

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Town Hall Meeting on Agency
 Approach to Environmental Justice

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: teleconference

Date: Thursday, October 21, 2021

Work Order No.: NRC-1723

Pages 1-84

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1716 14th Street, N.W., Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20009
(202) 234-4433

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC TOWN HALL MEETING ON AGENCY APPROACH TO
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

+ + + + +

TELECONFERENCE

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,

OCTOBER 21, 2021

+ + + + +

The meeting was convened via
Teleconference, at 3:00 p.m. EST, Larniece McKoy Moore,
presiding.

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Meeting Welcome
 By Larniece McKoy Moore.....3

Meeting Introduction and Procedure
 By Jessica Bielecki.....6

Overview of Feedback
 By Allen Fetter.....12

Public Comments
 By Larniece McKoy Moore.....16

Meeting Close
 By Larniece McKoy Moore.....84

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

3:00 p.m.

OPERATOR: Thank you for standing by. All participants will be in listen only mode until the question, and answer portion of the presentation. During that time, if you would like to ask a question, please press star one, and record your name when prompted. As a reminder, this call is being recorded.

If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. Now I'd like to turn the call over to your host, Larniece McKoy, you may begin, thank you.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you. Good afternoon, my name is Larniece McKoy Moore, and it is my pleasure to facilitate today's meeting. The purpose of this comment gathering meeting held by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or NRC staff is to describe the staff's efforts in assessing environmental justice, or EJ in NRC's programs, policies, and activities as directed by the commission in the staff requirements memorandum of session number ML211138070.

I want to thank you for attending the meeting. We are near the end of our review process, and your comments are important to the NRC's assessment of environmental justice. The comments will be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

considered carefully and help shape our efforts. This is a comment gathering meeting by the NRC's definition, meaning the purpose of the meeting is to receive comments from members of the public, and other stakeholders.

NRC staff will answer process related questions if time permits. I'd like to note that the NRC is continuing to operate in largely a work at home status. And most participants in this meeting are working remotely, and individually calling in. There do happen to be a few of us in a large room together with masks to help you experience a better meeting. We recognize that this consideration presents unique challenges, and continue to welcome comments about what is, and isn't working.

Comment on the format, and presentation of this meeting may be submitted in the link provided on the web page that originally led to the meeting.

Your input helps provide improvements to NRC future meetings. Slide three please. The agenda for our meeting is fairly straightforward. After a brief presentation by the NRC to provide some information about the NRC environmental justice efforts, and feedback it has received to date, the public will be offered an opportunity to provide comments and ask

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

questions of the NRC staff.

This meeting is scheduled to run from 3:00 to 5:00 Eastern Time. We will try to allow for as much public input as possible, but we will generally try to adhere to the meeting schedule. Today's call is meant to be an exchange of information. And as always for NRC public meetings, no regulatory decisions will be made. Slide four please. This slide provides logistic information on today's meeting. To view the slide, be sure to login to Teams, and call into the toll-free line for audio.

The audio is only through the bridge line. This arrangement allows for those without broadband access to also participate in the meeting. If you are not on Teams, and would like to view the presentation slides, they are in the NRC's ADAMS document database, or you may call NRC's public meeting document room for assistance at 301 415 4737. The accession number for the package containing the slides is ML212918006. The presentation's slides, and the number is also included in the public meeting announcement.

Today's call is an operator moderated line where participants will have their line muted until we reach a portion of the meeting where you can provide comments and ask questions of NRC staff. You will be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

given instructions on how to provide all comments and ask questions before the public comment portion of this meeting. As indicated in the agenda, we will have allocated a substantial portion of the meeting for this process.

However, if participants would like to email a question to our public affairs officer during the staff presentation, please email Mr. David McIntyre at dtm@nrc.gov. Today's call is being recorded and will be transcribed. The transcription will be made available along with the public meeting summary. Given the number of participants we are accepting on the call format, I would ask that as each person speaks you introduce yourself each time. Additionally, I would ask that speakers limit their use of acronyms.

Slide six please. This slide notes speakers for the meeting, starting with Jessica Bielecki.

MS. BIELECKI: Thank you Larniece. Good afternoon, and welcome to today's meeting on the NRC's review of how it addresses environmental justice in its programs, policies, and activities. If folks have questions as we're going through this presentation, please, if you have access to the chat, you can type your question in the chat, we have a few people

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

monitoring that. And if not, you can get in touch with the operator, we will work to address your questions as soon as we can.

Next slide please. So, the purpose of the meeting today is twofold. First to provide an overview of the NRC staff's environmental justice review effort.

This review was directed by our commission in April of this year. As part of this effort, we've been conducting extensive outreach, and have received a lot of great feedback to date. Allen Fetter, our team's project manager, will provide an overview of this feedback later in today's meeting.

Second, we're here to receive your comments, as Larniece mentioned, your comments are critical to our review. So, on behalf of the team, thank you for engaging with us. We very much appreciate your time and look forward to hearing more today. Next slide please. To help frame today's discussion, I'd like to start by providing a little more detail about our review effort. In response to direction from our commission, a team was created to conduct a review on how we address environmental justice.

Importantly, our work is the first step in the agency's assessment of environmental justice.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

This team is in essence currently canvassing the landscape, and we'll be sharing what we find with our commission in February. Any policy decisions about the NRC's approach to environmental justice would be made by the commission at a later date. The sourcing feedback is an important part of this canvassing, and a key component of today's meeting.

Though we're in the middle of an active outreach effort, we have already begun assessing the comments received to date to help inform our paper to the commission, and we appreciate that there may be interest that extends beyond the scope of today's meeting. As part of the EJ review, the team is not examining in detail ongoing licensing action, and such actions will not be discussed today. Particular licensing, and regulatory matters will continue to be addressed through NRC's normal processes.

So, when we get to the comment portion of the meeting, we would like to focus our discussion on comments related to the environmental justice assessment. For example, how are we doing with environmental justice? Could we do better? So, we thank you for your patience, and understanding as we try to keep this meeting focused. Next slide please.

A key question to start with is what is environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

justice? If you've been to our other public meetings, this may sound familiar.

For those new to our meetings, welcome, and we hope you find the following information useful.

Environmental justice refers to a federal policy established in 1994 by a presidential executive order.

This order directed federal agencies to identify, and address disproportionately high, and adverse human health, or environmental effects of programs, policies, and activities on minority, and low-income populations.

As an independent agency NRC was requested, and not directed to comply with this letter.

And importantly, this order did not create new authority for agencies. So, the NRC looked to see how it fit into existing authorities at the time and determined that it would address environmental justice in its environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. Next slide please.

Ten years later in 2004, our commission issued a policy statement on environmental justice.

Like the 1994 executive order, the policy statement explained the focus of an environmental justice review should focus on identifying, and weighing disproportionately high, and adverse

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

environmental impacts on environmental justice communities. Again, this is currently done through the NRC's NEPA process. Next slide please. This 2004 policy statement has not been updated since its issuance and is one area the commission directed we consider.

The commission also directed that we consider recent executive orders, practices of other federal, and state agencies, and travel governments, as well as potential formal mechanisms to gather external input. As part of its review, the commission directed we engage others representing a broad range of perspectives. Next slide please. Since engagement has been a big focus of our effort to date, I would like to take just a few minutes to talk about our outreach strategy for this assessment.

It includes a variety of means to engage with stakeholders, and interested persons representing a range of perspectives. First, we identified specific questions to help hone the conversation. These questions were included in the federal register notice back in July, and we have shared them through various means, including our public meetings in July, and September, hard copy pamphlets that were distributed at in person meetings in South Carolina

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

over the summer, email listserv, and on our public website.

We've also had discussions with a variety of individuals, and groups to solicit, and better understand their perspectives. This has included for example, environmental justice community leaders, and organizations, environmental, and nuclear safety non-governmental organizations, labor unions, and tribal, state, local, and federal government agencies.

To help keep folks informed, we recorded a podcast, and are working hard to keep our public web page about this effort up to date.

In addition, we've sought to leverage resources within the agency, conducting interviews with staff across the agency, holding a town hall style meeting, and launching an Idea Scale campaign, which is an internal agency crowd sourcing tool. Our strategy is intended to be flexible, and has allowed us to learn, and adapt as we go. For example, we heard concerns about broadband limitations, so we have been sure to include toll free numbers for both our public meetings, and as a means to provide comments.

We've also been partnering with local community leaders to help get the word out about our effort. In addition, we heard our comment period was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

not long enough, so we extended it twice, and it now closes on October 29th. We also heard from tribal representatives about how to better engage, and hearing that feedback, issued a letter offering tribal nations consultation.

So, we hear you, and are carefully considering your feedback. Thank you so much for engaging with us, please keep the comments coming. I'll now turn it over to Allen Fetter, our project manager, and he'll walk us through an overview of the feedback we've heard to date, and then we'll open it up for additional comments. Allen?

MR. FETTER: Yes, thank you very much Jessica, and Jessica is our deputy director of the environmental justice review team. I understand that the microphone is temporarily muted in case you didn't catch that. So, next slide please, and I'm going to give you a brief overview of what we've heard to help inform the NRC's environmental justice review. This is by no means a complete listing of all. We've received on the order of several hundred comments.

So, in combination with what's been sent in via the email capture, address, and as well as comments we've pulled from transcripts, and other interactions. So, next slide. So, we've heard about

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

barriers to meaningful engagement with EJ communities. And Jessica read me this earlier. Specifically, NRC's reliance on IT for notices, and public meetings, a lack of broadband internet access in many EJ communities.

Lack of consistent communication from NRC, and communication from NRC is not always easily understandable. Next slide please. Thus we're asked to evaluate leads from executive orders, and as such whether environmental justice has been appropriately considered, and addressed given the agency's mission. We've heard that NRC should not limit consideration of executive orders to submit EJ review, and the NRC should consider a number of executive orders that have been issued since Executive Order 12898, such as executive orders 1 through 985, 1 through 990, and the one for 008.

Next slide please. One of the other questions we posed to the stakeholders, and others, was to review the adequacy of the 2004 commission policy statement on environmental justice, and which portions were affected. We heard that NRC's approach to the policy statement reflects outdated thinking on justice concepts, and should be revised specifically, for example rather, census data tools might not truly reflect social, economic, and racial makeup of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

community issues.

Also, the policy statement does not guarantee that the NRC will uphold principles of environmental justice, and ensure that all ES populations are treated fairly, and included in the decision-making processes that relate to the environment. The 2004 policy statement does not address tribal engagement, and this should be done early in the licensing process. And NRC should include racial discrimination in its siting any environmental issues in evaluating licensing action.

Next slide please. And then, what are the ways that NRC can enhance identification in environmental justice communities? And how can we enhance opportunities for members of environmental justice communities to participate in licensing, and regulatory activities? We've heard that NRC should cultivate relationships with state, and local government, and non-governmental organizations from other community organizations, or community leaders such as church leaders, and church networks, or other social networks.

NRC should tailor all these efforts to the specific community considering the differences, and challenges that might exist in each one. NRC should

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

convey technical information in a manner that is clearly understood by all members of the community, and NRC should provide opportunities for early verification, and input safety, and environmental aspects of licensing.

Next slide please. So, what actions can NRC take to enhance the consideration of environmental justice at the NRC considering the agency's mission, and steps towards environmental justice. We've heard that NRC should create an organization, or advisory committee within the NRC with staff fully dedicated to performing outreach and facilitating meaningful engagement with EJ communities. And the NRC should respect sovereign tribal nations by offering consultations early in the decision-making process.

Next slide please.

So, as Jessica mentioned earlier, the comment period is ending on October 29th, and this is, we're in the last week of getting comments, and so we strongly encourage you to submit your comments if you haven't already done so. Comments are accepted by telephone, you can leave a voice mail, our preferred method is through the email address shown on this slide.

You can also send it by regular mail, or through the federal rule making website which is listed in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

Federal Registry.

So, in February 2020, the staff will provide the results of the review to the commission.

Next slide. So, now I'm going to turn it back over to Larniece.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you Allen. This brings us to the public comment, and question portion of the meeting. Our operator will now tell you how to get into the queue for making comments or asking questions.

OPERATOR: Thank you. If you would like to ask a question, or have a public comment, please press star one, and record your name when prompted.

And if you would like to withdraw your question, please press star two. One moment to see if we have any questions.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you. Also, in our last meeting, we received feedback about the comment queue process. For this meeting, we will try to periodically provide a list of who is in the queue verbally, or in the chat so folks have a sense of when they might be speaking. A few final things before we start taking questions, and comments. In an effort to make sure that we hear from as many of you as possible, we ask that participants limit their comments

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

to three to five minutes.

If you go beyond this time, we will need to move on to the next commenter and ask you to reenter the queue to provide your additional comments as time permits. Keeping the comments within this time frame helps all of us ensure that we are inclusive of others who may want to comment, and respectful of others who have taken time to attend this event and wish to speak.

Additionally, remember, this is a transcribed, and recorded meeting. And while sensitive issues may arise, we ask that comments be provided in a civil, and respectful manner.

With that, I'd like to return to Mr. David McIntyre to see if he has received any questions from members of the public via email.

MR. MCINTYRE: Hi Larniece, I have not at this point.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Okay, seeing that you have no questions, I'd like to ask the operator if there is anyone in the phone queue that would like to ask a question.

OPERATOR: So, our first question, or public comment comes from Eric Meyer, your line is open.

MR. MEYER: Hi there, thanks so much for taken this question. Yeah, my name is Eric, I actually

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

run a pro-nuclear advocacy non-profit organization. One of the reasons I decided to start this organization five years ago now was because I think nuclear plants are one of the strongest environmental justice technologies we have. It may be kind of counter intuitive to say, but when you see the research by Jim Hanson at NASA, and Pushker Kharecha at Columbia University, where you realize that because nuclear energy has displaced so many fossil fuel plants over the years, it's saved about two million lives.

So, to put it another way, every time a nuclear power plant was built, a coal plant wasn't built there, and the environmental justice community that would have suffered from the impacts of particular pollution like heart disease, cancer, asthma, that just wasn't created, because nuclear plants don't create any air pollution. I know just listening to the presentations in the previous month, and reading up, there is a really tricky legacy that we have to deal with going back to uranium mining predominantly for weapons, and some of that in the early days of nuclear power.

And I just hope that we don't let that history kind of cloud where we are right now in 2021, where we need to decarbonize as fast as possible, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

the NRC striving to keep the public safe maybe loses sight of what will be built instead of nuclear plants if we don't get them approved. Because the public, and politicians place a very strong preference in keeping the lights on, rightfully so, we're seeing more, and more gas plants built.

And you can see the foils in doing that in Texas, and in Europe right now. So, I hope the NRC is able to look holistically at this question of environmental justice in terms of air pollution, and climate change, and realize that nuclear energy is a way to kind of bring environmental justice into the future and create opportunities for the future. I mean, you build a nuclear plant, you've got clean energy for 80 plus years.

And I think that's just worth keeping in mind since the NRC has such an important job to do.

So, I appreciate the opportunity to speak, and look forward to hearing other people.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you Eric, next question please.

OPERATOR: Our next public comment comes from Elaine Cooper.

MS. COOPER: Yes, I'm calling in, can you hear me?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Yes.

MS. COOPER: Okay. I'm calling in from Columbia, South Carolina, I'm a South Carolina Sierra Club member, 350 Columbia, and Richland County. That last phone call, last response, I felt so saddened about because that person obviously was not associated, or living in an EJ community such as we are. In Lower Richland we have a Westinghouse facility that produces nuclear rods for nuclear facilities.

The folks down there are desperate for jobs, and so they take their jobs to feed their children, et cetera. As I sat around the table with these folks, they say yeah, this is an incredibly dangerous facility. We have to take it to eat, to put food on our table, but yeah, we have to take showers after, and cousin so, and so has cancer, and this person over here worked 30 years, and he had the same form of cancer, and that person over there has the same form of cancer.

And everyone knows everyone who has the same form of cancer, and who is incredibly sick, we know that this is from years, and years of working at this facility. And we are deeply, deeply so sad that we have to give up our health to supply, in order to afford a job that puts some food on the table. So,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

nuclear power facilities like this Westinghouse, and others prey upon desperate low income communities of color who have no other choice, none whatsoever.

No other corporations, no other business in order to get a job. Shame, shame on them. These aging facilities have to be closed down, and now they're seeking 40 year renewal license for facilities that are at least 50 years old, and have huge safety violations. I was even told recently that there's safety violations that these folks know about all the time that the public are not aware of, and there are no evacuation plans that the community knows of, no way to even get to the community in case there is a far more dangerous, which almost happened at this facility.

There's no way to green wash your way around nuclear power facilities. So, as people continue to be aware of this, and empowered, we're all moving towards solar. Yeah, we do have other means to develop such as solar, and more actual renewables without having to prey upon low income, black communities. Thanks I guess. Also I wanted to say that I was not able to hardly hear the audio.

I can see the slides, got on the phone call, I have my audio up all the way, I could barely hear

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

the presentation. So, perhaps you'll have to repeat this presentation, or send us some recording of the audio along with the presentation, it was barely audible. And I just wanted to let you know that I'm available to teach you all to use Zoom, thanks.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Your comments are noted Elaine, thank you very much. The meeting is being recorded, and transcribed also, just so you know. Thank you very much. Next commenter please.

OPERATOR: Our next comment comes from Manna Jo Green, your line is open.

MS. GREEN: Thank you very much, I agree with the previous caller who has first hand experience.

I also want to say that we have first hand experience around Indian Point, but the biggest environmental justice issue, in addition to all the outreach, and effective input that you're seeking ways to improve, and I commend that, but I think there's a bigger issue, and that issue is that we should not be grooming nuclear waste from around the country to so called interim consolidated storage.

Because it's not likely to be interim if we don't have a national repository, or repositories already sited, and agreed upon. So, you're going to be transporting very high level nuclear waste across

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

the country. And in spite of the infrastructure bill, there's no emphasis on hardening those routes, and improving those routes. True environmental justice communities, communities in the two states of New Mexico, and Texas, and those environmental justice communities have been exposed since the Trinity atomic testing, and then through years of uranium mining, and milling, and processing, and transportation.

And now potentially storing so much of the nation's nuclear waste. Instead, the real environmental justice solution is to store it as safely as possible on site. Or, if it's a very dangerous area like San Onofre, to be moved to a site as close as possible that is safer than the Pacific Floodplain.

So, I think there's a bigger issue at stake, it's very commendable that you are doing outreach, and asking how to do better outreach to environmental justice communities.

And I just want to close by saying that nuclear power is absolutely not a climate solution.

We have good, safe climate solutions at hand, wind, water, solar, storage to make it reliable, et cetera. But nuclear power means to continuously generate nuclear waste for which there are no good solutions. There is no truly safe disposal. We can make it as

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

safe as possible at each of the sites until there are national repositories.

But Hudson River Sloop Clearwater strongly believe that we should be investing in renewable, and stop making highly dangerous, high level nuclear waste, thank you.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you, we appreciate your comment. Next caller please.

OPERATOR: Our next call comes from Leon Woodberry, your line is open.

MR. WOODBERRY: Okay, thank you so much. I wanted to ask some questions, and call to make some recommendations that I heard. So, the wording is in there by whatever EJ advisory body, whatever it's called, the commissioners agreed in February to establish that. I think the word meaningful engagement needs a little more definition. So, and then the EJ movement, we define meaningful engagement as involvement in planning, decision making, allocation of resources, implementation, and evaluation.

I think that's very important, because we want to make sure that whatever body is created is in line with the principles, and the policies, and procedures that EJ organizations over decades set in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

place, and so that's one. And I'm asking in that, that there can be an expansion of those words, meaningful engagement. Also in terms of how the body will be assembled, a recommendation to the commissioners that we get a group of EJ organizers, and leaders together.

And some that have a history, that actually are involved, and that has helped with creating the advisory body, and then the third thing is we definitely need some sort of definition in terms of what organizations, what individuals should be on the advisory body. We have a lot of folks who say they do environmental justice work from a for profit corporation, to foundations, green organizations, et cetera, in order to actually accurately have the voice of the community be heard, then we need to come up with that stakeholder group has to put it together.

We need to make sure that the authentic voice of the community is being heard, maybe by saying that, in order to be a member of the advisory board, you have to be involved in the neighborhood for a minimum amount of time that your organization, leadership has to be a member of an EJ community. Your organization should be headquartered in an EJ community, and that's so we know that we're getting authentic voices from the community.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

And not folks who just added that onto their programmatic work, so I think that's very important. And I know that might be a lot, but I was just thinking that if those additions, those changes could be added to the recommendation, it would be really helpful towards us putting together a body that can actually have some impact, and influence into the decision making, and actions that NRC takes, where by doing this we can be proactive.

And maybe avoid many of the incidents, and many of the complaints, and cries of the for change that we hear from the EJ communities when it comes to nuclear incidents, and industry. If we put this together right, then we can work together, EJ community, its authentic voice, hear it's needs. And that would be to take proactive action so we can have healthier communities, and avoid some of the adversarial relationships that have developed over the decades.

So, thank you very much for that, and I hope that that is helpful, and we probably will be submitting some more comments regarding this report recommending the possible establishment of an environmental justice advisory consideration to you all. Thank you very much.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you very much for your comments, and your recommendations Mr. Woodberry. Next caller please.

OPERATOR: Our next caller is Kelly Munkhtuya, your line is open.

MS. MUNKHTUYA: Hi everyone, I am Kelley Munkhtuya, and I've earned my master's, and my bachelor's in nuclear engineering from the University of Illinois, and I currently work as the outreach chair for generation atomic. And I am so glad to everyone here concerned about nuclear energy. I think I've heard a lot of concern about nuclear waste, but I'm here to dispel any myths. Just like the way you guys are concerned, many nuclear engineers are even more concerned, and they've designed so many systems in order to keep the radiation in, in order to keep it completely secure.

And as a matter of fact, nuclear waste isn't really even waste, it is simply just nuclear spent fuel that our future advanced reactors are going to be able to utilize as a fuel source. So, my recommendation for the NRC would be to continue to invest in outreach programs in order to dispel these myths about nuclear. Because it's completely understandable to be afraid of something you don't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

know.

So, that's why it's important for the NRC to continue to invest money, and resources into educating communities that are around nuclear power plants, and just overall. Yeah, so thank you guys so much for listening.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you Ms. Munkhtuya.

Do we have any other callers?

OPERATOR: Our next question, or comment comes from Pamela Greenwall. Your line is open.

MS. GREENWALL: Thank you very much. I'm sorry, I missed out, so I'm going to say Ms. Kelly, I'm sorry that Ms. Kelly has not done her historical study on the damages of nuclear spent fuel, and not just spent fuel, but the other issues with it as pointed out by a former caller, including the uranium mining, and processing, so she needs to go back, and look at the broad scale of it.

I believe that we've had several Native Americans from New Mexico who educated us in past calls.

And I would hope that Ms. Kelly would go back, and look at that. I would ask if you would return to the slides, and you're trying to do that, but what you have there, I can't remember the slide number, but Reverend Woodberry, Leon Woodberry, who spoke with you, was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

talking very eloquently, and accurately about a need for definitions.

And that's great, thank you so much. This is really important for us to look at that. If you could scroll to the next one, and I'm sorry I didn't take notes. So, I'm going to try not to take -- there we go, here we go. Okay, as far as these definitions, Reverend Leo was exactly right. That if you get a group of stakeholders without having the qualifications, you're going to end up I think with not a broad base from which to work. So, I'm just here to say absolutely, look at everything that he suggested, and incorporate that.

My concern, the reason I'm calling specifically, I know you didn't want to go into specifics, but we really have to. Nuclear energy is not totally separate from the nuclear military use, and let me explain. The Westinghouse Fuel Fabrication Plant in Hopkins, South Carolina that Ms. Cooper was referring to, also has on the campus, Westdyne, also known as Westinghouse Government Services, has been fabricating TP bars, which the lithium aluminate, I'm sorry, my pronunciation's not right.

But those bars are put together, they're sent to a nuclear commercial site, TVA, Watts Bar to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

be irradiated to create tritium. So, we actually have some waste streams that people think are separate from, they're not from the same source, but they are. What happened between 2004, and 2010, and this is in the GAL report, the TP bars were leaking tritium so badly into the nuclear facility, and this persisted even after redesign.

I hope Ms. Kelly will go back, and maybe she can research, find out if they can solve that problem. The GALL doesn't usually get involved unless someone can converse, asks them to make a specific inspection, or specific audit. But these are not myths that nuclear energy production, and the mining, and storing the spent fuel, that it is dangerous. These are not myths, these are actualities, and we know that this is a problem because the waste processing, and storage area in New Mexico is running out of space as we speak.

And I also, I'm not going to go on much longer here. We're talking about energy production. And the other fuel that Duke Energy used to talk about a lot, with energy efficiency, we have to think about, and I know that you cannot do this, I know that NRC does not have the authority, or power to do this, but everyone on this call needs to think about how we are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

using this energy. If we're using it for base load, that's one thing.

If we're using it to power only cities, and not industries that run overnight, well I'm doing a Sara Palin, kind of stopping one, and starting another. Stores, and businesses, new development, the energy efficiency standards are rarely high enough to reduce the amount of energy received that we need to run them. So, I just wanted to pitch that, it's not something that you all can do. But if you will scroll one more time to this thing about what you've heard, would you scroll to the next slide? Thank you.

Okay. I think you need to tighten up the definitions on that second bullet, NRC should tear outreach efforts to the specific community considering the differences, and challenges that might exist. They do exist, I think you should say that exists, take the might out. Because you're going to have to drill down in your advisory committee, and work on actually looking at what these challenges are. Also that last one that you should provide opportunities for, and I can't read the rest of it, it's obscured by someone's raised hand on my screen. Well, anyway --

MR. FETTER: So, actually while you brought that up, if anyone has their hand raised, we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

won't be able to call on anyone with their hand raised.

Please lower your hands, and if you want to speak, press star one, or type a question in the chat. The raised hand we can't really address.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Well that's good to know. Anyway, yeah. I'll just put these in written comments, how to tighten this up. I know you're trying to write it generally as a template, or as a way for you to start working on these things. But I think you should tighten some of them up from the beginning, and I'm going to stop, other people have questions, and comments. Thank you.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Appreciate your time. So, the bullets on the screen, that was our effort we've heard to date, so the specific information you just provided is fantastic. If there's other specifics, you're talking about drilling down, that's the specific kind of information, if you want to provide that in written comments, or if others on the line have those, that's fantastic information for us to consider.

So, thank you so much for raising that, and appreciate your comments.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: I believe we have about three people in the queue, so please feel free to call in, we have time for more. Can you please, operator,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

put the next person through please?

OPERATOR: Absolutely. Our next comment comes from Diane D'Arrigo, the line is open.

Hi, this is Diane D'Arrigo, I'm with nuclear information and resource service. I believe that the NRC needs to improve its environmental justice policy, but it also needs to take a look at what its environmental justice history has been. And to focus on possibilities for helping to correct previous violations. Those previous violations continue, far from what the first speaker said about it being tricky, it's way more than tricky.

We're talking about pretty much most, if not all of the thousands, 15000 or more uranium mines that are still open, and contaminating the communities in which they were located throughout, mostly the west, but other parts of the country as well need to be dealt with. The Church Rock spill from 1979, the dam break has never been cleaned up, has never been followed up on, and those are clear violations of environmental justice that are part of the nuclear fuel chain that has been.

And it's not like it's gone forever, that's a long ago history. I'm from around the West Belling Nuclear Reprocessing Site. Another speaker talked

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

about reusing the portions of the irradiated fuel, and the reality is that we have a potentially 10 billion dollar cleanup project on the only commercial reprocessing in the country that only operated for six years before we can ever do any future quote recycling, it's actually reprocessing of irradiated, or spent fuel.

And the communities that are most effective are directly downwind, and downstream, it's the Cattaraugus Territory of the Seneca Nation of Indians, and they were never notified. And they're calling for the full cleanup of that site. So, that needs to be done long before we're going to make new messes, or do new reprocessing. The NRC only looks at the federal agencies when they look at radiation.

The radiation standards in this country only look at cancer health effects.

And in some cases, birth defects in the next two generations. They ignore all of the other many impacts of radiation. So, already the nuclear regulatory commission, and the other federal agencies are -- it's violating environmental justice by exposing people of color, and poor communities to radiation, but it's also unjust overall. Women are 50 percent more likely to get cancer than men, according to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

latest National Academy of Sciences report on radiation.

Children, little girls, especially seven times more likely according to their charts, and yet the radiation standards don't protect. So, indigenous communities, communities that are closer to the land that use the water, and the environment, are present in it more closely are going to get much more exposure.

There's no consideration, and radiation protection for cumulative effects of radiation, and other stressors in the environment.

They don't have to be carcinogens necessarily, but certainly they are cumulative, multiple synergistic effects from radioactivity, and chemicals, and other stressors in the environment, and that's never considered. People in low-income communities, in low economic brackets have been shown to be subject to greater stress in many cases, that being a stressor, not always, but that needs to be factored in.

The NRC, under its current EJ policy does not consider environmental justice in doing environmental assessment, and generic environmental impact statements, and in many other situations where it should. So, the policy needs to be expanded to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

always consider environmental justice, to presume that people in environmental justice communities have standing for interventions, and for the ability to make contentions.

And that the NRC should reassess its allowable standards to include the greater risks to women, children, the elderly, and communities that have multiple additional other stressors. So, the NRC I believe should assist environmental justice interveners, and interventions, that there should be funding for independent review of policies, rules, regulations, changes, and for technical, and legal support for environmental justice communities. This is a problem with all public interest interventions, they're all interveners that are completely outnumbered by the NRC, and the applicants for various nuclear licenses, and amendments.

What the NRC can do is, I support the previous caller's suggestion of having an environmental justice advisory group, but yes, I do support that, I think that's a great idea, and I would --

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Excuse me, Diane?

MS. D'ARRIGO: One more sentence. And, so I would also add though, that institutionally within

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

the NRC, there needs to be a division to assist interveners, and to also review, and change the regulations in part two for intervention, to assume that EJ is an acceptable criteria for standing, and for contentions.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you very much Diane, we appreciate your perspective. Can we have another commenter please?

OPERATOR: Yes, next question, or comments comes from Madison Schroder.

MS. SCHRODER: All right, hello, my name is Madison Schroder. I want to make sure that I'm refocusing my comment toward the purpose of this meeting, which is the NRC's relationship with environmental justice. I was able to listen in last hearing, at the beginning of October, and it's evident that there is apprehension, and fear around nuclear energy, and we acknowledge this fear as it its valid. However, I think it's also important that we acknowledge that there is a gap in credible information being discussed about nuclear energy.

And the solution for this is my recommendation to the NRC as it pertains to environmental justice. The participants here go back, and forth on what's right, and what is wrong, but there

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

is little intervention from the NRC to sort some of this out. Environmental justice is both a retroactive, and proactive effort, not just conducting past failures to these communities, which are valid, but to provide opportunities for the future.

These discussions have really focused on the retroactive aspects of environmental justice. But I want to discuss what the NRC can do as a part of its proactive effort towards environmental justice. Therefore, I believe that the NRC's environmental justice efforts should be contingent on fostering a comprehensive understanding of the effects, and basics of nuclear energy as they're understood by experts.

If the NRC could take a well-rounded approach to environmental justice, I believe that it has a responsibility to provide up to date knowledge about the issues that are being discussed here. This includes the safety of nuclear energy plants, and waste storage, the economic benefits for communities in the form of jobs, and taxes, and its contribution towards addressing climate change. Misinformation is dangerous, but here it is especially threatening when it is pinned up against the real threat from fossil fuels.

Therefore, I specifically recommend that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

the NRC put together up to date expert driven information about nuclear energy that is made available on the website for the public to access. These should include peer reviewed scholarly research, and current data. I believe that one of the strongest weapons we have for environmental justice is education. And this requires addressing sources of misinformation, and encouraging fact based discussions about nuclear energy. Thank you for your time.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you Madison. Do we have any other callers?

OPERATOR: Our next question, or caller comes from Seaver Wang, your line is open.

MR. WANG: Can you hear me? Hello?

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Yes, we can hear you.

MR. WANG: Wonderful. Yeah, thank you so much to the NRC for convening this public meeting. I'm Seaver Wang. In my comments regarding environmental justice, I want to emphasize that no energy is without risk. Fundamentally, the production of energy requires fundamental transformation of vast quantities of energy, and I commend the NRC for its efforts to ensure that the industry follows good practices, and manages risk.

At the same time, we should keep an eye

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

on that nuclear is statistically an extremely safe source of energy. And that new nuclear technologies -- sorry, can I be heard?

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Yes, you can be heard.

MR. WANG: Okay. And new nuclear technologies have the potential to be many orders of magnitude safer still. I'll point out that I am a young caller, I'm only 29 years old, so in contrast some of the other callers, I will have to actual live with the consequences of climate change. I also hold a PhD in climate, and earth science, and so I am far more concerned about the environmental, and climate risk that under current trends, will be a guaranteed, and real threat to me than I am about the near zero, highly unlikely risks associated with nuclear power.

I am at many, many, many more times at risk of being harmed traveling to the grocery store than I am from nuclear power. So, I would like to call out environmental groups like the Sierra Club, and Union of Concerned Scientists for stoking nonscientific fears, especially among poorer minority communities as part of its ideological anti-nuclear campaign. I think this is actually an environmental justice injustice that exploits historical trauma in these groups, and inflicts unneeded mental harm.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

I agree with an early comment by Eric Meyer that the NRC should adopt a holistic approach and consider the potential for industrial projects under the eye of the NRC to avoid disproportional environmental harms that would impact poor minority communities if alternative fossil technologies were built in their place. I also agree with Eric that we should acknowledge historical environmental injustices associated with uranium mining, and waste storage, and that the NRC should look at such historical incidents to inform how it evaluates license applications.

So, I'm going to close by also echoing sort of Madison and encouraging the NRC to continue to use scientific objective standards for evaluating risks that could be -- in the process of its activities, and processes, and again, as I've mentioned earlier, to also evaluate avoided risks as a result of benefits that could be brought about by projects under its purview. That's all I have to say, thank you.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you, thanks so much. Just to let everyone know, we have almost ten people in the queue waiting, so please be mindful of your comments, and your time. Operator, next caller please.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

OPERATOR: Our next question, or comment comes from Michelle Lee, your line is open.

MS. LEE: I would just add in one procedural thing, for people who have come onto this later, they may not have heard that the way to get into the queue is through pushing star one. So, I would request that when you're doing these meetings, you periodically identify how people can present input. So, that being said, I'm going to focus very narrowly on some of the procedural aspects, problems that I've seen rather than the substantive issues, which I will address in written comment.

Procedurally, much of the resource references that the NRC uses in its environmental justice, and environmental impact statements are your own regulations. Which is absolutely circular reasoning. You assume that something will not happen, there will not be a problem because you have a regulation, and that is really something that would get you a D grade if you were doing it in a college paper.

So, that's number 1, number 2, I really urge you to get input from lay people on how to improve ADAMS, and access to documents on your web pages. They're really, I've been working in this industry for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

decades now, and I go nuts for somebody who doesn't have facility, or able to have experts get into it, it's a nightmare, and I think you'll find that to be a very widespread problem. It certainly is an impediment to people in the EJ communities in participation.

Along those lines, I really urge you not to continually use marketing terms that are advanced by the industry. Words like clean are not scientific words, zero carbon is actually scientific false, at pretty much every single level of the full fuel cycle including the fission process, which generates carbon 14, the level of which the NRC does not assess. It is really unconscionable to be using language that is essentially PR that is being promoted by the industry.

And the final thing I would say is I certainly support this task force, but it really needs to include experts from outside of the NRC. I certainly think the NRC staff are among the most proficient, and skilled physicists, and engineers, and so forth that we have, but you do not have people with background in other disciplines, and oh my God, your analyses really reek of that.

I'll just end with one example, is your draft environmental impact statement for the Whole Tech

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

New Mexico BISF doesn't address issues with water. If there's one issue in New Mexico that is imminently a crisis, you would think that would be it, heat, water, drought. And your citations in the document go back to textbooks from decades ago. But that is partly, I think the result of the fact that you don't have people on your staff. And that's why you need to solicit people outside the NRC, and outside the nuclear industry. Thank you.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you Michelle. Can we have the next commenter please?

OPERATOR: Yes, our next question, or comment comes from Ed Lyman. The line is open.

MR. LYMAN: Hi, can you hear me?

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Yes, we can hear you.

MR. LYMAN: So, I spoke on the panel discussion a couple weeks ago, so I wasn't going to say anything, but I did hear my organization, the Union of Concerned Scientists invoked in vain, so in our defense on the four, if I counted right, speakers representing Generation Atomic, which is an industry funded green washing group, their comments not only are extremely patronizing by maintaining that somehow they have a perceived truth about the safety of nuclear power, and that it's simply a matter of ignorance on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

the part of everyone else because they don't understand how safe it is.

Let me just say it clearly, they are appallingly ignorant in their approach, the things that they say, which are not supported by science, so that certainly is not the way to do environmental justice, I fully agree that you need to base all understanding, decision making on the best available evidence informed by policy, and individual perspectives. And science is fundamental to that. But to spout nonsense about how advanced reactors are going to eat up all the spent fuel in the world, as Diane D'Arrigo pointed out is an absurdity.

And I would argue that if the Generation Atomic folks want to be taken more seriously in this process, they need to think a little bit harder about the materials that they're putting out, and need to acknowledge that there are technical, and health related issues associated with the generation, and release of ionizing radiation that need to be fully accounted for. And superficial, and apples to oranges comparisons to fossil fuels, which are not within the NRC's main regulatory responsibility of regulating radiological health, and safety, but putting that aside, that these comparisons written by Jim Hanson,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

and others are fundamentally flawed in a lot of ways.

And it would suit anyone to try to understand a little bit better, the relative issues, not only the technical, and health related issues associated with different energy sources, but also how our society distributes those energy sources, and who benefits, and who suffers in each case. So, I think we all need to think a little bit harder about when we raise the mantle of who has the best scientific, and technical evidence, that we all need to be a little humbler about it, and try to understand where the uncertainties are, because we're not going to come to a good understanding of how to promote environmental justice unless we're basing things on the best available information, thank you.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you Mr. Lyman, for your comments. I'd like to emphasize while just taking a moment, that while we want to be fair for you to respond to some of the previous commenters, please keep your comments on task, what you have to say to the NRC, that's for all of the callers. And let's remember to be civil, and respectful so that we can get everyone's opinion, and remember that they are just that, opinions, and we're considering them all as we move forward.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

So, thank you very much to everyone who has commented thus far, and let's move on with the comments. Operator?

OPERATOR: Next question, or comment comes from Catherine Skopic. Your line is open.

MS. SKOPIC: Thank you, can you hear me?

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Yes, we can hear you Ms. Skopic.

MS. SKOPIC: Thank you very much. I am presently chair of Sierra Club New York City Group, and for several years I've chaired Shut Down Indian Point Now, the nuclear power plant on the Hudson River in New York. This is in regard to environmental justice, true?

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Yes.

MS. SKOPIC: Yes, thank you. First thing, give back the land. If we're talking about true environmental justice, we have to start prior to colonialism. Secondly, I understand that the down winders received an remuneration, however the indigenous did not. This is shocking to me, I don't know if it's true, from everything I've researched it is. But I think these down winders, their remaining relatives need receive remuneration.

Secondly, the White Mesa Uranium Mill is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

causing a lot of problems. I'll just highlight two, or three of them. One, the holding pit for water is supposed to have a protective fence around it, it's a very low fence, so wild animals jump that fence, and drink the water. As someone else mentioned, water is an issue in New Mexico, and sometimes there is drought.

So, animals are drinking this water, the company has not protected against that from happening.

When trucks are hauling away some of the contaminated earth, flaps have been seen to be open, and dust is blowing out where children play, where elders walk, and where sheep graze. So, there has been a completely sloppy, irresponsible handling of the operating uranium mill, the White Mesa. I would also like to mention the CIS, consolidated interim storage, which several people have mentioned already. I find it's something in my brain I can't comprehend, if you're really interested in environmental justice, why you would put these in communities, BIPOC communities, black, indigenous, and people of color communities.

In my mind there's a big disconnect, maybe you're doing this now, because you hadn't looked at it in the future. But these are people who are struggling, these are people are the lower end of the economic, and financial, and social, and everything

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

else, if there is such a spectrum, and they are the people least able to deal with the harms that come from the leaking uranium fuel, and all of the other problems that these consolidated interim storage facilities in New Mexico, and Texas can deal with. They are least prepared to be able to deal with the impact of the dangers of these.

To say nothing of the fact that this nuclear spent fuel would be shipped from all over the country from various, what do we have about 90 aging nuclear power plants at the moment? Most of them aging, getting ready to begin decommissioning, where is all that spent fuel going to be going? Rather than keeping it on site in storage casks, ship to these CISFs. And we've all heard, just look in your mind going back how many accidents you've heard of train derailments, of trucks having an accident, and spilling whatever their cargo is.

So, to ship nuclear waste all around the country is compounding the problem. So, the people where these CISFs are now located are the people who have not received any of the benefits, if one could say they are benefits of energy from this dangerous fossil material. And the last thing that I would like to say is that I like the idea of having a special

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

committee for outreach to deal with this issue. What I would like to suggest is that you create a formula that is tied to the profit of the nuclear industry going back to when it began.

And whatever that formula is, 50 percent per year of the profits going to those who have been negatively impacted. The Navajo, the Diné, the Ute, all of the Seneca, all of the tribal nations whose lands have been absolutely ruined by nuclear waste. Take this formula, make it fair, have everyone sitting around a table, all the stakeholders, representatives of all the tribes who have had to mine, and live with the millings and drillings and the Church Rock spill, and so forth.

Sitting around a table, come up with a formula that is realistic, and fair based on the profits of the nuclear industry, and have distribution going to these tribes henceforth, forever, or as long as is possible. Thank you very much.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you, just for everyone's information, we still have about five, or six people in the queue, so we're going to keep moving right along. Operator, can we have the next commenter please?

OPERATOR: Absolutely, our next question,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

or comment comes from Chief Michelle Mitchum, the line is open.

CHIEF MITCHUM: Hello everybody, can you hear me?

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Yes, we can hear you.

CHIEF MITCHUM: Okay, I tried to put as much as I could into the chat, because this call is going in all sorts of different directions, and I am trying to take notes, and I'm also in a second meeting concurrently, so I'm missing to two meetings at once. So, just to reiterate, and make sure this is all on the record, I asked earlier in what ways is the NRC proposing to develop better operating procedures, and communication needs to develop relationships?

Is the NRC making a safety review process available to the public? And in respect to that, does the safety review process include protective measures that might force the removal of Native American artifacts. Is the safety review process available to the public, and will the NRC work with the tribes directly as it relates to the safety review process, plan, and process?

I also had shared that, in case I did not to speak, I reiterated those questions. I agree that an advisory committee should be created, and I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

recommended that the NRC develop an anti environmental racism policy. I keep hearing race, and ethnicity, and discrimination being raised. I'm not saying that that is not the case, but these are not sound bite items to continue to throw up in everybody's face. I think that that is a stone wall creator, and it breaks down communication.

And with that in mind, the issue of BIPOC communities, my question on that is going back to the safety review process that the NRC might have and have a place that may, or may not be available to the public.

In that safety plan, are there any suggestions, or measures in place for these community residents where there might be a breach, or has been in the past? Of course there might be a future breach where there are better communication processes to getting information out, or is that placed on the facility?

If it is not under the facilities to communicate that information, is the NRC harrying a process to get immediate information on the streets, and into these communities? I want to thank you for letting me speak, I will let you have this very interesting floor back.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you. We missed, I think a little bit of what you said first, but based

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

on your later comments that you put them in the chat, I think we captured everything. And we will definitely be considering your questions as we will other comments.

MS. BIELECKI: And one -- some information in response to one of your questions Chief Mitchum, you asked about will the information that we're working on be made publicly available. So, our plan is to make as much of our report publicly available as we can shortly after it's provided to the commission. So, that will be out there, thank you.

CHIEF MITCHUM: Okay, thank you.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: With that, we can move onto the next commenter please.

OPERATOR: Our next question, or comment comes from Barbara Warren, and the line is open.

MS. WARREN: Hello, can you hear me?

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Great, thank you.

MS. WARREN: I live in New York, and we're very concerned about the environmental justice issue. First of all I want to bring up the issue of nuclear waste, because it's inherent in anything nuclear, and a couple of years ago, GAO identified environmental liabilities as high risk for the nation. It was the first time that this was done, that they identified

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

it as high risk for the nation. And what they were talking largely is nuclear waste. We have more, and more nuclear waste dumps, just waste sites that have not been cleaned up.

Whether it be mining, manufacturing, we're just not handling the waste that exists, and it has just piled up. What that means is that there's an environmental justice today, but environmental justice for thousands of years into the future because of the long-life nature of radionuclides. So, this must be part of your review, of what this is all about, because right now, when GAO identified it as high risk for the nation, we are spending one eighth the amount every year of what is needed to clean up these various sites around the country.

One eighth. So, that means we're never going to catch up, it's only getting worse. In fact, if you look back a few years, you'll see that that number has changed, and it only is changing in the wrong direction. And what that leads to is inter-generational injustice as well, because it means that the children, and the grandchildren, and the next generation ahead of us will be contaminating the water, the air, the land around everywhere where people are living.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

So, this is a very dangerous proposition, unless the NRC gets a hold of this, and really addresses it. I'll probably be submitting written comments, but that's all I have to say today, thank you very much.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you. I just want to take a minute to remind people that if they would rather send their questions via email, they may send their questions to Dave McIntyre at dtm@nrc.gov. He is available to send the questions to us here. Or, if they have a comment that they would like to be read. With that, we'll move onto the next comment please.

OPERATOR: Our next question, or comment comes from Leon Woodberry. Your line is open.

MR. WOODBERRY: Okay, thank you. I wanted to address the issue about what science NRC should be considering, and specifically as this event is around environmental justice, I want to say that that is the decision that should be made by the environmental justice advisory group members, as it should be made with environmental justice organization and with the community, there's a history of industry science being one of the main reasons why there is conflict, and dissent, and disagreement around all environmental issues.

So, I say people in communities, and EJ

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

leaders, et cetera, that we should be able to respect their ability to look at all kinds of science that come from all different places. So, whether it's industry science, citizen science, academic science that comes from academic science, it's been peer reviewed, the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, whatever that, in order for us to make good decisions we have to look at both the diversity of the science, and then have to look at what that science, what kind of an impact that science is having on our communities.

Or what benefits may come from us aligning ourselves with certain types of science. I think it would be a grave mistake, not only in terms of putting together the environmental justice advisory group, I think it's a grave mistake for NRC to limit the science that they look at from only one perspective, and instead they should be as inclusive, and diverse as possible, just as we strive to be in the environmental justice.

Thank you, thank you very much.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you. Next commenter please.

OPERATOR: Our next question, or comment comes from Jesse Deer In Water, the line is open.

MR. DEER IN WATER: Let's see here, I think

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

I'm unmuted, right?

MS. MCKOY MOORE: We can hear you.

Mr. DEER IN WATER: All right. Greetings all, Jesse Deer In Water, Citizens Resistance at Fermi Two in North Redford, citizen of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma. Here in Michigan. I really just wanted to comment on the final policy statement. Personally, I feel like it's crap, I mean I won't speak on behalf of my organization, but I will give you some other comments. The executive order needs to create new, or substantive rights, or requirements. That should be the purpose of it, it's literally dealing with people's lives, the earth's health.

It should grant rights of protection to people, beings, and land if determined. If determined, it also need be applied toward any finding that points towards environmental justice communities, and issues. The community needs to recognize EJ as more than a tool and recognize it as a foundational premise of any just society, as well as the deciding factor of the future, and acknowledgment of past harms of impacted peoples, communities, lands, waters around environmental justice issues, and nuclear regulatory policy, and future.

EJ also needs to be a litigable tool, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

issue in NRC proceedings, and adequately investigate, and evaluate the proceedings, and everything based on the principles put forth by EJ communities. And follow honor and uphold the work that EJ communities have put forth in providing these principles. Also, you guys mentioned that racial motivation is cognizable under NEPA. In that case, maybe there needs to be some more language around that. Maybe the NRC need not depend on NEPA, and their rules, and regulations as far as environmental justice goes, maybe, or maybe not.

But one of the important things is that with all the money, and power, and sway that the nuclear industry has, whether civilian, or military, you guys should have the capacity, resources, and know how to work with some environmental justice communities, and figure some shit out. Whether it be language around racial motivation, whether it be language around environmental justice. Whether it be language around how new rights, and requirements are created through environmental justice in relation to nuclear.

Also I would like to say that environmental assessments need to include environmental justice analysis, I believe somebody else already said that, generic, and programming impact statements, they also need to have environmental justice analysis. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

these environmental justice analysis would be those same ones I mentioned earlier whenever it comes to EJ being a litigable issue, and evaluate, and investigate, and all the different things, the principles put forth by EJ Communities.

And that could look anything like the effect of the environmental justice advisory council that I heard a couple people mention. Also, there need be funding in there for these community organizations who are intervening on their own, because their whole freaking part of the state is in the utilities pocket. So, there just need be some way for the environmental justice communities, and, or people to be able to take a swing at these things.

I believe that that's all that I have now. I could keep going with tons of examples how the NRC has failed with specific examples of environmental justice in communities, and people. I could also go into more demands, A, but those are my basics, you know?

The executive order needs to create new, and substantive requirements, and rights for peoples, beings, and land when determined to be a part of an environmental justice community, or issue.

The commission need recognize EJ as more than a tool and recognize it as a foundational premise

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

of a just society, and EJ needs to be a litigable issue, and courts, NRC's proceedings, because yeah, just those are the things around that.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you Mr. Deer In Water.

MR. DEER IN WATER: Oh yeah, and the environmental assessments, generic, and programmatic impact statements need to include environmental impact analysis, that's all, thank you all for your time.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you very much, thank you. Appreciate your time. Just a reminder, we have about a half an hour left, so if you have something that you want to email, or you want to get in the queue, please do so. Also remember this meeting is being transcribed, and will be published. And so, we want to not have any redacted language, so let's please watch our language as we are giving our opinions, and our comments. So, with that, let us move onto the next comment.

OPERATOR: Our next question, or comment comes from Jackie Toth, the line is open.

MS. TOTH: Hey there, this is Jackie Toth with the Good Energy Collective, and I just wanted to take a moment to say that we really appreciate the NRC's commitment to getting this right, and addressing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

environmental justice more holistically, and effectively than the existing 2004 policy statement definitely allows. Ultimately from our perspective, addressing historic, and present environmental injustices, it's going to take an all of government approach with each of the agencies that are involved in nuclear issues, and nuclear cleanup, including the Energy Department, Environmental Protection Agency, and to do so collectively to work on achieving restorative justice for communities who have borne the brunt of impact from the nuclear fuel cycle.

We support the development of an internal EJ advisory group, two-way in at the NRC through the NEPA process, and agree strongly with Reverend Woodberry that this group should consist of EJ leaders specifically working on justice issues in their community. The people convened as he suggested, they should have demonstrated work, and commitment to environmental, and social justice. But with the clear commitment we've seen from NRC, and the Biden administration at large to do better in this area.

But Energy Collective, where I'm at, we believe that together we can get this right, and ultimately leverage nuclear energy in an appropriate way to toward a emission reduction, and start

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

meaningfully addressing climate change. So, I'm very thankful to NRC for undertaking this effort, and holding this meeting today, and we look forward to communicating with the NRC throughout this process, thanks.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you, we appreciate your comment. Next caller please.

OPERATOR: Our next question, or comment comes from Caylene Walker, your line is open.

MS. WALKER: Hi there. I guess the way I see it, if the NRC were actually doing its job of regulating for safety, then this wouldn't even be a discussion. Then the consequences of poor regulatory process start impacting the wealthy white communities, and the regular New York City, or anywhere else that there might be impact from poorly contained nuclear waste for example in the canisters that the NRC has allowed, the push back is going to be even more extreme.

So, the environmental justice issue, I think really comes down to the NRC doing their job.

I've been kind of following the process over the last five years, kind of attending a lot of meetings. And what I've noticed is that the NEI has both boots in the door, and they're basically running the show on so many levels. With 72.48 process of exemption

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

regulations, if the NRC requires Title ten to be followed, we wouldn't have a lot of the problems that we have.

Yet, again, our city right now is so blatantly promoting the new nuclear. As for the gentleman, the 29 year old gentleman who was feeling so confident about the nuclear energy, I've become aware of a lot of impacted communities, and I'll just point out, Piketon for example, where the DOE radiation monitors registered Neptunium, Americium, and they shut down a junior high school here in Harrisonville, and lately children who had been in that school are dying with leukemia now, as we speak.

Meanwhile, the NRC has approved the enrichment facility at Piketon with only an environmental assessment. So, the categorical exclusions of NEPA that the NRC has been pushing for are just brazen violations of what should be a very inherent code of conduct within the NRC. So, unless the individual staff members use their conscience, and moral code this is hopeless. You can do whatever you want as far as having some kind of committee for environmental justice, but right now the NRC is seriously flawed in my humble opinion. Thank you.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you for your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

opinion Ms. Walker. Let's take the next caller please.

OPERATOR: Our next question, or comment comes from Kelly Munkhtuya, your line is open.

MS. MUNKHTUYA: Hello everyone, I'm Kelly, again, from Generation Atomic. And I really love everyone's concerns for these communities that are impacted. But you know what happens more frequently are communities that are being impacted by the effects of fossil fuels. There are far more communities facing those consequences, and so the only way that we're going to be able to decrease these low income POC communities being impacted by the effects of climate change, and emissions is by supporting nuclear power plants.

Because even though renewables are great, they simply do not produce enough base load energy to sustain our needs. Right now, I am calling in from good old windy city, AKA Chicago. But guess what? The wind is not blowing, and the sun is for sure not shining. So, guess what? The communities that are impacted by fossil fuels are going to continue to suffer until we transition completely, or majority to nuclear energy, and that way we can eliminate our carbon emissions. Thank you.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you, next caller please.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

OPERATOR: Our next question, or comment comes from Alyssa Hayes, your line is open.

MS. HAYES: Hello, can you hear me?

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Yes, we can.

MS. HAYES: Okay, good afternoon. Thank you, first and foremost to the NRC staffers, who have enabled this important conversation. I want to give a little bit of background about myself, because I think a few others have done similarly. I'm a bisexual woman of color. My mom immigrated to the United States from the Philippines when she was nine, so I am the first person in my mom's family to be born in the United States. Both my parents have a high school education, so I'm also the first person in my family to attend college.

My mom worked at a Walmart to support five kids, and I grew up in a community of color, but thanks to a FAFSA, multiple NEUP, or Nuclear Energy University Program scholarships, and university grants, I was able to afford the chance to earn my bachelor's degree in nuclear engineering from the University of Illinois, and I am now a current nuclear engineering PhD candidate at the University of Tennessee.

And I want to address the previous comments concerning the safety of nuclear power in our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

community. I know that the history of uranium mining is a shameful one, and it's one that the EPA is working to address through dispersing hundreds of millions of dollars in retroactive clean up grants, and I also know that long term geological storage of waste is a major point of political contention that has resulted in the indefinite temporary storage of used nuclear fuel in above ground dry casks.

And I will actually be visiting San Onofre myself this coming Sunday to visit their used fuel with the intention of posting educational information about nuclear waste. So, if anybody has a questions about San Onofre, waste handling specifically, feel free to post questions in the comments, and I'll try to get to them while I'm there on Sunday. But there have been multiple -- there's a plane.

Okay, there have been multiple instances of people on this call requesting for the NRC to be more transparent, to provide more educational content, and I think that there's a possible, realistic way to do so through publicizing the monitoring of extremely low level radiation released from basically all nuclear activity. There has been kind of a common theme that we've seen between people real concerned about even the most recent comment about radiation in schools,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

radiation from fuel fabrication, fuel waste storage.

Indian Point has been mentioned more than once, and everybody knows about the news articles about leaks from Indian Point. So, I think if we publicize, and take ownership of that level of radiation, and then pair those measurements with metrics for comparison that explain the minimal biological impact of Becquerels, and what's effectively like microrems of dose to people, that I think there's going to be less of a conspiratory mind set about what are they hiding?

We shouldn't have the, we don't want the perspective of what are they hiding. We should take ownership of this happened, it was not great, and we then kind of -- Indian Point is an example here to say this happened, and this is the full information of what we can release to the public about how much was released to everybody, what exactly happened at the planet. Because a lot of that stuff can be found in formal documents, but it's not easily accessible by the common person, and it should be.

We should take the responsibility to be transparent. A little bit going back to me, I actually grew up just 15 minutes away from Desai Nuclear Generating Station, which like Indian Point, was also decommissioned. Desai was decommissioned only a year

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

after I was born, and the consequences for me, living near Desai, living near the nuclear waste after Desai was decommissioned wasn't consequence related to safety, or radiation, it was economic.

That plant was a centerpiece of the Desai economy, so its premature shutdown was detrimental to my community. It was detrimental to the schools funded by those property taxes, and still more than 23 years after the plant was decommissioned, Desai schools still spend about 3000 dollars less per student than neighboring schools, like Greys, like Warrens, and Central.

And those economic issues are now being addressed by the state of Illinois, but I wanted to point out the severe impact of prematurely decommissioning a plant, and the long-term difficulties that the U.S. has experienced in our efforts to address them, not just Desai, but for the communities of other plants that have been decommissioned as well. Finally, essentially if a plant is located not in a big city, San Onofre is not going to have a major impact on the community of San Diego, or LA.

But for Desai, it's far enough removed from Chicago where it did have a major impact on the people

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

that live in that area. Finally, I do want to address one of the concerns of the Nuclear Information and Resource Service Representative, because climate change is no small problem. In 2019, fossil fuels comprised 84 percent of the energy consumed worldwide, and as developing nations improve their citizen's quality of life, demand for energy continues to escalate, and it is currently predicted that energy demand will double by 2055.

And right now we're seeing the biggest growth from yes renewables, but also from natural gas. Nuclear, and renewable need to work together to replace fossil fuels, but we keep fighting each other over who we should build more of, then that's just a distraction to allow fossil fuels to grow in the background. And this kind of draws back to Eric Meyer's comment in the very beginning that it's vital for the NRC --

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Ms. Hayes, Ms. Hayes, I have to stop you there, we have a couple more people in the queue, and --

MS. HAYES: I have one line, I'm reading off of a script, and this is one line, it's the last one.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Last line, okay go for it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MS. HAYES: Going back to Eric Meyer's comment, that is it's vital for the NRC to enable the efficient deployment of new reactors, particularly of full modular reactors, thank you for your time.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you. Next caller please.

OPERATOR: Our next question, or comment comes from Pamela Greenlaw.

MS. GREENLAW: I'm sorry, I stepped away for a minute, I apologize. I do think that we have moved away from the topic a little bit, and started going back, and forth about do we need nuclear, do we want nuclear, which isn't really the topic here. The topic is of environmental justice, and what NRC should do, and can do. And so I actually have a question, I don't know if you're going to answer any questions, because most of us are just making statements.

NRC has a specific set of responsibilities that to me appears to be limited, that you can do for your agency what you can do, and other agencies who control nuclear decisions, and so on, such as NSA, and DOE, and DOD need to do the same sort of policy examination. And I'm not sure, and here's my question, are you talking with those agencies about what their EJ policies are if they have any? And the second part

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

of my question is what other government agencies are you looking at as templates, or guidelines for your own EJ policy? Would you like me to repeat those?

MS. BIELECKI: I think I got them, so let me try, and if I miss something, just let me know, so this is Jessica Bielecki. The first thing you asked is are we talking to other federal agencies, and we certainly are. We have a pretty extensive benchmarking effort ongoing reaching out to agencies of various sizes, compositions, admissions. You asked some of the agencies we're talking to, a few of the examples include FIRC, EPA, DOE just to name a few.

And I think one thing you mentioned that we are very focused on in our review is our statutory mission, and what is within our authority, versus other agencies. Other agencies have different authorities.

So, while we are benchmarking, and making comparisons, we're always coming back to our mission, and how that fits together.

MS. GREENLAW: Well, I'm sure that you are, but what I'm saying is I guess I'm concerned about the influence of those agencies, and the nuclear weapons overlap that you all have with them through contracts, and through actions that take interagency agreements.

And so my suggestion is that NRC stand up, and I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

not saying that you're not standing up, that you be insistent with these other agencies about environmental justice, and don't let them water down what you come up with. We're looking forward to a very strong policy, the idea that Reverend Leon Woodberry, and others about the stakeholder process that follows the 17 EJ principles, are you all familiar with the 17 EJ Principles that was developed?

MS. BIELECKI: Yes.

MS. GREENLAW: Okay, great, so my question is well answered, you are looking at other agencies. But I am concerned about those that are involved in the weapons part, where there's overlap really now.

There shouldn't have been, but it's like mission creep, and industry capture of the very agencies that are supposed to regulate the industry, and it's a struggle, it's a balance, and it's not balanced very well right now. So, I'm just hoping that you will insist on having something that's unique, and effective that the other agencies will learn from you that we're trying to help you win. Thank you very much.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you Ms. Greenlaw.

We have two more callers in the queue, so let's get the next one please.

OPERATOR: Our next question, and comment

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

comes from Priscilla Preston, your line is open.

MS. PRESTON: Thank you. My name is Priscilla Preston, and I would like to just say that the whole reason we're having this discussion about environmental justice with the Nuclear Regulatory commission is because nuclear facilities are by definition dangerous. That's why they require regulation. You wouldn't need a regulatory commission in the same way for solar, or wind because they don't do the same amount of damage to the environment.

It's considered again, by definition, a polluting industry, just like a fossil fuel plant, or a hazardous waste site. So, given the fact that you have already acknowledged, by going through this process you have acknowledged that you're a dangerous industry, that these facilities are dangerous. And we've already gotten the point across that communication is a problem.

So, if we have the advisory committee, as suggested by Reverend Woodberry, I think the first thing to consider is given the fact that we have acknowledged that this is dangerous, what can be done to protect the people once something has been identified? Such as the uranium, and TC99 in the groundwater in lower Richland. What can people do to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

protect themselves, do they need to test their well water?

If so, how do they test their well water?

Which companies are reliable to test the well water?

How can they determine any other contaminants that would relate to the cumulative effects? So, that's my primary concern about how we communicate the safety issues, and how people can respond to these safety issues, thank you for having this panel discussion.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you. Your comments, and your concerns are noted, and we will take our last caller now.

OPERATOR: Our last question, or comment comes from Diane D'Arrigo, your line is open.

MS. D'ARRIGO: I have a comment, hold on, I just dumped something, hold on. I wanted to -- Diane D'Arrigo, Nuclear Information and Resource Service, and I wanted to read three sentences of which, if I can't find them real quick, I will just paraphrase that basically the NRC, I'm going to have to paraphrase, so I mentioned in my first round of comments, and it's come up with others that environmental justice doesn't just start from today, there's a history.

And the Navajo Nation, the Diné have just filed suit in international court on human rights

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

violations having to do with previous practices with uranium in their nations. And so it's clear from an objective perspective that there's a legal argument being made, we can talk about how previous wrongs have not been corrected, and now we've got a situation where the nation has made a statement against more uranium mining, there has been a license granted by the NRC, and there is a challenge.

So, I am wrong to speak for others, but no one has brought this up, and I think that it's worth being on the record that there is a legal challenge to current, and previous NRC activities that are clearly human rights, and environmental justice are very intertwined. Thank you.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you. While you were giving your comment, two other commenters have entered the queue, and those will be our last commenters for the evening, and we have at least one other message for everyone before we adjourn the meeting. So, let's take the next few callers, and we will give you some other messages that we'd like to share.

OPERATOR: Our next question, or comment comes from Erniko Brown, the line is open.

MS. BROWN: Good afternoon everyone, can you hear me?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Yes, we can.

MS. BROWN: Okay, fantastic. Yes, my name is Erniko Brown, and I'm the ECJ chair here on behalf of the NAACP, the South Carolina State Conference, and South Carolina. And I really just want to say that everybody has said so many things about the need, and the urgency around this, and the only thing that I really want to say is I went, and looked at your website, and it says the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission was created as an independent agency by Congress in 1974 to ensure the safe use of radioactive materials for beneficial civilian purposes while protecting people, and the environment.

The issues that are going on down in Lower Richland is we're having to do all of these things, then it's not beneficial, and it's not protecting. If we're having to do all these clean ups, then it's not helping. As far as the NRC, and learning what an environmental justice community is, I think that it is high time that individuals really understand the people, and the pain, and the process of what these people are dealing with.

To have these things in communities that aren't beneficial to the community, and having that be a compound injustice occurs for particular

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

communities like the Lower Richland Community. There is a paper mill plant, there are several different things. I always, having these things in low-income communities aren't beneficial to the community. Yes, they bring about some economic development, but what good is that economic development if you're killing the people in the process? And how do we protect the people not only in that community, but in other communities where these nuclear places are placed.

How do we protect the people who aren't at the table, who can't have access to having their voices heard? How do we bring about a change in the communities that are beneficial to everyone, and not just the people who are profiting off of these communities? I think that we really need to stop building, and stop pouring money into these plants, or have these plants, and communities where people who have access would have them. These plants are almost always placed in low income, low wealth communities that are environmental justice communities.

And this issue is not only a environmental justice issue, this is a civil rights issue, a human rights issue, and we really need to stop looking at the profits, and start seeing the people. Because the people are being affected tremendously, and there needs

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

to be a change in what's going on, and I feel like a multi-agency conversation should be had, and people should be educated. I think that the people who sit in these offices are never the people who are sitting, and living in these communities, and it should be more than just one house conversation about what's going on.

I really feel like the two gentlemen who came to Columbia, I think that more people need to come, more education needs to be had, and people need a real opportunity, and I really think that these agencies who are over these regulations, and these commissions really need to come to these communities, and see what's going on, and see what's happening in these communities, and how people are impacted, and affected by what you're regulating. Thank you.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you Ms. Brown.
Last caller please.

OPERATOR: Our last question or comment comes from Brian Campbell. Your line is open.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, hello, thank you for letting me speak. Ed Lyman's Organization for Concerned Scientists has references, the father of climate change awareness, James Hanson. A leading climate scientist, and director of NASA Institute for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

Space Studies testified before Congress that scientific data confirmed humans' role in climate change. That same year, 1988, the intergovernmental panel on climate change was created.

I suggest that the 42 million dollar a year Union of Concerned Scientists take James Hanson off their website since, when he was a NASA scientist under the Obama administration in 2013, he, and another scientist did a study that said that because of nuclear power, 1.8 million lives were saved. So, I'm just hoping that Ed disagrees with that finding, so it's obviously the Obama administration let that slip through some way, I don't know why.

So, I was a member of the Sierra Club. The Sierra Club is definitely against nuclear power, as is the Union of Concerned Scientists. The Sierra Club has a much bigger, almost a billion dollars a year budget. They promoted the shutdown of Indian Point Nuclear Plant along with Governor Cuomo, and Governor Cuomo got significant campaign contributions from natural gas industry, and he built two new power plants, 2018, and 2020 to take over generation of Indian Point.

But Indian Point put too much power out, and it was prematurely closed. We had rolling blackouts in New York City on June 30th, this year after

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

Indian Point was closed. And that has directly involved with delivering power, and other things in New York City. As far as environmental Justice goes, well those two plants that were built still can't take over Indian Point on electrical generation. So, we have to have more generation done in Brooklyn, at Ravenswood, and Historia Natural Gas Plant.

But they also can burn oil, which is going to have to be done, which is 2-point micron particle pollution, and that's in New York City. And then we have Newburgh, another environmental justice community. We're going to build a 500-megawatt Danskammer power plant there that's going to take over from the old one that's there currently that's not generating, and that's going to be a new gas plant in that environmental justice community.

When it comes down to it, when you take away nuclear power, you're killing people, and you're also putting the electrical grid in severe unreliable power situations. So, these people in New York city, they're going to be getting more blackouts. At the same time, natural gas prices are peaking. We have to pay a lot more for natural gas, it's gone up 90 percent just this year. 90 percent, nevermind the other fossil fuels, coal has gone up about 60 percent.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

That makes nuclear a lot more affordable. But Indian Point was a profitable plant to begin with.

But now it's closed, so now we're going to have more emissions, and that's going to affect environmental justice communities in New York City.

So, thank you for allowing me to speak. And James Hanson, the father of climate change awareness, to me he is putting out accurate information, and when you have the money of the Sierra Club, by the way the Sierra Club took 26 million dollars from Chesapeake Gas in 2012, it's one of the reasons why I don't support the Sierra Club, and not only that, the Sierra Club sells solar panels. So, their interests are not in nuclear panel by any means --

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Mr. Campbell, we will have to ask you to --

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, and I thank you very much.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you very much for your comments, thank you very much. With that we are wrapping up right now. I want to ask everyone to remember to fill out their participation forms and let us know how this meeting worked for you. If you have written comments, please we're still taking comments, get those in. I'm going to now turn it over to Jessica

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

Bielecki for some additional information before we close for the evening.

MS. BIELECKI: Thanks Larniece, and once again, thank you all for your attendance tonight, I know our meeting is running late, and we appreciate you listening, we appreciate you engaging, we've heard a lot today, just going through my list, information about impacts on communities, past, and present, climate change. Challenges related to accessing information, outreach engagement, concerns related to cumulative impacts, and communications, as well as a whole host of recommendations about, for example creation of an advisory committee, proactively providing education.

Looking at an anti environmental racism policy, our adjudicatory proceedings, policy statement revisions, engagement with agencies, as well as communities, just to name a few, so thank you, thank you, all things we will be considering carefully as we continue with our analysis, and prepare our report to the commission later in February of this year. And so, real quick before we break, separate from this EJ effort, I'd like to take a moment to highlight another opportunity where the NRC is seeking feedback.

And this is on our transformation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

initiative, again, this is separate from what we're doing, but wanted to share this with everyone, so next slide please. For the last few years, NRC has been focused on transforming the way that we do business to become a more modern risk informed regulator. To check in to see how we're doing, the NRC is seeking feedback from external stakeholders on our transforming efforts. For example, what do you think about our efforts, and are there suggestions for our future transformation activities?

Next slide please. To provide comments on the transformation effort, you can go to our public website and enter transformation survey on the search bar. Or you can call 1 800 638 8081, and leave a verbal comment any time between now, and March 31st. So, that's all I have, thanks again for listening in, for engaging, and we hope you all enjoy the rest of your day.

MS. MCKOY MOORE: Thank you Jessica, thank you everyone for your time, and your respect, and with that, the meeting is adjourned.

OPERATOR: Thank you for your participation, this concludes today's conference, you may disconnect at this time, thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 5:10 p.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14th STREET, N.W., SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309