATOR: Yes, our final comment
2 comes from Donna Gilmore. Your line is open.

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

5 MR. KORSAK: Yes, we can hear you. Go
6 ahead.

7 MS. GILMORE: Okay, I think there was a
8 Mr. Ford that talked earlier about the Blue Ribbon
9 Commission. I think it's important to know that a
10 couple of people on that Blue Ribbon Commission had
11 some assumptions that were incorrect.

12 Former NRC Chairman MacFarlane did not
13 know that thin wall canisters couldn't be inspected.
14 I met with her in person and once I explained it to
15 her, then she understood. But she wasn't aware of
16 this, even though she was responsible for all the
17 people that were responsible for approving those
18 systems.

19 I also met with Per Peterson who was on
20 the Blue Ribbon Commission. He assumed that once
21 the waste was in dry storage nothing could go wrong.
22 That was his assumption on the Blue Ribbon
23 Commission. Myself and Dr. Marvin Resnikoff
24 informed him that with high burnup fuel, as the NRC
25 knows, that the fuel cladding can become damaged

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 after dry storage as it cools. There was a study
2 that documented this.

3 I emailed that information to Per
4 Peterson, and he said yes, Donna you're right about
5 that. If anybody wants the email, I can send it.
6 Thank you.

7 MR. KORSAK: Thank you for your
8 comments. At this time I would like to conclude the
9 public comment section. Thank you for coming in
10 person or on the phone. The NRC is always looking
11 for ways to improve the public meeting process.

12 If you're here tonight you can pick up
13 an NRC Public Meeting Feedback Form on the way out
14 and return it to us. Or if you prefer or attended
15 virtually, you can access the form on the NRC
16 website by going to the Public Meeting Schedule,
17 clicking on the Meeting Feedback link for this
18 specific meeting.

19 You can also click on the dot-dot more
20 link for a specific meeting, and then pressing the
21 Meeting Feedback link on the Meeting Details page.
22 With that, I will turn the meeting back over to
23 Brian Smith, for some closing remarks.

24 MR. SMITH: Thank you. I'd like to
25 thank everyone for all the comments we received

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 tonight. Very numerous comments, well thought out
2 and passionate at times. We really appreciate
3 those. As I said earlier, we will take each and
4 every comment we received into consideration. And
5 address them specifically as we need to in the EIS.

6 The comment period is open until April
7 28th, so if you do have additional comments, there
8 are ways to submit those to us as I went through
9 earlier, via email, through the website, in writing
10 as well. So thank you once again for all your
11 comments.

12 MR. KORSAK: Thank you. And I wanted to
13 thank everybody for their participation tonight, for
14 providing their viewpoints and showing respects for
15 those with differing opinions. Thank you again,
16 have a good night.

17 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
18 went off the record at 9:57 p.m.)
19

NEAL R. GROSS

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