

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

Title:                   Public Online Webinar for the Draft  
                                  Environmental Impact Statement for the  
                                  Proposed Holtec Hi-Storm Consolidated  
                                  Interim Storage Facility

Docket Number:       72-1051

Location:               webinar

Date:                    Thursday, August 20, 2020

Work Order No.:       NRC-1030

Pages 1-88

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+++++

PUBLIC ONLINE WEBINAR FOR THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE  
PROPOSED HOLTEC HI-STORM CONSOLIDATED INTERIM STORAGE FACILITY

+++++

THURSDAY

AUGUST 20, 2020

+++++

The webinar convened via Webex, at 6:00 p.m. EDT, Chip Cameron, Facilitator,

presiding.

PRESENT:

CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator

JILL S. CAVERLY, NMSS/REFS/ERMB

THERESA V. CLARK, NMSS/REFS/ERMB

KEVIN A. COYNE, NMSS/REFS/ERMB

JOSE R. CUADRADO-CARABALLO, NMSS/DFM/STLB

STACEY F. IMBODEN, NMSS/REFS/ERMB

KELLEE L. JAMERSON, NMSS/MSST/MSEB

DAVID T. MCINTYRE, OPA

JOHN B. MCKIRGAN, NMSS/DFM/STLB

ANGEL D. MORENO, OCA

JESSIE M. QUINTERO, NMSS/REFS/ERMB

**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

6:04 p.m.

MR. CAMERON: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's virtual public meeting on the NRC draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Holtec International Company's application for an NRC license to construct and operate the spent fuel storage facility in Southeastern New Mexico.

My name is Chip Cameron and I'm going to serve as your facilitator for today's meeting. And I want to begin by giving you a brief guide to what's going to happen tonight, so that you'll know what to expect.

First of all, acronyms, we're going to try to avoid acronyms as much as possible, but there's some that you will be hearing. I just used one, NRC for Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Another one you might hear is EIS. That stands for Environmental Impact Statement. And one other one is NEPA, N-E-P-A. That stands for the National Environmental Policy Act. That's the statute that provides for the preparation of an EIS, such as the one under consideration today.

Next, I would like to emphasize the word draft, as in draft EIS. The NRC staff is here today to listen to your comments, your concerns, your recommendations on the draft EIS on the Holtec license application.

And the EIS is a key part of the NRC's evaluation of whether to grant the license to Holtec. The other key component of the NRC's evaluation is to look at public health and safety issues.

And this requirement comes from the Atomic Energy Act, and that analysis will be reflected in a Safety Evaluation Report that the NRC will prepare. And that will be out some time

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

next year.

The NRC's staff is not going to finalize the draft EIS or use it in decision-making on the license application until it evaluates all of your comments on the draft EIS.

Now, tonight, the NRC is going to be listening to your comments and going to be thinking about them. They're not going to answer any questions you might have in your comments. You can certainly put a question into your comment if you want and then, the NRC staff will carefully evaluate your comments and questions when they prepare the final EIS.

And note that one of the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act is that the NRC staff formally respond to your comments.

Now, we're in a virtual setting tonight, because of COVID-19. And so, we're taking comments by phone. Dexter is our operator and he's going to instruct you on how to sign in to speak in a few minutes.

Now, you can also sign onto Webex. On Webex, you can see the NRC presentation slides. And there's also what's called a chat box on Webex. You can alert us to any technical difficulties, such as you can't hear one of the NRC speakers, ask them to speak more loudly.

And also, you can look on Webex, we're going to put on the chat box the list of speakers, your fellow commenters out there. And so, you can see where you are in the queue.

And if you want to post a question that you might have about what the NRC's EIS process is like, put it in the chat box and we'll try to get you an answer to that tonight. And we're going to take a break at 7:30 tonight and we'll look at the chat box and see what we can answer for you.

In terms of speaking, it's first come, first served. And Dexter's going to tell you in a few minutes about how you sign up to speak.

I'm asking you to keep your comments to four minutes and if you're finishing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

up, we can stretch that out to five, but five minutes is going to be about it. We've had two previous virtual meetings and everybody was very courteous and basically kept it to four minutes or less.

If you keep going on past the five minutes, I'm going to have to, and I apologize in advance for this, I'm going to have to ask Dexter, I'll ask you to finish up, but anybody who isn't finishing up, I'm going to have to ask Dexter to mute your line and then we're going to go on to the next commenter.

Note that we're taking a transcript tonight, that's going to be publicly available.

The transcripts from the two previous meetings are on the NRC website. This transcript will be available in about two weeks.

And our court reporter is Alexis? Allegra. Allegra is our court reporter tonight. And we thank her for being on with us.

So, when Dexter introduces or puts you on, please introduce yourself. If you want to provide an affiliation, that's fine.

And note that you won't be able to get through if you're using a speakerphone.

We found this out over the last couple of meetings. So, you can't be on a speakerphone.

And if you can't get your whole presentation in tonight, note that you can send the NRC a written comment, an email, and Jill Caverly, the project manager for the EIS, is going to tell you all about this.

And even the comments you give in the short amount of time accomplishes three important objectives. It gives you an opportunity to directly address the NRC staff and we wish we could be there, as we were in 2018, to be with you in-person, but it's just impossible with this pandemic.

Secondly, your comments will give the NRC advance notice about a concern so they can start thinking about that. And just as important, or not just as importantly, but it's also

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

important for others in the community to know what people are thinking about these issues.

And, Jill, do you have a Webex slide that you can show people?

MS. CAVERLY: Yes, Kellee, could you page down, please? Page down one more. Which --

MR. CAMERON: The one that shows them about Webex? Don't you have a

--

MS. CAVERLY: Oh, no, I -- that's, if you go up -- Kellee, go up, please, one more slide, yes, right there. So, Webex is the link, and I just wanted to make sure that you're having trouble on Webex, the slides are available at these websites.

They're available at the NRC's public meeting website. If you scroll to the public meetings and you click on the agenda, there's a link for the slides.

And if you go to the Holtec web page, the NRC's Holtec CISF web page, which is listed there, you can download slides in English, Spanish, and in Dine.

So, if you're having trouble with the Webex, I would suggest going to the NRC's website and pulling down the slides from there.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Jill. And I just wanted to introduce the NRC staff who's working on this particular project, that are either here in-person in the room, Webex room, at NRC Headquarters, or they're on the phone also.

And we have Kevin Coyne with us, and he's the Deputy Director of the Rulemaking, Environmental, and Financial Support Division. That's who's responsible for preparing this Environmental Impact Statement.

And we're also going to have Theresa Clark, another Deputy Director, same division, with us.

We have Jesse Quintero. She is the acting branch chief of the Environmental

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Review and Materials Branch within the Division.

Jill Caverly, who's going to be giving you a presentation in a few minutes. Jill's the senior project manager on the Holtec draft EIS. Her co-project manager, Stacey Imboden is on the phone with us.

I mentioned before that there is a public health and safety aspect to this, and we do have the Public Health and Safety staff with us tonight.

We have John McKirgan, who is the Branch chief of the Storage and Transportation Branch.

And we also have Jose Cuadrado, who is the technical project manager. And Jose is also going to help with any Spanish translation that we need. Jose, do you want to say a few words now?

MR. CUADRADO: Sure can, Chip. Good evening, everyone, my name is Jose Cuadrado. As Chip said, I'm one of the project managers. And right now, I'm going to be reading a brief introduction and discussion in Spanish for any members of the public that wishes to do a comment today in Spanish. (Foreign language spoken.)

MR. CAMERON: All right. Thank you. Thank you very much, Jose. Let me finish with a few more introductions and then, we'll go to Kevin Coyne, the Deputy Director, for a welcome.

We have Kellee Jamerson. She is our technology, our Webex expert.

We also have Angel Moreno from the Office of Congressional Affairs here at the NRC.

And finally, we have Dave McIntyre. Dave is our public affairs officer. And for any of the journalists that are out there -- Jill, could you put up Dave's, the slide with Dave's contact information on it? Oh, there it is, good. Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Well, Kevin, let's go to you. And then, we'll turn it over to Jill. We'll go to you for a welcome to everybody out there.

MR. COYNE: Okay, thank you. I want to welcome and thank everyone for attending this webinar.

As Chip mentioned, my name is Kevin Coyne and I'm the Deputy Director for the Division of Rulemaking, Environmental, and Financial Support at the NRC. That division is the group responsible for the development of the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The draft Environmental Impact Statement is the result of the NRC staff's evaluation of the environmental impacts associated with Holtec International's proposal to construct and operate an interim storage facility.

Tonight, we are asking for your comments on that draft report. It's important to note that any comments received in this webinar forum are handled in the same manner as those comments received at an in-person meeting.

As Chip mentioned, your comments presented here tonight are recorded and transcribed. Our staff will review and analyze them and will update the final Environmental Impact Statement report as appropriate.

Comments received during this webinar will be made available in a transcript of tonight's meeting, and that will be posted on the NRC's Holtec review website shortly after this meeting.

The NRC staff in its commitment to openness in this licensing review had planned for five in-person public meetings. Unfortunately, under the current public health emergency, these meetings cannot be held as planned.

The NRC staff is adhering to the New Mexico Governor's guidelines for public gatherings and are following similar guidance from the state to its own agencies for converting

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

in-person meetings to a virtual format.

Our staff is very disappointed that we won't be able to meet with you face-to-face tonight and host open houses prior to the meetings.

However, if you have questions regarding this licensing action, you should feel free to reach out to the NRC project manager, Jill Caverly.

Again, thank you for your time this evening and I'll turn it over to Jill to present the NRC staff draft Environmental Impact Statement.

MS. CAVERLY: Okay. Thank you, Kevin. I've got a few slides to present to you tonight to talk about the project in a little bit more detail.

So, I want to thank you for joining us today. We're here to collect your comments on the NRC's draft Environmental Impact Statement. And the majority of the evening will be dedicated to that activity.

As Chip mentioned, I have a short presentation. And I'm going to begin with an overview of the application process, including the differences between the environmental review and the safety review.

Next, I'll move on to the overview of the application submitted to NRC. I'll summarize the results of the NRC staff's analysis. Then, I'll cover some of the public comments received during the scoping process. And then, finally end up with the environmental evaluation and those results.

At the end of my presentation, I'll show you how you can access the reports and make comments on the draft EIS.

So, as we go through the presentation, I'll use the term facility and proposed project interchangeably. The abbreviation CISF stands for Consolidated Interim Storage Facility. I may also interchange the applicant with Holtec, which is short for Holtec International. And

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Environmental Impact Statement will be abbreviated as EIS.

Finally, staff and NRC staff will be referring to the staff of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Next slide, please.

So, the purpose of tonight's meeting is to receive your comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS, for Consolidated Interim Storage Facility, a CISF.

NRC is requesting that you review the draft EIS document and provide comments that are pertinent to the current licensing action and the draft EIS report. You can have access to the report at the NRC's website, where it can be downloaded and read.

There's also three different ways to comment, either by email, website, or regular mail. And that information and methods will be summarized at the end of my presentation.

I also want to mention that any comments you make in this forum, as well as the three other methods I just mentioned, will be recorded and entered into the public docket for this licensing action. Next slide, please.

So, I'll just start with a little bit of the NRC's review process for a license application for a CISF. Next slide, please.

I want to clarify NRC's role. NRC is an independent regulator. The NRC determines whether it is safe to build and operate a storage facility at the proposed site in Lea County, New Mexico.

The NRC evaluates an application for a facility and determines if a license can be issued. The NRC does not promote or build nuclear facilities. The NRC doesn't own or operate nuclear facilities. Again, our mission and our regulations are designed to protect the public, workers, and the environment.

Holtec International, also known as the applicant, has proposed a location for the interim storage facility. So, in our role as regulator, staff will perform both a safety evaluation

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

and an environmental review of the application. Next slide, please.

So, if you were in attendance at our scoping meeting in 2018, this slide will look very familiar to you. It's a schematic of the NRC's licensing decision process. And it's here to show you that the NRC has concurrent reviews occurring during its evaluation process.

So, you'll see from the slide that the process of licensing is based on three foundational activities, the environmental review, the safety review, and the adjudicatory process.

The safety review results in a Safety Evaluation Report and is based on the Atomic Energy Act and regulations in the federal regulations. These regulations must be met in order for a license to be granted.

The environmental review results in an Environmental Impact Statement. And this action is taken because a license, issuing a license is considered a federal action under NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act. NEPA requires federal agencies to evaluate and disclose environmental impacts for federal actions.

You'll see that the last pillar of these three processes is an adjudication process, which can be used for disputes. Okay, next slide, please.

Okay. So -- okay, it's up. Okay. So, I just wanted to delve into the safety review just a little bit more. And this slide shows many of the areas of the safety review, which are required by the NRC to assure that the design can be constructed and operated while protecting human health.

The NRC safety staff, so here with me, Jose and John, will evaluate the design of the CISF and the characteristics of the construction to ensure that it will be built and operated safely, that it will be protected from manmade and natural hazards, and that it will protect public health and safety.

The NRC staff will evaluate the physical security practices to assure the facility

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

is protected from intrusion, theft, and sabotage.

The design of the structure at the facility is evaluated to verify its integrity and its ability to withstand accidents.

Other areas, such as financial qualifications, are reviewed to ensure it meets NRC standards before a facility can be licensed.

In addition, the staff will evaluate if the facility is capable of withstanding external hazards, which include things like extreme temperatures, floods, tornadoes, and earthquakes.

The safety evaluation determines whether a facility can be constructed and operated to protect human health. So, you could say that the safety review, in part, evaluates how the environment will impact the design and whether that design is capable of providing protection and safely storing spent fuel. Okay, next slide, please.

So, on the other hand, the parallel environmental review evaluates what the project will do to the environment. The environmental review starts with the current environmental conditions as the baseline.

And so, in the EIS, we call this the affected environment. Each of the resources you see listed in this slide will be evaluated for the impacts to the baseline. Using the baseline data, the staff will evaluate changes or impacts to each of the listed resource areas, should the facility be constructed and operate.

So, that delta, or that change to the resource is evaluated and that change is the impact to the resource, which is disclosed in the Environmental Impact Statement. Next slide, please.

So, here, we have our impact significance levels. So, to quantify the impacts, the NRC uses these definitions for significance levels of the environmental impacts, small, moderate, and large. And the scale rises based on the destabilizing influence to the resource. These

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

definitions are from NRC's guidance documents. Next slide, please.

So, let's talk a little bit more about the specific Holtec application. Next slide, please.

The proposed project is located halfway between the towns of Carlsbad and Hobbs, New Mexico. Holtec's project includes the storage facility, related buildings, and a rail line.

The portion of the rail lines is shown on the diagram on the right and is that little loop that you can see on the east side of the facility. That rail line actually continues off of this diagram to the south and then turns to the west and continues for about five miles, to tie into an existing rail line.

So, the area of the rail line that's not shown on the diagram on the right is on Bureau of Land Management controlled land. Holtec is seeking a permit from the Bureau of Land Management, or BLM.

So, BLM acted as a cooperating agency with the NRC on the development of our EIS. In addition, New Mexico Environment Department worked as a cooperating agency with NRC on surface and groundwater resources. Next slide, please.

So, on the left side of this slide is an artist's rendering of the proposed action. And the project diagram is again shown on the right.

The picture on the left and the area circled in red on the diagram on the right represent the current licensing action, which is to build Phase 1 of the spent fuel storage facility.

So, if licensed, Holtec would be granted a license to build and store 500 canisters of spent fuel. The additional support buildings, transfer facilities, and the rail line are included in the Phase 1 impact analysis.

So, Holtec, the applicant, has stated its intention to apply for amendments to the license for up to 20 phases, which is represented by all of the rectangles on the diagram. So, the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

full build-out, or all 20 phases, would cover about 330 acres.

And NRC would perform a safety and environmental review on any additional amendment requests. Okay, next slide, please.

So, as mentioned, the proposed project is an in-ground, low-profile design. And so, on the left, you can see the artist's rendering. And on the right is a photograph of a similar design used for spent fuel storage, to give you some perspective.

So, this project would use the HI-STORM UMAX system for storage of spent fuel. And the HI-STORM UMAX is an acronym that stands for Holtec International Storage Module Underground Maximum Capacity System. Each one of these modules will hold one canister of spent fuel. Next slide, please.

Okay. To give you a little bit more perspective, we're again looking at the artist's rendering of Phase 1 of the proposed licensing action. This would include 500 canisters of spent fuel stored in an underground system using UMAX canisters.

So, you can see in the cutout the UMAX canister. And the canister is an engineered canister and it's designed to passively cool and store spent fuel for long periods of time. It's constructed from stainless steel and it's been certified by the NRC for storage of spent fuel at power reactor sites.

That means that the manufacturing and the design of the canister is engineered to meet NRC requirements for safety. Those include structural integrity, material integrity, and longevity.

The canisters contain the spent fuel rods and there's no liquid inside of the canister that could leak into the environment. The thickness and the internal characteristics are designed to prevent radioactive materials from escaping under normal and accident scenarios. That is achieved by using redundant welded seals and a robust structural design.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

The HI-STORE design which is being proposed in the current license application will store for a license term of 40 years. That means that the NRC is currently evaluating the design of this facility to assure that it meets those requirements.

All right. Let's move on. Next slide, please.

So, I added this slide to help clarify some of the terms in the review and throughout the project documents. And as I mentioned earlier, the proposed action is Phase 1 or 500 canisters of spent fuel.

So, as I also mentioned, the applicant has made it known its intention to request up to 19 additional phases of 500 canisters each in license amendments. And those are often referred to in the EIS as full build-out or Phases 2-20.

Although it's not part of the current license, the staff in its discretion evaluated all 20 phases of the project in its Environmental Impact Statement.

So, it's important to understand that the NRC is not licensing all 20 phases. The decision to evaluate 20 phases was made by the NRC staff to provide an additional perspective of the environmental impact.

So, finally, we can look at the stages, and the staff had to evaluate the project in stages, construction, operation, decommissioning, because each of those stages has a unique environmental impact.

So, when we were putting together the environmental impact analysis, the staff evaluated the maximum impact for combined stages of different phases of the project.

So, that's kind of complicated, but an example of that is that the staff may have evaluated the construction stage for Phase 2 in conjunction with the operation stage for Phase 1, because that represents the peak impact to a particular resource. Okay, next slide, Kellee.

Okay. Let's talk a little bit about, let's go back to some of the scoping

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

comments. Next slide, Kellee.

So, about two years ago, we held in-person meetings, which we were happy to do and we wish we could do again, and one webinar during 2018.

And at that time, we received quite a few comments between our different methods of commenting. And at the end of that process, we put together a scoping comment report that was made available to the public. Next slide, Kellee.

So, many of the comments that we received at the time had to do with issues listed on the left side, transportation, location, geology, sink holes, contamination to water resources. And those are all comments that we're evaluating for our final EIS.

Some of the comments that you'll see in our scoping summary report are called out of scope, but I want to show you on the right side that they're not really out of scope, because they're being evaluated under a safety review.

So, things like potential for floods and external hazards like earthquakes, that Jose and John, their group will be reviewing for the safety evaluation. Compatibility of the system, integrity, financial assurance, accident conditions, those are all going to be covered in the safety review. Okay, next slide, Kellee.

All right. So, we're getting to the results of the NRC's review. And we'll go down to the next one. Okay, thank you, Kellee.

Okay. So, just to talk a little bit more about some of the impact evaluations. So, the staff evaluated a 40-year licensing term. And that, with the spent fuel being removed before the decommissioning stage would begin. So, the fuel would be removed during the operational stage.

The staff's impact evaluation also characterized groundwater near this facility and it evaluated the stormwater overflow and runoff to the nearby lakes and playas. It's important

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

to note that the overflow is not contaminated to those local water bodies. Next slide, please.

So, for transportation and accidents, the staff evaluated traffic and road degradation from workers and construction vehicles during all stages and phases of the project.

Staff also evaluated the movement of the entire 20 phases of material, or 10,000 canisters, using a conservative representative route.

Radiological doses and health effects to the public and workers along the route were conservatively estimated and found to be low relative to background radiation and expected baseline cancer risk.

Impacts from transportation accidents evaluated doses to first responders, workers, and members of the public.

NRC rules require spent fuel transportation containers to withstand severe accident conditions, so an assumption of a no-release during these accidents was used by our staff in its analysis. Previous NRC technical analyses involving the spent fuel and canisters support the no-releases option.

We also looked at land use and the location of the facility, and that was evaluated by the staff. And although the location of the facility was proposed by the applicant, the staff evaluated the applicant's site selection process.

So, also, land use was evaluated within a six-mile radius of the facility. Okay, let's move on to the next one, Kellee.

The environmental justice impact evaluation evaluated the impacts on human health and the environment using well-known guidance from the Council on Environmental Quality, the Federal Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice, and NRC's guidance and policy statements.

The region of influence for the analysis included 115 block groups, which are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

geographic areas that include between 600 and 3,000 people. And those were within the ten counties that fall either completely or partially within the 50-mile radius of the proposed project area.

So, the staff identified potentially affected minority and low-income populations and then performed the relevant comparisons to the broader geographical region.

Socioeconomic impacts were also evaluated and those were based on workers, tax revenues, and resource availability for the community.

Tax revenues and economic growth from the proposed project and from additional workers in the area were evaluated for impact to things like public services, schools, housing, and just due to the increased demand and increase in population. Okay, next slide, Kellee.

So, here we are at the summary of the results. So, the next two slides is a tabulated form of the results of the EIS and you'll see that we've summarized it by the proposed action, which is, as I mentioned before, Phase 1 or 500 canisters, and separately for the additional phases or the full build-out. So, you'll see the results of our analysis here.

As you can see, most of them were small, except for there was a moderate in ecology.

And if we go down to the next slide, that's the additional resource areas there.

And again, there is a moderate in the waste management area. Okay, let's move on Kellee, one more.

Okay. So, here we are at the information resources. These are the links to the impacts, the Environmental Impact Statement. You can click on that and it'll take you right to the impact statement.

I would suggest that you start with the reader's guide, because that is a short summary, about 20 pages, and it explains the evaluation and then, the results of the staff's evaluation.

And if you really want to get into the details of the application, you can go to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

the NRC's Holtec International web page, which is the last bullet on this page. And there, you will find all of the application information, RAIs, responses to RAIs.

And that includes the safety information, the safety evaluation information, all of the background material for the environmental evaluation, and you'll find our slides, transcripts for the meetings, in Spanish, English, and in Dine, for your use.

So, I think it's a really good resource to take a look at. All right, next slide, Kellee.

And so, as I promised, I'll tell you how to comment. And so, tonight, all of your comments here will be transcribed by our court reporter and then put into a transcript that will be made available on our website within a week.

You can also go online to the federal rulemaking web page and that's regulations.gov. You should search for NRC-2018-0052, to make your comment on that docket.

You can use U.S. Mail and handwrite or type or any way you would like to send through the mail, we'll accept those. Our mail is open right now, so we can definitely get to any hard copies.

And finally, probably the easiest is to email comments to the dedicated email box, Holtec-CISFEIS@nrc.gov.

And so, the last thing I'd like to say is that, please make your comments by September 22 in any one of these ways.

And if you have any questions or would like to discuss this project, feel free to reach out to me, Jill Caverly, that's J-I-L-L dot C-A-V, as in Victor, E-R-L-Y at nrc.gov. And I will be happy to arrange a time to call you or I'll answer your emails, just drop me a line, I'd be happy to talk to you about the project.

Okay, I think that's it. Kellee, last slide. All right. I'm going to turn this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

back to Chip now.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much, Jill.

And, Dexter, before we go to the open roster, there's a couple people that tried to get on to comment from our past meetings, but weren't able to. And we just thought we'd see if we could move them to the head of the line. So, I'm going to ask you if you see a Cal McManis, a Carol Merrill, on the list of people signed up to speak?

OPERATOR: Okay. I can do that.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, great.

OPERATOR: Would you like me to do the introduction now?

MR. CAMERON: Sure. Yes.

OPERATOR: Thank you. If you'd like to make a public comment, please press Star 1 and clearly state your name for public comment introduction. To retract your public comment, please press Star 2.

Again, to make a public comment, please press Star 1 and clearly state your name for public comment. To retract your public comment, please press Star 2.

One moment while we await public comments. Thank you. Our first comment.

MR. GILBERT: Petuuche Gilbert, Laguna-Acoma Coalition for a Safe Environment.

OPERATOR: Your line is open.

MR. GILBERT: Thank you. Can you hear me? Can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can. Yes. Go ahead.

MR. GILBERT: Because I heard you say something about an inability to use a speaker. Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

My name is Petuuche Gilbert and I'm from Acoma Pueblo here in New Mexico.

And I'm the vice president for the Laguna-Acoma Coalition for a Safe Environment, a small NGO in our community.

Our two pueblos are one of the 19 pueblos here in New Mexico and some of our pueblos are affected, will be affected directly because of a transportation corridor that crosses our lands. There's 12 miles of a railroad that crosses through Acoma lands.

And we have lived here for over a thousand years and this corridor where there's a small stream coming through our lands and our homelands are through this valley. And our communities along the way will be affected if there's any kind of accident.

And I remember when we commented on the containers sending nuclear waste to Carlsbad, that we commented through the same kind of instances if an accident should occur about possible damage to a small stream that traverses our land. If there's going to be any evacuation of our people, that our villages and over 3,000 to 4,000 people would be affected.

So we are very concerned. And, of course, we strenuously oppose this nuclear waste storage in southern New Mexico because of the possible transportation of nuclear waste through the northern part of our land.

Acoma is one of the 19 pueblos in New Mexico and they are under a consortium on the Pueblo Council of Governors. This group has passed a regulation directly opposing the transportation of nuclear waste through their lands.

So, not only do I oppose it, but you have our tribal peoples and the governments that are actively resisting this transportation and nuclear waste storage here in New Mexico.

And I myself have looked more closely at the EIS and will comment to a small portion of it.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

We believe that the analysis really needs to go beyond the 40-year possibility of storing the waste there, because as we all know, the nuclear waste and the radioactivity extends way beyond the limited time frame there. So, it generally really needs to go for hundreds and thousands of years, needs to be analyzed in that regard.

We also believe that the 50-mile radius of evaluation for the current facility there needs to be much greater than that, because, again, the transportation, especially the transportation corridors, are national. And that, therefore, you have the possibility of accidents that could occur along the transportation corridors.

And we would just say, furthermore, the railroad that crosses our land was constructed during the last century, in 1880. So, the same corridor is still in place.

You would think that some maintenance and reconstruction has occurred, but it seems to me that some of those bridges and overpasses are still the same. So, I think we would be very concerned about heavy loads that will cross all bridges or other crossings over the stream or over the highways and really need to be evaluated.

And in our review of the EIS, just a few, and I won't go through all of what we actually reviewed, or I actually reviewed, but my review was of Chapter 5, the cumulative impacts. So, I'll just read a few of those, because we will submit written comment.

The first one is that the cumulative impact analysis is limited, again, as I mentioned, only to a 50-mile radius, and it really needs to be more, because the nuclear waste storage not only affects the onsite environment, but affects the transportation corridors throughout that whole area there.

Secondly --

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Gilbert?

MR. GILBERT: Yes?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Gilbert, I'm going to have to ask you to sum up for us, please. Thank you.

MR. GILBERT: Okay. I'm only going to read one more, then I want to make an ending statement. The present and future events of transportation accidents involving the nuclear waste has to be seriously evaluated.

And finally, I just want to comment about the inefficiency of holding these digital hearings. As you know, a face-to-face meeting, that's been said that that was going to be performed in New Mexico.

And yet, I'm hearing today that there may not be any. So, we definitely protest that. And not only that, but we think that national hearings need to be held. So, thank you for hearing me out.

OPERATOR: Our next public comment comes from Leona Morgan, Nuclear Issues Study Group.

MS. MORGAN: Okay. Can you hear me? Can you hear me?

OPERATOR: We can hear you, Leona.

MS. MORGAN: Okay. I am making this statement on behalf of the Nuclear Issues Study Group, which Cal McManis was a part of and was patiently waiting for their name to be called on the last webinar and was never called.

We are opposed to the project as a whole and we recommend that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission reject the license application.

More importantly, today, I would like to just make a statement that we oppose this process that the NRC has announced only ten days ago. Our congressional delegation has already spoken on behalf of all New Mexicans that the entire licensing process should be paused until the threat of COVID-19 has passed.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Cal McManis is just one of five individuals I know personally who was not allowed to make their public comment on the last webinar. We have no idea how many people nationally have been robbed of their right to make a public comment regarding Holtec's application for a CISF.

There is no substitution for in-person public hearings. Right now, I am calling from the Navajo Nation and the internet reception here is quite slow. I'm lucky that I have internet and that I have a computer, as many New Mexicans do not own personal computers and many do not have internet in their homes.

In addition, in order to make our comments, we have to have both the internet slides to review, as well as time to look at the draft Environmental Impact Statement, but on today's call, we also have to have a phone line that we can call in on. However, in New Mexico, there are many parts of the state that don't even have adequate cell phone reception.

Our state has documented, in the last census, that there is a large population of individuals living in New Mexico without internet or phone access.

For these reasons, our organization is boycotting the remaining webinars. This entire process is a sham. It violates our rights to participate fully, without in-person public hearings.

Our organization has already called on a halt to these webinars as a replacement for in-person meetings. There is no reason to rush this process, except to line the pockets of for-profit corporations and their shareholders.

We the people of New Mexico need ample time to gather and to make our public comments known to you, the Commissioners, and the staff of the NRC, who we cannot even verify are sitting before us today.

We cannot see a single human being in the room. We heard some

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

presentations earlier, but it's impossible for us to know who is really hearing our comments. We see this as a violation of our rights to submit public comments according to the National Environmental Policy Act, and it's also a violation of environmental justice.

Our organization will not be participating in this process, as it robs our rights as citizens of this country to oppose this project and speak face-to-face with you all, who are, as it was put in a previous slide, that you're not supporting the company's proposal, but we see it as the opposite.

We see the NRC, by conducting these webinars, as promoting Holtec's CISF. If you were truly not in support of this and were truly unbiased in this application, you would stop this entire process and wait until we can have proper in-person gatherings and sit face-to-face after the threat of COVID-19 has passed.

We call on you all to pause the process and extend the public comment period until no sooner than six months after a proven vaccine is available for the public.

These are my comments on behalf of myself, Leona Morgan, as well as the Nuclear Issues Study Group and all the voices who you will not be able to hear for lack of internet and phone accessibility. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much, Leona. And it will be unfortunate not to hear from you again, but I think that we understand what your position is. So, thank you very much. And, Dexter, could we go to the next person, please?

OPERATOR: Our next public comment comes from John LaForge. John, your line is open.

MR. LAFORGE: Thank you. Are you able to hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can hear you, John.

MR. LAFORGE: My name is John LaForge. I have worked on the staff of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Nukewatch for 28 years, here in Northern Wisconsin.

I'm making these comments, similar state of mind as Leona has, under protest, because obviously we can't verify independently that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's decision-makers are receiving these comments or will.

I believe that to be lawful, these hearings must be conducted in-person at site locations in New Mexico, as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission earlier promised.

Furthermore, they must extend, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission must extend, as Leona recommended or demanded, the comment period until after the public health emergency has ended and after it's safe to have mass gatherings again.

And the NRC must include New Mexico's congressional delegation or its staff members, so they can verify the validity of the hearing's format and the written transcript of it, the summations.

There is no compelling reason at this time for these meetings to be rushed as they are during the pandemic. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission itself says that waste, high level waste, currently stored at the reactor sites can be stored there for 120 years.

There are no contracts between the waste generators and the railroad companies that the Holtec firm must honor and under which it would be pressured to press ahead with these hearings.

I oppose this plan, as do the governors of New Mexico and the governors of 20 tribal nations, as well as the large majority of people in New Mexico.

With these online meetings, it's apparent to me that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has no interest in understanding the public's concerns.

Every state in the nation has clearly said no to hosting a storage site such as is being considered by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission here. The people of New Mexico have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

said no.

In the presentations made just before the public was invited to speak here today, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission presenters said that the environmental review and the safety review that is conducted, both address the hazards from transportation.

The environmental review, as listed in one of the slides we were shown, includes transportation as something that was reviewed. And yet, when it came to its analysis of the impacts of severe accidents during transportation, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission assumed that there would be no releases of radioactivity.

This is alarming and it's preposterous. And I understand that I don't have a lot of power in this equation, but I would recommend that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission address this question and hold public hearings in each and every one of the over 40 states through which this high level radioactive waste would travel in route to Holtec's site, if and when its approved license is allowed to operate.

Thank you very much for the opportunity here. That's all I have to contribute.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you for those comments, John. And, Dexter, could we have the next speaker, please?

OPERATOR: Thank you. If you'd like to make a public comment, please press Star 1 and clearly state your name for public comment introduction. To retract your public comment, please press Star 2.

Again, to make a public comment, please press Star 1 and clearly state your name for public comment introduction.

Our next public comment comes from Diane D'Arrigo. Your line is open.

MS. D'ARRIGO: Thank you. This is Diane D'Arrigo, I'm with Nuclear

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Information and Resource Service.

I also am commenting under protest. I was one of -- my organization, Nuclear Information and Resource Service, was one of over 80 organizations that asked the NRC Commissioners to suspend all of their processes that involve the public during the COVID crisis, to hold off until that has cleared through and then six months, and then proceed.

As was mentioned by a previous caller, our organization is opposed to the project. But regardless of that, we need to participate in the process, because it is the only avenue available to us.

We do support their boycott. We speak today under protest and point out that it's not just 82 public interest groups that come to the NRC, asking for the -- that requested to the NRC Commissioners an extension of comment periods and interventions until six months after the end of the COVID-19 crisis, but chairs of 14 U.S. House of Representatives committees and over 20 U.S. Senators wrote to the Office of Management and Budget back in April, asking a similar request that all rulemaking, not just NRC, but all agencies, that they back off until after the COVID crisis and then some more time for people to readjust.

I don't know what the people who are pushing this rulemaking through, what their lives are like, whether they've got some kind of ability to avoid the dangers that the rest of us have to face every day when we go to work and when we try to avoid the COVID crisis ourselves, but it's a lot to ask for people to take on during this time.

So, we repeat that request and protest that NRC is trying to get away with four glorified conference calls to replace public meetings committed to New Mexicans, five of them.

And then, we've also been asking, for over a year, for years, and certainly in every public comment period that there's been throughout the process, safety and environmental, that public meetings or hearings be held along the transport routes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

It was stated earlier, I believe Jill said that the canisters are, the transport casks are robust and, I don't know her exact words, but tested for challenging road conditions, transport conditions.

And the reality is that they are not. No canister on the road today has ever been tested. No canister has ever -- no canister type, there was one set of destructive tests that were done back in the '60s or '70s at Sandia, and those same old films are shown over and over again and try to claim that, oh, look how sturdy these containers are, when all those were tests way back on previous canisters that are no longer even in use.

So, the current requirement for canisters fall far below the real world conditions. They are supposed to be designed to withstand a 30-foot drop, but the routes that they travel could result in droppage of the canisters over a much higher bridge or into a body of water. So, the 30-foot drop is inadequate.

And that's just the design. They're supposed to withstand submersion in water for a few feet of water for a few hours, at most. It might even be a half hour. There's no way that these massive containers are going to be located and pulled out of the water before that time would lapse.

So, the crash tests, the equivalent of the crash criteria is for a 30-mile-an-hour crash, perhaps 60 miles. The containers are going to be moving much more quickly than 30 miles an hour on the roads and rails and over much deeper water and over higher bridges and overpasses.

So, the criteria that the canisters are designed to meet are inadequate to begin with. So, it's a misleading statement to say that they're sturdy and they're built to withstand whatever they would encounter.

If you look at the history just in Western Texas and Southeast New Mexico, and people from that area can report even more firsthand, but there are regularly massive accidents

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

and fires and crashes and derailments. It happens routinely.

And the amount of radioactivity in each of these containers is enormous. More cesium than released from Chernobyl, more plutonium than released from Hiroshima. No, it's not supposed to explode, but we don't know what's going to happen in a certain situation.

If it's fire, like the Baltimore fire that lasted far longer than 30 minutes. The fire test, I didn't mention that, 1475 degrees, it's supposed to withstand for 90 minutes. That fire lasted much longer than 90 minutes. And in fact, when the cask tests were done at Sandia, the o-ring melted at the 91st minute. So, the containers are not adequate.

And we deserve, we deserve, along the routes, to have this discussed. If the NRC is so confident about it, then come to our communities, come to Chicago, come to Cleveland, come to Detroit, come to St. Louis, come to all the major cities through which this will travel and discuss it and share the information and hear what people have to say.

We're the ones that have to suffer it, we're the ones that are going to suffer the consequences. Our insurance does not cover it, it's expressly exempted from our insurance policies for homeowners, car insurance, express exemptions for nuclear accidents and natural disasters from nuclear.

So, our opposition continues. As we've mentioned before, we support the boycott by the people in New Mexico. We encourage the NRC to reconsider its decisions that it's made to not hold -- well, I don't know if it's a final decision to not hold the meetings, it sure sounds like it. Hold the meetings you committed to, hold meetings along the transport routes across the country, for both this and the Texas proposed site.

Thanks for the opportunity to speak and again, it's under protest.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Diane. Thank you for those comments.

And, Dexter, could we have the next speaker please?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

THE OPERATOR: Our next public comment is Linda Lewison, Nuclear Info and Resource Services. Linda, your line is open.

MS. LEWISON: Hi, can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can.

MS. LEWISON: My name is Linda Lewison and I'm with Nuclear Info and Resource Services. Watchdog on the nuclear industry in Illinois for close to 40 years and the Sierra Club Nuclear Free Campaign.

I want to mention three process issues and a content issue. We certainly support the comments that were made previously by Diane and Leona. We don't support this project and we contest the process.

Whether we meet in person or like this, it is an outrage to limit the public to this four minute rule. If you have to stay all night to listen to us, this is much too important to put in this limited time frame.

And it is an insult to the seriousness of what we are considering here. There are so many lives that are at risk given with whatever the outcome of these discussions will be.

So, we protest the process and we are also concerned about the party that we're dealing with, the Applicant itself. They have been under investigation for various criminal activities in the past and we are dealing with a compromised party.

So that raises questions and compromises the process to begin with. And we have to ask ourselves, what is the environmental impact of doing business in the first place with such an applicant. It puts the public and the environment at risk because we have a lack of trust we are dealing with.

Now, in terms of content issues I want to make two points. The nuclear waste technical review board recommendations of 2018 have, did not make any comments on the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

possibility for short-term and long-term storage being a reality.

They have said, there is no technology of present to make geological repositories work, short-term or long-term. Even for 20 years.

These canisters cannot be inspected, repaired or monitored. I want to quote the Holtec president Dr. Kris Singh, who said at a public meeting, "it is not practical to repair a canister if it were damaged. You will have, in the face, millions of curies of radioactivity coming out of a canister. We think it's not a path forward."

So doctor is saying himself, has raised the problems that we are discussing tonight. We oppose this project for this and many other reasons. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much, Linda.

Christine, I think you're sitting in for Dexter now, and if you could put our next speaker on please?

THE OPERATOR: Thank you. Once again, if you would like to queue up for public comment Press \*1 and record your first and last name.

The next speaker is Ed Hughes. Your line is open.

MR. HUGHES: Hello, can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can, Ed.

MR. HUGHES: Can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can.

MR. HUGHES: All right, thank you. The comments I have to make are this.

First of all, I support Petuuche and Gilbert and Leona Morgan and others that have commented about the inappropriateness of this hearing. Of this webinar.

The COVID thing is going to be transitory, it will be over next month or months

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

from now. So what we're dealing with, as far as Holtec and the proposal, is for, as far as we're concerned, you know, it's forever.

And so, I think it is absolutely immoral not to have face-to-face meetings. The earlier presentations of the slides, here earlier at your presentation it said that due to the governor's rules you, NRC, was going to follow the governor's wishes and not to have these face-to-face meetings.

Well, if the governor is that influential here, the governor wrote a very strong letter to President Trump quite recently saying that she is in opposition to Holtec and what is being proposed. So why don't we follow that as well and drop this project.

I think that we are not being honest in what's going on here. Now, as far as the environmental impact statement itself, you have evaluated it for 40 years, but the rules of the NRC as a permit can extend it to 140.

And in last year, the Secretary of Energy, Department of Energy, Rick Perry, admitted under oath to Congress that Holtec and the DEIS can easily become defacto permanent locations to the most dangerous radioactive waste on the planet.

Have you in fact, as part of this DEIS, evaluated the potential of that happening, being constructed far below the Yucca Mountain standards, which was closed. What happens not only after 40 years but after 60 years or 80 years. Which is quite likely going to happen.

So I think it is disingenuous to think, as an engineer, I've had over 40 years' experience as a professional engineer, I'm not a nuclear engineer by any means, but to say on any engineering design that there will be no accidents or no failures is, at the least, naive. And at the max is arrogant and very disingenuous.

Failures will happen. Think kitty litter at WIPP, think Three Mile Island, think

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Fukushima, Chernobyl, and on and on. And if you look at the design of these canisters, Chernobyl's in a can, these lemons as they've been called, they're designed you can't inspect them once they're sealed, you can't repair them.

There's a half inch of stainless steel protected by another two feet of concrete.

And these canisters themselves, by the Holtec application, are guaranteed for only 25 years. By their statement.

Have you in fact, as part of your environmental impact statement and the design of this utility, taken into account that something is going to have to happen after 25 years if there is failure or less. Has that been looked at?

And I think I can go on and on. But I think this process, as been stated, it needs to be halted. I think you should show the respect for New Mexicans. And I'm a native New Mexican, third generation, as many of the speakers are as well.

I love this state, so does my wife and our family. But if this comes here, we're talking about forever. We're talking about bringing the amount of waste, Yucca Mountain was being permitted for 70,000 metric tons. We're talking about the permit here of 173,000 metric tons to max out.

And to not allow face-to-face meetings with New Mexicans and those along the transportation route I believe is immoral. This is, and so I think there are many, many issues with this, including the New Mexico environmental departments' different takes on the water evaluation that was done and on and on and on.

And I want to conclude here. And I would like to ask the respect, Mr. Cameron and I have met before on the borehole when the DOE tried to put highly radioactive waste three miles deep, about two miles from our southwest ranch fence.

And I know that in fact I don't want to deal with that kind of issue. Because

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

what happened there is, the immediate thing that happened was our real estate values plummeted.

And so if you think that bringing this waste to southeast New Mexico, on Eddy and Lea County, their Ag production alone is \$290 million a year. And we're talking about income to the state, maybe, from this and \$5 million a year.

Why? Why would we be willing to risk that, particularly when every state in the union that has this wants to get rid of it. Why would we take it? That concludes my remarks, thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Ed. And I do remember you and your wife from the borehole experience too, but thank you for those comments.

And, Christine, who do we have next?

THE OPERATOR: The next speaker is David McCoy. Your line is open.

MR. MCCOY: Hello. My name is Dave McCoy, I'm executive director for Citizen Action New Mexico.

Let's be clear about what the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is planning for New Mexico. NRC's accelerated virtual meetings and the knee-jerk approval of an environmental impact statement minimizes and fails to address the most significant issues in the public mind.

The environmental statement is NRC's approval of nuclear reactor waste disposal that signifies the control of bureaucracy over a minority population.

Other than the demands of the greedy developer subgroup, the people of New Mexico, and their representatives, have been clear. We reject the NRC's temporary storage plan that will become permanent disposal without adequate canisters for transport, removal without onsite radiation monitoring and no financial assurance for long-term maintenance.

New Mexicans are fed up with keeping the business of eastern nuclear utilities operating along with the developing of more weapons of mass destruction. The public does not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

want a quick fix to the disposal of nuclear waste.

Approval of the DEIS would be an NRC violation of the 1982 Waste Policy Act that requires a onetime geological disposal of high level spent nuclear reactor fuel. We're not talking about a continuation of the shell game that the nuclear industry and the nuclear regulatory has played for the last 50 years.

Despite reports with the corporations involved, behave in illegal schemes of bribery, political manipulation and encourage agency deceit, the NRC continues to approve this plan that would have dire consequences for New Mexico.

The DEIS and comment periods have become a pro-form of fraud on the public because the approval of the DEIS and the decision for licensing approval is already a done deal with the NRC.

All the talk about face-to-face meetings and more virtual meetings are really meaningless because NRC has already decided, basically, that it intends to go forward with this project despite what all the opposition that the public wants.

Now, when the criminal organization, known as the Trump Group, gets out of power, hopefully, NRC is going to have to take another path for this problem. So you might as well postpone this entire proceeding.

Now, an example of the instability of the corporate ability to manage radioactive waste. As an example, waste control specialists recently said it needed a \$367 million merger with Energy Solutions for its long-term viability. Well, a judge shot that down.

But it just indicates that we're basically at the mercy of large corporations that see a buck to be made in handling radioactive waste. And it is not respectful of the needs of the public for health and safety.

Again, I reiterate, the 1982 Waste Policy Act is being violated here. That

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

concludes my comments, thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Dave.

And, Christine, who do we have next?

THE OPERATOR: The next speaker is Bill Addington. Your line is open.

MR. ADDINGTON: Hello, can you hear me? I'll take you off speaker.

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can hear you.

MR. ADDINGTON: If the sound is off I can take you off speaker.

MR. CAMERON: No, it sounds okay I think.

MR. ADDINGTON: Okay. Yes, again, my name is Bill Addington. I co-founded an organization here in Sierra Blanco in 1991. The Sierra Blanco Legal Defense Fund. Which we are now starting it up again because of different threats.

You talk about spent fuel, these are my quick comments. You talk about spent fuel.

I learned long ago that there is nothing spent about spent fuel, it's highly irradiated fuel so I think that's a term that needs to go away because it gives the impression that it is not dangerous, it's spent.

It's only too dangerous to be used by workers. As you know, it could boil water for many, many thousands of years, probably.

Temporary storage, which the Applicant is applying for, Holtec I understand. I don't understand why that's even happening.

Congress passed a law, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, requiring no storage of radioactive waste in any temporary or other form without a permanent storage facility license by the NRC. So I don't even understand why this application is being considered.

I know Ted Cruz has a bill that would change that, but it has not been passed.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

The people, also most directly affected by this project I don't believe had been consulted or even apprised. And most of them don't even know what's happening. This is not only in the counties where it's happening but surrounding counties.

I know none of my fellow residents in Hudspeth County, which is three million acres, the third largest county in Texas, know about it. None. Yet we have two rail lines going through here which are transportation.

If this storage facility is safe, I kept hearing staff talk about safety and how the application is perceived to be safe, the canisters and the storage facilities, dry cask and all this, if it's safe enough in the desert thousands or hundreds of miles from the site of generation, these storage casks are safe at the site of the reactors themselves where it's generated.

I see a direct loss of property values. We did extensive studies for the Sierra Blanco radioactive waste dump from 1991 to 1998 showing, because of fear and stigma, whether perceived or real, had very real loss of property values of any one owning property in the area of disposal or even transportation.

Environmental justice, I think that you all have kind of cursed, from what I'm seeing, it's just being glossed over. I don't see any environmental justice.

This meeting, for example, most people can't access it. Nor do the people that only speak Spanish, how can they even understand.

I just think that I agree with the other commenters, in closing, that you need to have real meetings. You need to advertise them and do it the right way. Instead of doing this as an excuse that we can't do it because of COVID, we're just going to have some online meetings, which have only a few people commenting.

So, this will probably be the last meeting I participate in because I can't even see, like others, who I'm talking to. Thank you very much.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Joe, for those comments.

And --

MR. ADDINGTON: My name is Bill, not Joe.

MR. CAMERON: Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you, Bill.

MR. ADDINGTON: My name is Bill Addington from Sierra Blanco Texas.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, Bill Addington from Sierra Blanco Texas, thank you, Bill.

MR. ADDINGTON: You're welcome.

MR. CAMERON: Christine, who is next?

THE OPERATOR: The next speaker is Kevin Kamps. Your line is open.

MR. KAMPS: Hello, can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can, Kevin.

MR. KAMPS: Thank you. My name is Kevin Kamps with Beyond Nuclear and Don't Waste Michigan and I've got a series of comments to make.

The first one is an article by CNN that I'm looking at entitled, Arizona train derailment and fire described as a scene from hell. And the first line is, one person was treated for smoke inhalation after a Union Pacific train derailed and caught fire on a bridge over Tempe Town Lake in Arizona, officials said Wednesday.

This is dated July 29th, 2020. So after the last one of these public comment meetings.

And the question that we often ask when we see headlines like this is, what if high level radioactive waste had been on board.

And Diane D'Arrigo said earlier that the design criteria for these waste transportation containers is woefully inadequate. It is a 30 minute fire that burns at 1,475 degrees

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Fahrenheit. And so, this particular accident and countless others burn at hotter temperatures for longer periods of time.

This one rose the specter of a combination of a crash, a fire and a water submersion. So these containers could be exposed to multiple forces that could break them open and release their contents. And it would only take a small fraction of the contents to cause a radiological catastrophe.

So, this is an example that we raised at the licensing hearing from Albuquerque in January of 2019. And that was also mentioned earlier by a commenter.

And that was the Baltimore train caught fire beneath downtown Baltimore, the Howard Street tunnel, in July of 2001. Which burned for 24 hours, not 30 minutes, at a temperature of around 1,500 degrees Fahrenheit. So hotter than the design criteria.

And Dr. Marvin Resnikoff of Radioactive Waste management associates did a study commissioned by the State of Nevada asking the question, what if a Holtec container had been in that fire. And Dr. Resnikoff determined that the container would have breached, would have released a fraction of its contents, but that's all it takes, and that's when the casualties start to mount.

So, inevitably, scores of latent cancer fatalities would have resulted. Even if an evacuation was carried out, they would have been exposed in the initial minutes, hours.

Then, if people continued to live in contaminated areas in downtown Baltimore, the casualties would increase something like 1,500 latent cancer fatalities after just a year's exposure. And then after a lifetime of exposure, 50 years' time period, we're talking now over 30,000 latent cancer fatalities from this hypothetical accident scenario.

And the only way to avoid those long-term exposures from contamination in the City of Baltimore, would have been a \$13.9 billion cleanup. Which has been adjusted for inflation 20 years later. So it's a much larger figure these days.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

So we do not agree that these containers, in a severe accident, would not release their hazardous contents. So that assumption by the NRC is not tenable, it is a baseless assumption and should be changed.

I would like to point out on the introductory Slide Number 10, that the NRC presented, that there is more to the adjudicatory process than is presented there. And that includes federal court appeals.

And in fact, as we speak, Beyond Nuclear, as well as a coalition called Don't Waste Michigan and others, which is seven groups, including NISG, which had Leona Morgan speak tonight, and also Sierra Club, which is the oldest and biggest environmental group in the country, are all appealing the NRC's final determinations on this Holtec licensing to the second highest court in the land. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

So that is an ongoing process and we are confident, as has been mentioned, that with the violation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, that we will prevail in that court appeal.

So, another issue that I've heard raised was security at the site. And I just wanted to point out that four security guards per shift, guarding what could turn out to be 173,000 metric tons of irradiated nuclear fuel is likely inadequate. Attackers could easily overwhelm such a guard force and have their way with that site for an extended period of time before reinforcements could come in.

I wanted to second the mention of the U.S. Senators Udall and Heinrich letter to NRC Chairman Svinicki that was sent two days ago. What has happened is the NRC has broken its promise to the State of New Mexico.

Five in-person public comment meetings were promised. That has been reneged upon, and that should not be. There is no excuse to take advantage of a national pandemic

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

emergency to ram through this public process.

And I'll just point out that dating back to March 25th, that's when a coalition of 50 groups, anti-nuclear environment, environmental justice, special justice, public interests, joined together, wrote the NRC urging a suspension of the deadline until after the pandemic emergency had passed. And then to have a 199 day public comment period.

And the reason for the choice of that is, that is what we got from the U.S. Department of Energy on the Yucca Mountain draft environmental impact statement 20 years ago. And in addition to 199 days, and that clock should only start ticking once the pandemic emergency has passed, we got close to two dozen public comment meetings across the country, along transport routes.

So we had multiple public comment meetings in the State of Nevada that was targeted for the Yucca dump. And we also got a large number of public comment meetings across the country at these transportation hubs.

And in fact, in our March 25th letter to the NRC about this proceeding, the cities that we asked for in-person public comment meetings to be held in, once safe to do so, included Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas Fort Worth, Detroit, San Antonio, Kansas City, Miami, Minneapolis St. Paul, Nashville, New York/Newark, Omaha, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, San Luis Obispo, California, St. Louis, Missouri and Tampa, Florida.

And since that time we have had members of Congress, like Lloyd Doggett, a Democrat from Texas, request meetings in his congressional district.

Similar requests from Jamie Raskin, a Democrat from Maryland. Both of those congress member districts are traversed by shipment routes to the Holtec facility in New Mexico.

And I would also like to, as a preferred alternative to the Holtec Nuclear Waste

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Dump, present renewables and environmental justice as a preferred alternative.

So on July 28th, New Mexico's Governor, Michelle Lujan Grisham, wrote to President Trump, as Ed Hughes mentioned, expressing strong opposition to both of the irradiated nuclear fuel consolidated interim storage facilities. Both Holtec's in New Mexico and interim storage partners targeted right at its border in Eunice.

Then just last night, August 19th, backed by solar panels, Governor Lujan Grisham gave a speech to the Democratic National Convention embracing New Mexico's cultural identity as the majority/minority states greatest strengths.

She also championed expanding environmental protections and a renewable energy future for which "our young people are crying out." So she mentioned in that letter many other economic sectors from ranching, to agriculture, to oil and gas that would be put at risk by this Holtec proposal. And renewables has to be included in that as well, as she pointed out last night.

So that is the preferred alternative, to not just this, and to cease and desist.

And I'll just point out that the timing of this hearing tonight, this public comment meeting, is problematic in that it's a culminating night of the Democratic National Convention. And in fact, the August 25 and 26 public comment meeting scheduled are going to conflict with the Republican National Convention.

And that is a problem because this election is probably the most significant of any of our lifetimes. And perhaps, one of the most significant in all of U.S. history.

The final comment I want to make this evening had to do with an issue that Leona Morgan brought up earlier and that is the bias of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

And I'll just point back to a late 2015 spent fuel management regulatory conference held across the road from the NRC Headquarters in Rockville, Maryland, where the acting director of the spent fuel project office, Tony Hsia, I'm mispronouncing it, it's spelled, H-S-I-A, ended a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

two day industry and NRC meeting with a pep rally cry that together we can get this done. And what he was referring to was consolidated interim storage facilities.

And so, that blatant promotion of this concept is a violation of NRC's mandate, which is supposed to be tit for tat, for public health and safety and the environment, as well as the common defense. Not to set policy, not to do the bidding of companies like Holtec.

Which has been mentioned tonight, this ramming through of this proceeding by an arbitrarily short deadline with no in-person public comment meetings, is doing the bidding of this company.

And one of our members and supporters in New Mexico, on whose behalf I am making these comments, on behalf of our members and supporters in New Mexico and across the country, along with transportation routes impacted, has said that it would be just the basic courtesy that if Holtec and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, as opposed in the world's largest high level radioactive waste dump in New Mexico, that the least you could do is come to New Mexico and look us in the eye. Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Kevin for those comments.

And, Christine, we're going to go on to the next speaker I think.

THE OPERATOR: Once again, if you would like to submit a comment, please press \*1 and record your first and last name. The next speaker is Marvin Lewis. Your line is open.

MR. LEWIS: Thank you. I'm very pleased to get on here and to talk.

Look, apparently, and this has been covered before, the canister is only developed for a 30 foot drop on a six inch plank. Unhappily, here in Philadelphia, I sit on a superhighway, actually, a superhighway that goes down to I-76, you know, State 76.

My superhighway here is another one, but it's connected to I-76. And most

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

of the spent fuel will be going through this area and down I-76. Local expressway, also known as Sure-Kill Spillway.

And if you ever go on you'll see the obvious reason it's called the Sure-Kill Spillway.

But on that highway, right here in the middle of a big city, a city well over a million people, there are drops into the Schuylkill River well over 30 feet. And your canisters are only setup for 30 feet, a 30 foot drop.

Which means here at the falls, which goes over falls of course, the roadway goes over falls, you've got a drop to 90 to 30 foot. What are we going to do, evacuate northwest, northeast Philadelphia or northwest Philadelphia?

Not a pleasant idea. Not a cheap idea. Not an idea that has been looked at in the analysis, your safety FSAR, Final Safety Analysis Report. Which I don't have and hadn't even gotten yet.

What I'm trying to say is, you haven't looked at anything. You haven't looked at what the (telephonic interference) that's going on. We're having fires in California, we're having major accidents in Pennsylvania, we're having gun fights in the streets in Philadelphia. Nothing has been looked at. Nothing has been figured out.

Is this really the thing we should be sending nuclear waste into?

All of my statements can easily be checked in the newspapers of today. They're not secrets. And yet, I don't see them being looked at by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gun fights in Philly, who would ever think that in America. I'm 82 years old, now I'm hearing about gun fights in the streets. In Philly.

The containers only have a thin skin, half inch to five-eighths. A bullet can

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

go through that much stainless steel. It doesn't even have to be a special bullet.

Although believe me, we do use special bullets in Philadelphia. Or at least the gangs do.

I don't know what to say to get you to open up your eyes. I've been saying it to the NRC for well over 40 years, 50 years. Since the 70s. What is that, 50 years, 60 years, I don't know.

I hope I'm getting through this time. Thank you for that.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you again, Mr. Lewis. Christine, do we have anybody else?

THE OPERATOR: The next speaker is Janene Yazzie. Your line is open.

MS. YAZZIE: Thank you so much. You know, I feel like you've already received so many powerful comments and points of view that I don't have to take up too much time.

I do want to start with, in stating that my comment is also being made in protest and that I fully support every single comment that has already been made detailing the several blatant issues with the process, with the application, with the EIS in criteria for assessment with security issues, the conflict with repeated requests from civilians and government officials to delay this process and so forth.

There is absolutely no reason to rush this process. In fact, there is every reason not to.

Not only does this process violate the rights of indigenous people impacted along the transportation route, it violates the basic rights of every impacted person to be informed and given appropriate opportunity to submit their positions on the proposed licensing.

I have been dealing with the impacts of COVID-19 on the Navajo nation. So where I would have otherwise been able to stay on top of these times of proceedings and where I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

would have otherwise fully reviewed the EIS document, I've had my hands full responding to the public health crisis already ravaging our reservations and rural communities.

A public health crisis that has been magnified by the prevalence of preexisting conditions resulting from generations of uranium contamination already present in our communities, along with proposed transportation routes.

These are communities still trying to deal with the impacts of the trinity tests, as well as the mining, the legacy of mining, the abandoned waste ponds and everything that comes along with this industry.

Communities dealing with contamination we still do not have the technology to cleanup. Contamination that is so great children are being born with uranium in their body.

How have these cumulative impact studies reflected these realities? I can give you a simple answer, it has not.

As was said before, the NRC mandates to protect public health and environment and you are failing at that. And if these so-called public hearings continue to be held, you are outright violating the rights of the very people you're meant to protect.

It is ridiculous that I have to have internet and phone service in order to participate in this call when we are dealing with an issue with over 30, in some communities, 50 to 75 percent of the population don't have access to either.

I truly hope you are listening and recording and documenting these comments because if you are, you would do the right thing and you would postpone this entire process until at least six months after a vaccine is widely distributed and accessible in order to keep our public safe and allow them their right to participate in these public hearings, as should have been done and committed to from the onset. That is all I have to say.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Janene.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Christine, who is next?

MR. CAMERON: The next speaker is Michael Keegan. Your line is open.

MR. KEEGAN: Thank you. Michael Keegan with Don't Waste Michigan.

Can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can, Michael.

MR. KEEGAN: Thank you. Now, the NRC and the proponents, Holtec International, have rigged this from the get-go at every juncture.

I am frankly flabbergasted by the fact that one quarter of the environmental report, which would be one quarter of the DEIS, has been withheld from the public. So there is things that we can't even see, can't even know about.

So I want to reflect back to the Atomic Safety Licensing Board proceeding where they terminated the record, the proceedings, very much prematurely. Holtec International has yet to put the final safety analysis report into the public record.

The NRC has not put one in. And the NRC says they will issue a final safety evaluation report March of 2021. And that the final environmental impact statement will be March of '21.

This is a railroading, absolute railroading for what. Timeout here. Due process is being denied at every juncture, at every game, every situation, every venue, the NRC is cheating, Holtec is cheating.

This is not tolerable. And I am from Michigan and I'm very much concerned about, none of this your investigation, doing an DEIS, EIS process in a hypothetical, something that is not even legal to do and there is no seriousness to it. It's a game.

You're looking to get some kind of approval for something similar that has nothing to do with moving nuclear waste. The Nuclear Waste Transportation Review Board has

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

said that the high burn-up fuel cannot move until the Year 2100.

So why are we railroading through this national pandemic, international plague, to push and approve this at this time. It does not make sense. There is something else going on here.

And you're violating due process. And you're aiding and abetting what looks to be very much like a financial scheme. I believe it is a nuclear Ponzi scheme.

And what you want to be able to do is say, oh, we've resolved it, now go ahead with your next generation and generate more and hotter and higher and more dangerous fuel than what we currently have. No, stop making it. Put the brakes on.

And we've got to have six months of comment period after COVID has been cleared. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thanks. Thanks, Michael. Christine, next speaker?

THE OPERATOR: Once again, if you would like to add to the public comment please press \*1 and record your first and last name. One moment.

MR. CAMERON: Is anybody coming on, Christine?

THE OPERATOR: At this time, sir, I'm showing no others have queued up for public comment.

MR. CAMERON: I think that means that --

THE OPERATOR: We did just have someone queue up, sir, one moment.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, good. Good.

THE OPERATOR: The next speaker is Rose Gardner. Your line is open.

MR. GARDNER: Well, hello, everybody. I'd like to say good evening. I'd like to also add that I am Rose Gardner from Eunice, New Mexico. I live about 35 miles from where the Holtec site would be sited.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

My comments tonight are under protest. We've heard so far from people that are opposed to it, haven't heard any pros tonight. So that kind of tells me that Holtec is not getting their word out to supporters. To get online and promote their project.

So what really I want to say is that I feel that this is a long procedure. The process is not inclusive.

As has been said, you got to have a phone, you got to have internet. Fortunately, my husband is able to pay the bills and we're able to do this. I don't trust this process. I can't see you. Chip, I recognize your voice.

I just don't like it. It's not fair. And what's really hurtful is that the considerations of the communities and the people of New Mexico aren't really being considered seriously.

This project would be one of the biggest things to happen in the United States. And yet, I don't see how we're being protected.

New Mexico has been used and abused for many, many years. Due to politicians and greedy businesspeople. This (telephonic interference) alliance are greedy businesspeople.

Inclusive, yes. They are city and state employees that are pushing this thing through. And they're so glad that there is not so many people on the line tonight.

But at the same time, I have to say that I feel like I'm not being taken care of. Nobody is looking out for my community. Holtec has never come to Eunice to speak to the people in the community to tell them what they're up to.

That you're being setup Eunice. You're being setup to live next to a nuclear waste site here, ten miles from out of town, that wants to send level, high level nuclear wastes. And then Holtec down the road 35 miles.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

My goodness, I'm being disrespected. There is no reason why this project has to continue at the rate it's going. I'm not getting the public meetings that I was promised.

My congressional leaders asked for it, they were told you were going to give it to us. And here, we're not going to get it.

I'm really upset. I don't like what's going on. It's not fair, it's not right. My family and I are very upset. We're Hispanic and Black and other mix. And we're not getting the respect that we need.

Indigenous friends all over this state are not getting the respect they need. They have been through so much. When is it going to stop.

I worry about the climate change and all the issues that are not being addressed in the impacts there. I'm concerned about the thin walled canisters when in fact I could have the superior ten to 19 inch canisters. Why is this being pushed through so quickly?

I'm concerned that we are being used as an experiment. This project is an experiment. How much collective radiation can this community take?

If we can take it, then we're going to be glowing. People laugh, they say, you're going to be glowing. And they laugh at me. They laugh at Eunice because we're just sitting ducks.

Well, I'm very, very unhappy. And I agree with all the speakers ahead of me that have said all of their concerns. We need to have more respect for New Mexico.

I appreciate what the Governor has done. I appreciate what my congressional leaders have done. But this isn't working guys. We need to do better.

Respect what we have to offer in our state. We grow agriculture. We grow cattle. We produce oil and gas so that you can function, so these calls can happen. So you can get to work.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

We deserve better. And this has got to stop. This is not the answer.

I think if the Nuclear Regulatory Commission really wants to be fair they will stop and do something else. Wait until after COVID is over.

I've already been tested. I came in close contact with my priest at my church and he was very sick. And this is our little town, and we can't do much. We're not in the big city, we can't get a fast test, we have to wait weeks. Weeks. Two weeks to get a test.

Come on guys, give us a break. Stop. This is not an emergency. The waste has been sitting there, it can sit a little bit longer. You're talking about my life, the lives of my children and grandchildren here. And I refuse to just sit back and let you just run over us.

I approached Holtec and this troubled project. Every site in the nation has said no to this waste. The people of New Mexico say no and I say no. Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Rose, very heartfelt. Thank you.

And, Christine, anybody else on?

THE OPERATOR: The next comment comes from Sofia Martinez. Your line is open.

MS. MARTINEZ: Yes. My name is Sofia Martinez, I'm calling directly from Los Jardines Institute here in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

And what we want to basically, formally reject Holtec's proposal. New Mexico continues to be a colony for this country. For all that would like make the reputations in the state, and it's a dumping grounds for its country's waste. And we are opposed to, definitely opposed to Holtec.

I won't repeat any of the stuff that has already been said. We basically support the majority of the comments that's been given.

We definitely need face-to-face comments. Especially with the high level of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

waste that is being proposed to be brought to New Mexico.

The total disregard for environmental justice protections that have been basically some sort of executive order. Presidential executive. As well as a state executive order and environmental justice.

And basically violating the basic principle of meaningful participation. How can you have meaningful participation when we have something like 75 percent of Spanish speaking have computers, but only 50 percent have intermittent access to the internet, so what does that mean?

Native Americans in rural areas, as well as poor people in rural areas, have no internet access. So, this truly is a total violation of environmental justice issues. And some of those folks that will be filing legal claims I'm sure will be listing environmental justice issues in that.

So once again, this is a total violation of environmental justice principles to hold these kinds of hearings. This is just disgusting actually.

Our role, again, looking at the criminality of the present administration that we're facing, I think NRC really needs to look at its own affiliation and its own complicity amongst the criminality that is going on, not only with immigrants and the dog caging of innocent children, which everyone is complicit in any government agency that is rural and continues to do what the administration tells them to do without asking for any, without complaints.

We are poor people, but we don't necessary have to bend over all the time. As people have already stated, our congressional delegation, our governor, the people have said no that have been able to get (telephonic interference).

So, before I close here Los Jardines, we can't tell you the number of permits here that have been held, where our voices aren't even heard. And if they're heard and recorded, it doesn't mean anything.

So, it should mean something when a delegate, congressional delegation and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

the mayor, as well as a majority of people basically say no to this. So I hope that all the comments that have been given to date, not only the Holtec commonality, including our own administration at this point, and just the craziness, the attitude of having (telephonic interference) of humans over the phone. That's all I have to say.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you for those comments, Sofia.

And, Christine, do we have someone else?

THE OPERATOR: Once again, if you would like to submit a public comment, please press \*1 and record your first and last name. One moment.

MR. CAMERON: And, Christine, could you just do a double check and see if there is anybody else out there who wants to talk?

THE OPERATOR: Yes, sir. Once again, if you would like to submit a public comment, please press \*1 and record your first and last name at this time. One moment.

The next comment comes from Nick Maxwell. Your line is open.

MR. MAXWELL: Hey, how you doing, Chip?

MR. CAMERON: I'm fine, Nick. How are you doing?

MR. MAXWELL: I'm doing pretty good. This is Nick Maxwell from Lea County, New Mexico.

And I noticed that none of the politicians showed up tonight, so that kind of makes me think that they don't really want these meetings to happen. They might be done cheerleading it at this point. I don't know, I might be wrong about that.

I'm not happy about this. I just found out about this meeting yesterday. Yes. They're making these meetings without giving enough notice.

And so I'm not happy about the fact that we're not getting the in-person meetings. There is a lot of substance we miss out.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

We don't get to see those nice posters that Jill Caverly likes to make. I don't know if she's the one that makes them but she seems to be in charge of a lot of what's going on down here.

I still hold on to that, Jill, if you're on the line. You ought to look at a job at Holtec. Joy, if she ever leaves there that would be the perfect job for you.

And so, I think this whole thing is structured like a Ponzi scheme. The NRC seems to be 100 percent behind this. You all say that you're not supporting it doing just presentations, but really as you watch the presentation it's very pro-Holtec. Some of the things that you all have said have already been rebuked by other participants today.

I sit here and I got to sit here and say, the NRC actually benefits from pushing this forward. Your bureaucracy gets bigger, your budgets gets bigger.

The government has this thing that it likes to grow and it likes to get bigger. And that's what's happening here. The NRC doesn't want to have any interest in not pushing this through, even if it is contrary to federal law.

I'd rather say that I've already made some comments. There appears to be these passive agreements that ELEA and Holtec actually have agreements for purchasing the land. That's not true, I've already debunked that.

They can't even follow their own bylaws. Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance is cutting checks to Gary King for over \$5,000 to lobby this thing. And then Gary King gets on this line, I hope Gary King is listening. Gary, I hope your listening.

Gary King gets on this line and starts supporting this project and doesn't display that he's getting paid by Holtec and Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance.

Sam Cobb sits there and pushes this. John Heaton sits here and pushes this.

And we know that they're part of the project.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

But Gary King gets on the line and doesn't disclose that he's being paid by these guys. I don't like what's going on, I think this whole thing is a sham.

I'm very appreciative of the people who have come on today and who have also spoken against them. I think the NRC is, you all are pushing your jobs. You're getting to keep your jobs and you have poor me to do it.

I bet Jill spends 40 hours a week working on Holtec stuff, okay. So I'm going to go ahead and wrap up my comments. Obviously I'm not happy. I might get back on during these next meetings, I don't know yet.

But it's not working the way that you want to do it. You need to put more meaningful public participation please. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Nice to hear you again, Nick. And I'm glad you know about the meetings next week, and if you can join us, then please do.

Christine, do we have anybody else?

THE OPERATOR: Once again, if you would like to submit a public comment, please press \*1 and record your first and last name. One moment.

At this time, sir, I'm showing no one else queued up for public comment.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, I guess we'll get ready to adjourn because we do have two meetings next week. One, it's going to be an earlier afternoon meeting and then another meeting that's going to be nighttime, at least eastern time.

I just, from the Facilitator's point of view, I'd like to thank everyone who commented, very articulate tonight. And because we didn't have a lot of people it was great to give you more time than four or five minutes. So thank you.

And let me just thank Christine and Dexter, our operators. Also Allegra, our stenographer.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

And what I'd like to do now is I'd like to see if, Theresa, Theresa --

PARTICIPANT: Theresa Clark?

MR. CAMERON: Yes.

MS. CLARK: Hey, Chip, I'm here.

MR. CAMERON: Hi Theresa, Theresa Clark. Could you --

MS. CLARK: Yes. Can you hear me, Chip?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can hear you. Can you just close out the meeting for us please as the senior management here?

MS. CLARK: Yes, thanks, Chuck. So for everyone on the lines, I'd like to add my thanks to Chip as well.

For everyone joining us this afternoon, we're going to consider everything that we've heard from you. We do take it very seriously.

So we'll be looking at the transcript of these comments, as well as those from our other public meetings. And through the various ways that folks can submit written comments. So, thank you for joining us today.

I want to remind you, as Jill said, that the transcripts from this meeting are going to be made available within a week on our Holtec portion of our NRC public website. That was on a prior slide.

It's quite easy to find while you're on the meeting. I Googled Holtec NRC and that public website was the first thing that came up. If you have access to the web.

And I'd like to remind you the upcoming meeting, Chip just mentioned recently. The two that are coming up next week. We've got one next Tuesday, they're on the Webex now, if you are able to view the Webex slide screen.

Next Tuesday, August 25th, at noon Mountain time. Next Wednesday,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

August 26th at 4:00 p.m. Mountain time.

And then the week after, Wednesday, September 2nd at 9:00 Mountain time.

So, we tried to choose a variety of times to hopefully make available for more folks.

And so, the details of all of those are on the slide that's showing right now on the Webex. Those slides are available on the NRC's public website, on that same Holtec dedicated page that I mentioned, as well as on the public meeting list for today.

And finally, I'd just like to remind you that the end of the comment period is September 22nd. Previously there was a slide up about the various ways that we can comment. That's on Slide 30 of tonight's slide, if you have those saved separately. And it's also, again, on the Holtec dedication portion of our website and our regulations.gov docket that's there on the slide, NRC-2018-0052.

So, I know that was a lot of information, but if you have access to the slides that's there for your reference. So thanks, again, for spending some time with us this afternoon and evening, and we look forward to hearing from more people at the future meetings. Thanks.

MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Theresa. Thank you. And we just look forward to hearing from all of you again next week, including Mr. McCoy. Thank you very much and goodnight.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 8:18 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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