

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

Title:                    Scoping Process for the Waste Confidence  
                                 Environmental Impact Statement: Webinar

Docket Number:    (NRC 2012-2049)

Location:            NRC/Webinar

Date:                 Thursday, December 6, 2012

Work Order No.:    NRC-2049

Pages 1-108

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

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
+ + + + +  
WASTE CONFIDENCE DIRECTORATE  
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR MATERIAL SAFETY AND SAFEGUARDS  
+ + + + +  
WEBINAR  
SCOPING PROCESS FOR THE WASTE CONFIDENCE  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

+ + + + +  
THURSDAY

DECEMBER 6, 2012

+ + + + +

The webinar was held at 9:00 p.m.  
Eastern Standard Time, Miriam Juckett, facilitator,  
presiding.

NRC STAFF PRESENT:

MIRIAM JUCKETT, Facilitator

ANDY IMBODEN, Chief, Communications, Planning,  
and Rulemaking Branch

LISA LONDON, Esq., Reactors and Materials  
Rulemaking, Office of General Counsel

KEITH McCONNELL, Ph.D., Director, Waste Confidence  
Directorate

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

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

NRC STAFF PRESENT (CONT'D)

PAUL MICHALAK, Chief, Environmental Impact Statement

Branch

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

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

Introduction ..... 4

Introduction to Mission and Formation of Waste  
Confidence Directorate, Keith McConnell ..... 9

Background and History of Waste Confidence,  
Lisa London, Esq., ..... 18

Approach to Scoping, Paul Michalak ..... 17

Public Participation Opportunities,  
Andy Imboden ..... 20

Question & Answer Session ..... 23

Comment Session ..... 54

Closing Comments & Adjournment ..... 111

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

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

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

9:00 p.m.

MS. JUCKETT: Good evening, and welcome to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Webinar on the Scope of the Environment Impact Statements to Support an Updated Waste Confidence Decision and Rule.

My name is Miriam Juckett, and I will be serving as your facilitator this evening.

I'd first of all like to go through the meeting process. I'll mention the objections, the format, the agenda, I'll introduce the NRC staff and then the ground rules.

We have two main objectives for this evening's meeting.

First of all, we would like to provide clear information to you on the NRC's staff approach to the waste confidence EIS. Then, we would like to present an opportunity for you to give your questions, comments, recommendations and concern to the NRC staff on the scope of the EIS and on the EIS process.

All the comments tonight will be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 considered with the same weight as written comments.  
2 And we do solicit your written comments as well as  
3 your spoken comments this evening.

4 The format for tonight is a webinar  
5 meeting. You can view the slides online which will  
6 be beginning with the four NRC staff presentations.  
7 Then to make a comment, call in using the toll-free  
8 number that will be provided.

9 This is the second webinar in our  
10 series. Tonight's webinar and the webinar from  
11 yesterday will be posted online. The transcript from  
12 the first public meeting on November 14, as well as  
13 the webcast transcripts are already available on the  
14 Waste Confidence website, which will be provided in  
15 the presentations.

16 The ground rules for tonight are very  
17 simple. Please hold your questions and comments  
18 until after the presentations. To make sure that we  
19 get a chance to hear from everyone, we ask that you  
20 please limit your comments to just five minutes.

21 The webinar goes until Midnight Eastern  
22 Time tonight or 9:00 p.m. Pacific Time. This is a  
23 lot of time for your comments, but we do ask that you  
24 give new callers a chance to make a comment before  
25 you call in for second or third comments.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           As a reminder, when you would like to  
2           make a comment, press \*1, and we'll remind you again  
3           of that during the comment period.

4           The agenda for this evening is as  
5           follows. We'll have four presentations. The first  
6           is an introduction to the mission and the formation  
7           of the Waste Confidence Directorate by Keith  
8           McConnell, the Director. Second, we'll have Lisa  
9           London from the Office of General Counsel talking  
10          about the background and the waste confidence  
11          decision. Third, we'll hear from Paul Michalak, the  
12          Chief of the EIS Branch in the Waste Confidence  
13          Directorate on the approach to scoping. Last, we'll  
14          hear from Andy Imboden, Chief of the Communications,  
15          Planning and Rulemaking Branch in the Waste  
16          Confidence Directorate. And he'll be speaking about  
17          public participation opportunities.

18          These presentations will be followed by  
19          a 20-minute question and answer period. During this  
20          time, the NRC staff will take your questions and try  
21          to provide some answers.

22          We'll take a ten-minute break following  
23          that, and when we reconvene, we'll have the remainder  
24          of the time for your comments. During that time, the  
25          NRC staff may not respond to the comments

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 immediately, but your comments will be noted and  
2 added to the scoping summary report and considered in  
3 the formation of the EIS.

4 I'd like to go ahead and introduce the  
5 speakers from the NRC.

6 Our first speaker is Keith McConnell  
7 who's the Director. Keith joined the NRC in 1986 as  
8 a geologist. He was on the staff of three former  
9 Chairman of the NRC and the Director of the  
10 Commission's Adjudicatory Technical Support Program  
11 in OGC. Most recently, he was the Deputy Director of  
12 the Decommissioning and Uranium Recovery Directorate  
13 in the Federal, State Materials and Environmental  
14 Management Office. His educational background is a  
15 Bachelor's in geology from Clemson, a Master's in  
16 geological sciences from the Virginia Polytechnic  
17 Institute and a Ph.D. in geological sciences from the  
18 University of South Carolina.

19 Our next speaker is Lisa London, an  
20 attorney for the Directorate. She attended NOVA  
21 Shepard Broad Law Center and did a legal externship  
22 with the Department of Justice for the Environmental  
23 Enforcement Division. She then served ten years as  
24 an enforcement attorney in the Florida Department of  
25 Environmental Protection. She has been in OGC for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 the last three years working on radioactive waste  
2 issues.

3 Paul Michalak is the Branch Chief for  
4 the EIS. He joined the NRC in 2005 as a hydrologist  
5 in the Uranium Recovery Program. He served as a  
6 Senior Project Manager for NRC's Office of New  
7 Reactors overseeing preparation of EISs on license  
8 applications for new reactors. Before NRC, he was an  
9 environmental consultant. Prior to joining the  
10 Directorate, he served as Chief of the Materials  
11 Decommissioning Branch in the FSME Division. He has  
12 a Bachelor's in Education from Temple University and  
13 a Master's in hydrology from the New Mexico Institute  
14 of Mining and Technology.

15 Andy Imboden is a Branch Chief, and he  
16 began his career with NRC in 2004 on the staff of  
17 former Chairman Jazcko. He then worked for the NRC's  
18 EDO. He was the Chief of the Environmental Review  
19 Branch, Division of Reactor License Renewal and NRR.  
20 Prior to coming to the Waste Confidence Directorate,  
21 he was on Chairman McFarlane's staff as a materials  
22 policy advisor. And prior to coming to NRC, he was a  
23 consulting engineering. His educational background  
24 is a Bachelor's in meteorology from Penn State and a  
25 Master's in environmental engineering from Clemson.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   Again, we would like to thank you for  
2                   joining us this evening. And now, we will go to our  
3                   first presentation by Keith.

4                   MR. McCONNELL: Thank you, Miriam.

5                   We in the Waste Confidence Directorate  
6                   would also like to welcome you all to this webinar on  
7                   Scoping the Generic Environmental Impact Statement to  
8                   support a revised waste confidence decision and rule.

9                   My opening remarks tonight will provide  
10                  some background information on the meeting purposes,  
11                  mission of the NRC and the mission of the recently-  
12                  formed Waste Confidence Directorate that was stood up  
13                  specifically to develop this generic environmental  
14                  impact statement.

15                  For the meeting purposes, there are  
16                  three. As Miriam has indicated, we're going to  
17                  provide some background information on the waste  
18                  confidence decision specifically to help you  
19                  formulate your comments and questions as we move  
20                  forward with the development of the GEIS. And Lisa  
21                  London will provide specifics on that.

22                  We'll then move on and talk about the  
23                  environmental impact statement development. Paul  
24                  Michalak will talk about some of the proposals we  
25                  have with scoping the generic environmental impact

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 statement.

2 And then again, as Miriam as indicated,  
3 we'll talk about the public participation  
4 opportunities. And Andy Imboden will specifically  
5 address those opportunities.

6 But the bottom line of this outreach  
7 opportunity -- this webinar -- as well as all of our  
8 outreach opportunities is that we want to hear from  
9 you.

10 Before talking about the NRC's mission  
11 and the Waste Confidence Directorate mission, it's  
12 important to put the development of the generic  
13 environmental impact statement into context. And  
14 there are two important considerations that help us  
15 do that.

16 First, as we move forward in the  
17 development of this generic environmental impact  
18 statement, we will need to address the deficiencies  
19 identified by the U.S. Court of Appeals from the  
20 District of Columbia when they vacated the 2010 rule  
21 and sent it back to us to fix those deficiencies.

22 In addition, subsequent to the  
23 publication of the Court's decision, the NRC  
24 Commission noted that it would not issue licenses  
25 that are dependent on this waste confidence decision

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 until all of our analyses and the Commission's  
2 deliberations are complete.

3 Moving on to the NRC's mission, there  
4 are three elements to our mission. First is the  
5 protection of public health and safety. We do that  
6 through the licensing and inspection of nuclear power  
7 plants and the use of nuclear materials.

8 The second element is to promote the  
9 common defense and security. We do that through the  
10 implementation of appropriate security measures based  
11 on the existing threat.

12 And the third element is the protection  
13 of the environment. We do that through the  
14 identification and consideration of impacts that  
15 might result from our licensing action.

16 I would note that we have over 30 years  
17 experience in regulating the safe operation of power  
18 reactors and the civilian use of nuclear materials.

19 Moving on to the Waste Confidence  
20 Directorate, again, it was formed approximately two  
21 months ago. It's housed in the Office of Nuclear  
22 Material Safety and Safeguards. In staffing, the  
23 organization reached out across the Agency to bring  
24 into the Waste Confidence Directorate some of the  
25 most experienced staff in implementation of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 National Environmental Policy Act.

2 As a consequence, we have a highly  
3 skilled staff in the Directorate of environmental,  
4 communications, rulemaking and legal staff members.  
5 We're supported ably by the Center for Nuclear  
6 Regulatory Analysis which is based in San Antonio,  
7 Texas.

8 The mission of the Waste Confidence  
9 Directorate was specified by the Commission in a  
10 staff requirements memorandum. We are to develop a  
11 generic environmental impact statement to support and  
12 revise waste confidence decision and rule. Secondly,  
13 we are to provide for ample opportunity for public  
14 participation in the development of this GEIS.

15 And I would like to just pause a minute  
16 -- even though Andy is going to speak directly to  
17 this -- and talk a little bit about our approach to  
18 public participation.

19 Within the Directorate, we have a focus  
20 communication team. Four staff members are devoted  
21 to outreach to those individuals that might be  
22 interested in what we do and how we do it and when  
23 we're going to do it in terms of developing this  
24 generic environmental impact statement. We intend to  
25 use multiple communication tools including blogs,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Twitter, YouTube and others. And I would note that  
2 we do have a website that's reachable through the NRC  
3 home page. And the address is listed on the slide.  
4 And Andy will talk more about this.

5 So in summary, again, the licenses that  
6 are dependent on the waste confidence decision will  
7 not be issued until the rule is updated and the  
8 deficiencies identified by the Court addressed. The  
9 Waste Confidence Directorate has been formed, is up  
10 and running, and we've reached out across the Agency  
11 and brought into the Directorate some of the most  
12 knowledgeable National Environmental Policy Act  
13 experts. We have a strong focus on communication,  
14 and we will provide for ample opportunity for public  
15 participation.

16 Thank you, Miriam.

17 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Keith.

18 And next we will hear from Lisa.

19 MS. LONDON: Thanks, Miriam.

20 So I'm here today to talk to you a  
21 little bit about the background and history of waste  
22 confidence and also to provide a common framework for  
23 us to use going forward in tonight's discussions.

24 It's really important for us to make  
25 sure we all have a common understanding of what waste

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 confidence is and what it is not. It's a generic  
2 environmental analysis. Under the National  
3 Environmental Policy Act, the Commission must assess  
4 the impacts of continued storage of spent nuclear  
5 fuel pending disposal at a repository. It's also a  
6 generic determination that fuel can be stored safely  
7 until a repository becomes available.

8 What waste confidence is not is it's not  
9 a licensing decision. It doesn't license any  
10 particular site or facility. And it does not allow  
11 for long-term storage of spent fuel at any site.  
12 Before that could occur, a licensee would have to  
13 come back to the NRC, and there would be a separate  
14 opportunity for public involvement prior to any post-  
15 license life storage of spent fuel.

16 This slide is simply to demonstrate how  
17 waste confidence fits into the Commission's overall  
18 environmental analysis for reactor licensing. On the  
19 left of the slide, you'll notice a green block. And  
20 that represents the term of the license life for a  
21 reactor. In the middle is the blue block, and that  
22 is the generic waste confidence analysis that looks  
23 at post-license life storage. And to the right is  
24 the yellow. And that's a generic environmental  
25 analysis that looks at the environmental impacts

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 associated with disposal.

2 At the bottom you'll notice a timeline.  
3 And this was actually taken from the 2010 rule. We  
4 did that just to provide some context. It's here for  
5 reference only. We haven't pre-judged how long the  
6 post-license life storage will be. We just wanted to  
7 make sure everyone understood how waste confidence  
8 factors into the overall environmental analysis that  
9 the Commission undertakes.

10 Next slide, please.

11 So I'd like to provide a little  
12 background on waste confidence so that everyone  
13 understands where we started and how we got here.

14 The waste confidence rule was originally  
15 adopted by the Commission in 1984 in response to a  
16 1979 Court decision from the D.C. Court of Appeals  
17 that led the Commission to look at the issues  
18 associated with waste confidence. This resulted in  
19 the generic and environmental safety findings that  
20 you would find in the 1984 rule.

21 Since then, the rule has been updated a  
22 number of times, most recently in 2010. In 2012, the  
23 Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit vacated and  
24 remanded, or basically they threw it out and they  
25 sent it back to us to do more work. They threw out

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 the 2010 rule and associated decision, sent it back,  
2 said do some more work.

3 Next slide.

4 Here we've got a short summary of what  
5 the Court actually found. The Court identified three  
6 specific problems with the Commission's environmental  
7 analysis to support the 2010 waste confidence rule.  
8 It found that the analysis didn't evaluate the  
9 environmental effects of failing to secure permanent  
10 disposal. And we'll be calling that the no  
11 repository scenario. You'll hear a little bit about  
12 that a little later on.

13 The Court also directed the Commission  
14 to provide an updated assessment of spent-fuel pool  
15 leaks and spent-fuel pool fires. As with the no  
16 repository scenario, you'll be hearing a little bit  
17 about how those are going to factor into our analysis  
18 going forward.

19 But the Court did find that a generic  
20 environmental assessment and associated finding of no  
21 significant impact or a generic environmental impact  
22 statement is an acceptable means to address the  
23 issues associated with waste confidence. And in  
24 response, the Commission established the Directorate  
25 that Keith mentioned and directed the staff to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 prepare an EIS to look at these generic issues with  
2 the possibility of issuing an updated waste  
3 confidence rule.

4 So finally, there are two things I'd  
5 like o leave you with, that I'd like to make sure you  
6 keep in mind as we go forward with tonight's  
7 discussions.

8 First is that the waste confidence rule  
9 is just a small part of the overall environmental  
10 analysis for reactor licensing. That timeline slide  
11 we went over a few minute ago, that demonstrates how  
12 waste confidence fits into the steps the Commission  
13 must take.

14 And the second thing is that waste  
15 confidence doesn't license any facility or authorize  
16 any storage of spent nuclear fuel. Before that could  
17 happen, there would be another opportunity for public  
18 participation, and a separate action would have to be  
19 taken by the Commission.

20 So thanks for everyone's consideration.  
21 Thank you, Miriam.

22 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Lisa, for that  
23 background presentation.

24 And next we'll go ahead and go to Paul.

25 MR. MICHALAK: Thanks, Miriam.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           As previously discussed, we are  
2           developing an update to the waste confidence rule.  
3           As part of that effort, we will develop and  
4           environmental impact statement, also known by its  
5           acronym EIS. The analyses and conclusions in that  
6           environmental impact statement will inform our update  
7           to the waste confidence rule.

8           Presently, we're working on defining the  
9           scope of the environmental impact statement.  
10          Tonight's webinar is part of the scoping process, and  
11          we're here to get your comments and feedback.

12          Why develop an environmental impact  
13          statement? As previously mentioned, earlier this  
14          year, the Court of Appeals vacated and remanded the  
15          2010 waste confidence rule. Our mission is to revise  
16          the waste confidence rule, addressing the  
17          deficiencies identified by the Court.

18          When developing a rule, the Commission  
19          must comply with the National Environmental Policy  
20          Act, also known as NEPA, by considering the effect of  
21          its actions on the environment. The environmental  
22          impact statement under development will contain our  
23          analyses of the environmental impacts of the updated  
24          waste confidence rule. I think it is important to  
25          note that the Commission is determined that waste

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 confidence should be evaluated with an environmental  
2 impact statement due to public and stakeholder  
3 interests.

4 The environmental impact statement  
5 currently under development is an integral component  
6 of the NRC's proposed action, which is to revise the  
7 waste confidence decision and rule to account for the  
8 safety and environmental impacts of continued spent-  
9 fuel storage for some period beyond the license life  
10 for reactor operations.

11 We have developed several potential  
12 scenarios as part of our internal scoping. The  
13 scenarios are based on different timelines for spent-  
14 fuel storage beyond a reactor's license life for  
15 operation. Currently, we will evaluate spent-fuel  
16 storage until a repository becomes available at the  
17 middle of the century, storage until a repository  
18 becomes available at the end of the century, and  
19 continued storage in the event a repository is not  
20 available.

21 The environmental impact statement under  
22 development will contain a generic analysis of  
23 impacts. We will not focus on capturing site-  
24 specific technical issues. Our current strategy is  
25 to take affected environments -- for example, air or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 water -- and develop a set of general characteristics  
2 and associated ranges to bound the conditions of  
3 spent-fuel storage throughout the United States. Our  
4 analyses will also contain an assessment of spent-  
5 fuel pool leaks and fires.

6 We're presently in the middle of the  
7 scoping period, and we welcome your comments.

8 Thanks, Miriam.

9 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Paul.

10 And for our last presentation, we'll go  
11 to Andy.

12 MR. IMBODEN: Thank you.

13 My name is Andy Imboden. I'm the Chief  
14 of the Communications, Planning and Rulemaking  
15 Branch. And before we get to question and answer, I  
16 wanted to take a quick minute to share NRC's plans  
17 for participation opportunities right now and over  
18 the next two years.

19 This slide has our preliminary schedule.  
20 There's three main phases: the scoping period,  
21 followed by a draft environmental impact statement  
22 and proposed rule -- and there will be a public  
23 comment period on those documents -- followed by a  
24 final environmental impact statement and rule. We're  
25 currently in the scoping period.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Next slide, please.

2 Scoping goes until January 2, 2013.

3 It's a 70-day public comment period during which we  
4 are receiving written comments at any time. This  
5 evening, you have the opportunity to put your  
6 comments on the record.

7 After the scoping period closes, the NRC  
8 will collect all the comments, no matter how they  
9 were submitted, and the NRC will take these comments  
10 into consideration as we develop the draft  
11 environmental impact statement.

12 We intend to have regional meetings on  
13 the draft document. So in particular, we would like  
14 your feedback and input on where those meetings might  
15 be held.

16 At the conclusion of the scoping period,  
17 we will prepare a summary of the comments we  
18 received, including the significant issues that have  
19 been identified. And we will make this publicly  
20 available probably in the spring.

21 This slide shows the draft environmental  
22 impact statement and proposed rule. We estimate they  
23 will be available in the fall of 2013, and there will  
24 be another opportunity for public involvement then.

25 At that point, we'll be looking for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 feedback and comments on the NRC's analysis and  
2 preliminary conclusions. During that time, we will  
3 receive written comments again and will have public  
4 meetings and webinars to get your comments on the  
5 record.

6 The final stage of the project will be  
7 the final environmental impact statement and rule.  
8 And we estimate that will occur in August of 2014.  
9 At that time, we'll also have the comments we've  
10 received on the draft and the NRC's consideration of  
11 those comments.

12 The next slide has details on how to  
13 submit scoping comments. I won't speak to the  
14 details, but if you're just calling in and don't have  
15 Internet access, please grab a pen.

16 Call us at 1-800-368-5642, extension  
17 492-3425, and we'll get you the details and  
18 information you need.

19 On my final slide are just some of the  
20 other ways that you can get information on this  
21 project, track our progress and how you can stay in  
22 touch with our activities. For example, you will be  
23 able to access our slides and a transcript of  
24 tonight's meeting from these websites. The slides  
25 and transcripts from the November 14 public meetings

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 are already posted in the Public Participation  
2 Section of this website.

3 Thank you for your consideration.

4 Miriam?

5 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Andy.

6 Coming up in just a moment, we'll begin  
7 our question and answer session where you are welcome  
8 to call in and ask questions to the NRC staff on  
9 their presentations or on the scope of the EIS.

10 If you have a slide in front of you on  
11 your computer, you'll see the number and the pass  
12 code to call in. If you are just listening, you  
13 probably are already on the line. But just in case,  
14 that is 1-800-475-8385 with pass code 3682386.

15 I will also go ahead and introduce that  
16 our operator this evening is Anna. And we have Eric  
17 Hendrixson, who is our court reporter who will be  
18 transcribing your comments and questions as they come  
19 in.

20 Anna, do we have any callers on the  
21 line? If you would like to make a comment or ask a  
22 question, press \*1 and we can add you to the queue.

23 Anna, do we have anyone on the line?

24 OPERATOR: I'm sorry. At the moment, we  
25 do not. But as a reminder, press \*1 if you have a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 question or comment.

2 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. And we'll be  
3 glad to wait for those who may have questions who are  
4 dialing in at this time.

5 Anna, I see that we have a Mary Olson on  
6 the line. Can you add Mary to our conference call?

7 OPERATOR: Certainly.

8 Mary Olson, your line is now open.

9 MS. OLSON: Is this the time for  
10 questions?

11 MS. JUCKETT: Yes, Mary. Go ahead with  
12 your question.

13 MS. OLSON: Okay. I'm wondering,  
14 there's been a growing pile of technical kind of  
15 nerdy details about irradiated fuel. And I don't  
16 really know whether -- to what extent this is going  
17 to be an opportunity for those things to be factored  
18 in. I mean, I guess some of them actually do come  
19 under like the fuel pool issues. But I'm just  
20 wondering how -- how -- how deep into technical sort  
21 of arcane aspects of this material are you going to  
22 go, are you just kind of going with the -- it's going  
23 to be somewhere anyway and we're storing it this way.  
24 I mean, is this the opportunity to really start  
25 looking at new alternatives or just kind of re-

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 shuffling the same deck?

2 MS. JUCKETT: So, Mary, just to make  
3 sure we understand your question correctly, you're  
4 trying to find out how much technical detail will be  
5 included in the EIS that has to do with the fuel?

6 MS. OLSON: Yes. I mean, I'll just give  
7 you an example.

8 I only recently heard, and I've been  
9 focused on this stuff for 22 years, that I guess in  
10 '92 somebody published that pyrophoria of irradiated  
11 fuel cladding -- spent-fuel cladding -- doesn't  
12 actually subside after five years like I was taught  
13 years ago but in fact it's an ongoing issue. And so,  
14 it's like those kinds of levels of concern could  
15 engender some pretty novel and interesting new  
16 alternatives being considered for how we handle and  
17 store this stuff. But I don't know if this process  
18 is opening up those sort of new information  
19 categories or just looking as I say re-shuffling the  
20 same deck that we've got dry casks, we've got wet  
21 storage. That's it.

22 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. Thank you, Mary.  
23 I'm going to ask Paul to try to address that question  
24 on how much new information there might be and how  
25 much old information we're planning on using.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. MICHALAK: We're going to use all  
2 the existing -- relevant existing information in  
3 developing the environmental impact statement. And  
4 if I have this correct, Mary was talking about  
5 potential spent-fuel pool fires. And that will  
6 definitely be addressed as required by the Court in  
7 the EIS. But we won't be doing any new research in  
8 developing our impacts. We will be looking at the  
9 breadth of existing work in spent-fuel pool fires.

10 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. Thank you, Paul.

11 Mary, did that answer what you were  
12 looking to have answered?

13 MS. OLSON: It does. I'm beginning to  
14 realize that there could be these fires in other  
15 types of situations than just the fuel pools. So  
16 that's where maybe I'll give you some comments.

17 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. We would  
18 appreciate those, and you're welcome to submit those  
19 in writing as well.

20 MS. OLSON: We will be --

21 MS JUCKETT: Great. Thank you.

22 Anna, I think our next caller that we  
23 would like to hear from is Laura Sorensen.

24 OPERATOR: Laura, you line is open.

25 MS. SORENSEN: Hi. This is Laura.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I don't have a computer in front of me.  
2 The webinar didn't work. I couldn't see your slides.

3 I had a question. I think I heard him  
4 say they'll be a separate action on the EIS for new  
5 licenses. Does that mean if, for example, the W.S.  
6 Lee has not been an issued a license, it's had a  
7 draft hearing on the EIS? What happens now? Do the  
8 people -- are you going back to their town so they  
9 can look at the spent-fuel and waste issues in their  
10 community more thoroughly because it wasn't discussed  
11 in the prior EIS or a hearing in their town?

12 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. Thank you, Laura.  
13 I think Keith would like to respond to that.

14 MR. McCONNELL: Yes, the site-specific  
15 reviews that are ongoing would continue up to the  
16 point where a license would be issued. So the staff  
17 will continue its reviews on those site-specific  
18 reactor licensing actions. But just the final  
19 licensing won't be done. There will be no license  
20 issued until the Court's deficiencies are addressed  
21 and the Commission has revised its waste confidence  
22 decision.

23 MS. SORENSEN: I understand that.

24 MR. McCONNELL: Okay.

25 MS. SORENSEN: There's a delay for two

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 years on issuing a license. But the people in t his  
2 town never really had anything specific being told to  
3 them about the waste that would be stored there in  
4 their town for who knows how long. And there was no  
5 discussion of that in their hearing. Are they going  
6 to get another hearing?

7 MR. McCONNELL: Not part of the  
8 development of this generic environmental impact  
9 statement. All of those activities would be done in  
10 the context of a site-specific licensing action.

11 Now we do in waste confidence address  
12 that period of time from when an operating reactor  
13 ends its operations until final disposition in a  
14 geologic repository. So for that aspect of specific  
15 licensing action, that would be what we would address  
16 in terms of our waste confidence efforts.

17 Does that help?

18 MS. SORENSEN: Yes. I think I'll  
19 probably read what you said because I --

20 MR. McCONNELL: Okay.

21 MS. SORENSEN: -- it's a little hard to  
22 hear.

23 But I had one more question was there  
24 was a date you said something was going to happen in  
25 the spring. But then you said there will be regional

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in the fall. You're having a draft EISs in the fall  
2 of 2013, is that what you said?

3 MS. JUCKETT: Yes, Laura. I'll let Andy  
4 address that. That was in his presentation.

5 MR. IMBODEN: Yes. Thank you.

6 In the spring, what we are planning on  
7 producing is a scoping summary report where we will  
8 show all the public comments that we've received and  
9 have some -- basically the NRC is going to put out a  
10 document so you can -- here's what we heard. That's  
11 going to be in the spring.

12 In the fall, there will be a draft  
13 environmental impact statement and a proposed rule.  
14 And we'll be in another public comment period on  
15 those documents. And as part of that, we're  
16 considering having regional meetings throughout the  
17 country to also have a means where people could come  
18 and present comments face-to-face with NRC staff.

19 And so, one of the things I'm in  
20 particular interested in is where should those  
21 meetings be because waste confidence is a generic  
22 issue. It impacts all parts of the country.

23 So if you have any specific comments on  
24 where we should have those meetings, we'd love to  
25 hear that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MS. SORENSEN: Are you limited to a  
2 certain number of hearings? Or are you really open  
3 to hearing what's necessary, or have you picked a  
4 number of how many you can have?

5 MR. IMBODEN: We haven't picked a  
6 number. I think a reasonable number might be  
7 something like four to six meetings around the  
8 country. But we definitely haven't settled on a  
9 number or anything like that.

10 We wanted to see what people thought  
11 about that. So we're asking that question  
12 specifically right now so we can plan what's  
13 reasonable.

14 MS. SORENSEN: Thank you very much.

15 MS. JUCKETT: And Laura, if you do have  
16 Internet access at some time, you will be able to  
17 access these slides after this webinar is over or at  
18 another time. And the previous information that was  
19 on the website does include things like the timeline  
20 and the dates and things like that. So hopefully --

21 MS. SORENSEN: Yes. I have this screen  
22 in front of me that says download complete, but  
23 nothing is happening.

24 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. Well, I think we'll  
25 try to get --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MS. SORENSEN: It's okay. We're past  
2 that point.

3 MS. JUCKETT: Okay.

4 MS. SORENSEN: Let's move on. Thank  
5 you.

6 MS. JUCKETT: Well, thank you very much  
7 for your call. We appreciate your question.

8 Anna, next we would like to go to Tom  
9 Rielly.

10 MR. RIELLY: Yes. Good evening. I am  
11 Tom Rielly, Executive Principal of Vista 360. I am  
12 in the Chicago area.

13 We'd like to advance a comment as  
14 constructive a suggestion based on this webinar being  
15 categorized as a generic scoping meeting,  
16 specifically for a waste confidence environmental  
17 impact statement and that fundamentals and  
18 assumptions are important inputs at the front end.  
19 Our suggestion is fundamentally generic, and we are  
20 seeking notation, not comment.

21 The term stakeholder as used or  
22 referenced in the NRC's lexicon doesn't seem to be  
23 institutionally formalized by a clear definition  
24 appearing anywhere granting that the term stakeholder  
25 is cited universally in the narrative and appears

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 likewise in electronic and in printed form on a  
2 routine basis.

3 Our organization, Vista 360, did a  
4 reasonably comprehensive search on this term and came  
5 up empty. So we asked the NRC to assist us in a  
6 search which came up inconclusive also at the time.

7 I thank you very much for this  
8 opportunity to participate.

9 MS. JUCKETT: Okay, Tom. And just to  
10 make sure, did you have a question that you wanted  
11 the staff to try to respond to?

12 MR. RIELLY: It is a comment and a  
13 constructive suggestion.

14 MS. JUCKETT: Okay.

15 MR. RIELLY: If you care to comment, you  
16 can. I think we would be seeking just a notation of  
17 our perspective at this time.

18 MS. JUCKETT: Certainly. We'll be happy  
19 to add that to the record.

20 MR. RIELLY: So if we want to define the  
21 formal institutional definition of stakeholder in the  
22 narrative, I'm happy to hear.

23 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. We'll be glad to  
24 take your comments. And that will go to the staff  
25 for consideration certainly.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. RIELLY: Thank you very much.

2 MS. JUCKETT: Anna, next we would like  
3 to go to Ruth Thomas.

4 MS. THOMAS: Hi. I have a question  
5 about oversight.

6 Since I'm an elderly person, I remember  
7 back when we just had the AEC -- Atomic Energy  
8 Commission. And there were questions at the time  
9 that this didn't allow for oversight. But then it  
10 was -- I'm not sure what it was -- when it became the  
11 Department of Energy, but it seems like that the  
12 Department of Energy makes a number of what I would  
13 call faulty decisions. And so, it starts with the  
14 Department of Energy.

15 But I don't see where there's the  
16 oversight that's needed whether when you've got these  
17 materials that are involved. I mean, you've got  
18 materials that are manmade that don't exist in  
19 nature. They're new things that are still being  
20 learned about these and as I understand it, there's  
21 no -- no way to change or control the characteristics  
22 of these. I mean, they're going to go on for -- and  
23 on and on. It's a different type of pollution --  
24 radiation -- radioactive pollution because it stays  
25 around so long. And it seems like there needs to be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 a study or an assessment or an estimate of how much -  
2 - for example, how much plutonium there is in the  
3 environment and in the air and in the soil.

4 Are we reaching the point where we're  
5 changing the environment so much? And also what  
6 doesn't get mentioned -- at least I haven't seen it  
7 mentioned much in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
8 documents is the cumulative effect and the fact that  
9 it -- radioactive materials concentrate in grass and  
10 fish and animals.

11 And so, I don't know -- it was mentioned  
12 in this *Federal Register* about having consultants  
13 unless it's been reading over the transcript, I  
14 certainly would recommend that we have consultants  
15 like Arjun Makhijani. I mean, he has such a full  
16 understanding of the whole process and -- well, I  
17 mean his testimony and his background. I read his  
18 qualifications. And when there are people like that  
19 that can contribute, it seems like we need to  
20 recognize this is going to take a lot of people, and  
21 it's going to take people that have not had that  
22 vested interest that keeps certain subjects from  
23 being fully explained and consideration given. And  
24 I've noticed that you have people testifying at these  
25 public inputs and they have -- you can see right away

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 they have a favorable outlook. And what they say is  
2 not -- it's not from the standpoint of the public or  
3 it doesn't relate to what the mission of the Nuclear  
4 Regulatory Commission is which is protecting people  
5 and protecting the environment.

6 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Ruth. I heard  
7 several questions in there, and I'd like to go ahead  
8 and go to Keith to address some of your concerns.

9 MR. McCONNELL: Well, we'll try to speak  
10 to some of your concerns. If we don't touch on all  
11 of them, let us know.

12 Just to go back to the Atomic Energy  
13 Commission, back in 1975, I believe, the Atomic  
14 Energy Commission was split in two with NRC being one  
15 component and the predecessor to the current  
16 Department of Energy -- the Energy Research and  
17 Development Administration -- were formed at that  
18 time. And part of the reason for the split was to  
19 make NRC's focus purely on the protection of public  
20 health and safety and the environment while the DOE's  
21 predecessor was in terms of promoting a nuclear power  
22 as well as the weapons side of the program.

23 With respect to oversight, at NRC, the  
24 way we perform oversight is to the licensing process  
25 and our inspections of existing licensees. And as I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 noted in my slides, we have over 30 years of  
2 experience in overseeing the safe storage of spent  
3 fuel, both in pools and in dry cask storage.

4 In terms of the cumulative effects,  
5 those are usually addressed in terms of how dose  
6 limits are applied to the various licensing actions  
7 that we undertake.

8 And then the last comment I would try to  
9 address is that Mr. -- or Dr. Makhijani was at our  
10 first meeting and provided his input there. And I  
11 think he intends to provide written comments.

12 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Keith, for  
13 that.

14 And Ruth, I just want to make sure that  
15 we did address some of your questions. And also  
16 you've have additional opportunity to comment  
17 following a short break that we'll be taking in a  
18 little while.

19 MS. THOMAS: Well, I'm still on the  
20 line. And I want to follow up and say I think it  
21 needs to be a dialogue, not -- not commenting and  
22 then maybe -- I don't know -- hearing a couple months  
23 later or something. I mean, this -- this is -- I've  
24 been in this for a long time, and I'm 92 years old.  
25 And as I said in the other meeting, I'd like to see

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 something happening now that is different -- that's a  
2 different process because you spoke about licensing.  
3 I know the difference, and I've taken part in a  
4 licensing process. They did work. And what it took  
5 was intervention. And it took lots of people and  
6 organization. It lasted four and a half years or  
7 more.

8 Now we don't have the time and the money  
9 and the energy to keep on doing that type of thing on  
10 every facility, every nuclear project that's planned.  
11 And that project was on reprocessing. And it was  
12 successful in that the reprocessing plant was never  
13 built and all this evidence came out as to -- that  
14 evidence wouldn't have come out if there hadn't been  
15 people there to dedicate their time and their energy  
16 to this.

17 And it's -- it's something wrong --  
18 something very, very wrong with what's happening.  
19 And it's costing us money. It's costing us lives.  
20 It's polluting our world. And there are things that  
21 keep people from saying something. There's nothing  
22 keeping me from saying what's going on. And --

23 MS. JUCKETT: And thank you, Ruth. We  
24 appreciate your concerns, and we're adding those  
25 comments to the record.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And I think we want to try to fit in a  
2 couple more questions during our Q&A period, and we'd  
3 be glad to hear from you again during --

4           MS. THOMAS: All right. Thank you.

5           MS. JUCKETT: -- our comment period.

6 Thank you very much.

7           Next, we'd like to go to Gregg Levine.

8           MR. LEVINE: Hi, there. And thank you  
9 again for taking the time for this.

10           I kind of wanted to ask what our basic  
11 assumptions are on the amount of waste that we have  
12 to account for in any confidence decision.

13           Because yesterday I was listening in. I  
14 only caught the second half of yesterday's meeting.  
15 And I heard 170,000 metric tons of waste was sort of  
16 what we think we have to account for under any of the  
17 three scenarios you offered. And I understand the  
18 present amount to be somewhere between 62,000 and  
19 72,000 metric tons being the spent fuel and whatever  
20 the DOE is also allowed to put into if and when we  
21 ever have a permanent waste repository.

22           So I'm wondering what does this 170,000  
23 include. Is that just existing, or is that existing  
24 plants plus proposed plants to make and deposit over  
25 a period of time? And in that case, what is the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 window? Is that up until 50 years from now or 100  
2 years from now? Does that amount include the return  
3 to sender stuff from the Atoms for Peace reactors?  
4 Does that include the MOX programs?

5 So what is that number? How much are we  
6 supposed to develop a waste confidence decision and  
7 an EIS around and what's the time frame on that?

8 And related to that, I'm wondering if  
9 the EIS will include transportation issues. Like, is  
10 it just about a site, or is it about a site plus  
11 moving any of the high-level waste to that site? And  
12 will any of your scenarios include interim  
13 centralized above-ground storage which has been  
14 floated by the new Directorate as a possibility if  
15 there is no long-term repository?

16 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you very much for  
17 that. And Paul will try to address the questions  
18 about the inventory, the transportation and interim  
19 above-ground storage.

20 MR. MICHALAK: Gregg, in terms of the  
21 inventory, I was corrected by my staff.

22 Consider the scenarios. One of the  
23 scenarios is assuming continued storage until the  
24 mid-21st Century -- 2050. That number -- the total  
25 volume that we're looking at is 150,000 metric tons.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 And that's from the commercial fleet at that time --  
2 2050.

3 For the second scenario at the end of  
4 the 21st Century, right now we're going to assume  
5 there's 270,000 metric tons that's being stored.

6 So that's projecting out based on the  
7 current commercial fleet. And we think it's a  
8 conservative number -- maybe a bit of an  
9 overestimate. But we think the 150,000 for the first  
10 scenario or the 270,000 for the second scenario will  
11 bound what we believe would occur. It's a  
12 conservative estimate.

13 MS. JUCKETT: And did you want to  
14 address transportation?

15 MR. MICHALAK: Transportation.  
16 Transportation will definitely be considered in the  
17 environmental impact statement. Absolutely.

18 And we are going to consider  
19 consolidated storage -- ISFSI -- in the second  
20 scenario and in the third scenario. First one, too.  
21 All right. Right. That's right.

22 So we're considering an interim  
23 consolidated storage facility all three scenarios.

24 MS. JUCKETT: Thanks, Paul.

25 Gregg, did that answer your question

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that you had?

2 MR. LEVINE: A lot of it. Could I just  
3 ask if the assumption for the 150 and the 270 is  
4 based on the 104, or by the end of the year, 103  
5 current reactors? Is that including Vogtle and  
6 Summer? Or is that including everything that's even  
7 sort of a twinkle in the eye of the nuclear industry,  
8 sort of earlier?

9 MR. MICHALAK: We think the 150, Gregg,  
10 will be bounded by the existing fleet and what could  
11 come online that we know about reasonably by 2050.

12 MR. LEVINE: So how many reactors do you  
13 think that is above the existing fleet?

14 MR. MICHALAK: I don't have that number  
15 in front of me.

16 MR. LEVINE: Great. Thank you.

17 Can I ask just one more quick thing or  
18 wait for a second round?

19 MR. MICHALAK: Go for it.

20 MR. LEVINE: I'm wondering if the scope  
21 of the investigation is allowed to include the ideas  
22 of -- depending on how it is decided that we will  
23 store the inventory, is it allowed to include  
24 something about how the plant -- the site --  
25 communicates with surrounding communities? Is it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 allowed to address a monitoring regime and whose  
2 responsibility that would be and whether or not there  
3 are any reporting mandates based both on normal  
4 function and on possible accidents?

5 MS. JUCKETT: I think Keith would like  
6 to respond to that question.

7 MR. McCONNELL: Yes. Those aspects of  
8 the assessment would be done in a site-specific  
9 licensing process -- licensing either an independent  
10 spent-fuel storage installation or an active reactor  
11 storage facility.

12 MR. LEVINE: And does the site-specific  
13 licensing under -- so that's plants are up for  
14 renewal then. Would this assuming now that under a  
15 second or third scenario, there will be much longer-  
16 term storage on site than originally projected?  
17 Would that require a more involved re-licensing  
18 procedure then because the storage will change  
19 considerably from the original license?

20 MR. McCONNELL: Well, the original  
21 license considers -- and the renewals consider  
22 licensing during the period of operation. The period  
23 between the end of operating license and disposition  
24 or removal from a particular site is part of the  
25 waste confidence decision effort that we have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 underway now.

2 If you have particular comments that  
3 you'd like us to consider on these matters, please  
4 submit them.

5 MR. LEVINE: I guess in the interest of  
6 brevity, I would say that if we are going to consider  
7 second and third scenarios here, which I think are  
8 extremely likely at this point, that re-licensing  
9 should only be done with a robust plan for a hardened  
10 above-ground dry cask storage program. And that  
11 should be coordinated not just in terms of the  
12 technical but it should be included in environmental  
13 impact and evacuation issues which you have to  
14 consider in the safety part of the NRC's licensing  
15 program.

16 MR. McCONNELL: Will you provide those  
17 as written comments? We'll have them as verbal  
18 comments in the record here. But it wouldn't hurt to  
19 submit it as written comments also.

20 MR. LEVINE: I appreciate that. I will  
21 try to get you something.

22 MR. McCONNELL: Thank you.

23 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you very much,  
24 Gregg.

25 MR. LEVINE: Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. JUCKETT: And for our final caller  
2 for the question and answer portion, we'd like to go  
3 to Norman Meadow.

4 MR. MEADOW: Hi. My name is Norman  
5 Meadow. I'm calling from Baltimore, Maryland. And I  
6 volunteer with a local environmental group called the  
7 Maryland Conservation Council which to set things  
8 straight is one of the few groups certainly locally  
9 that has a pro-nuclear policy.

10 I have a couple of questions and then  
11 some things that are comments that I can perfectly  
12 well save until later. In fact, I plan to submit  
13 some written comments.

14 The first thing that I have in the way  
15 of a question is that in one of your introductory  
16 slides, you mentioned -- I think these were  
17 conclusions from the Court's decision -- that either  
18 an environmental assessment or an environmental  
19 impact statement would be acceptable. But in  
20 listening to some of the other webinars that you've  
21 had, I vaguely remember a question being raised about  
22 whether this EA or EIS can be generic or whether  
23 every individual nuclear power station has to be  
24 considered in its own impact statement or assessment.  
25 So that's one question.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 My second question would be -- and I  
2 don't know whether there's anybody on the panel today  
3 who can answer this -- is that given the timeline  
4 that you presented in your introductory slides, do  
5 you anticipate that this effort is going to delay the  
6 issuance of any licenses either for new reactors or  
7 license extensions for existing reactors? Because if  
8 it does, my opinion of the whole Court decision  
9 becomes even more disapproval.

10 Actually along those lines -- and I  
11 don't know why the NRC hasn't done this -- but rather  
12 than calling this a waste confidence rule, why not  
13 call it a spent-fuel confidence rule? I think spent-  
14 fuel describes the material in a much more accurate  
15 way than the term waste.

16 The final question I have now -- and  
17 again this gets fairly deep into things. I don't  
18 know whether there's anybody there who can answer it.  
19 But I've been focused as far as the spent-fuel  
20 problem is concerned on a figure that comes from the  
21 Yucca Mountain environmental impact statement which  
22 even though it's 1,000s of pages long, I think is  
23 well summarized by one figure that -- right now, I  
24 have it as Figure 5-4. I don't know where it's  
25 found, whether it's in the EIS or the supplemental

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 EIS. But it's a figure that shows the annual  
2 individual dose to the maximally-exposed person from  
3 Yucca Mountain as a function of years from the time  
4 the repository is closed. And the time scale goes  
5 out for one million years. And it shows that the  
6 mean estimated dose occurs 400,000 years from now,  
7 and it's a little less than half the annual  
8 background dose in that region. Then there's another  
9 spike at about a half a million years. The 95  
10 percent confidence intervals are somewhat higher.

11 My question is has anybody challenged  
12 those data because to me this graphs summarizes the  
13 lack of rationality of the whole controversy about  
14 Yucca Mountain -- why we should be determining our  
15 energy policy today on events that are estimated to  
16 occur in twice the length of time that humanity has  
17 even existed and involve doses that are pretty well  
18 acknowledged to be insignificant is a puzzle.

19 So I'm not sure I'm describing the  
20 location of this figure well enough. But the  
21 critical question for me is has anyone challenged the  
22 estimates which I assume were made by metallurgists,  
23 geologists and geophysicists.

24 Those are my three questions for the  
25 moment.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. JUCKETT: Okay, Norm. Thank you  
2 very much.

3 To address your first question about the  
4 generic site-specific issues, Lisa would like to  
5 speak to that.

6 MS. LONDON: Yes. And Mr. Meadow, if I  
7 get your question wrong, I'm going to repeat it just  
8 to make sure we're on the same page. Let me know.

9 I think what you had asked was why we  
10 elected -- why the Commission elected to do an EIS  
11 when the Court said an EA or an environmental  
12 assessment was sufficient. Is that correct?

13 MR. MEADOW: Well, no. I wasn't aware  
14 of that, but that's an even better question than the  
15 one I asked.

16 MS. LONDON: Well, that's good. Great.

17 While the Court found that an EA is an  
18 acceptable method, the Commission recognized that  
19 waste confidence always generates a lot of public  
20 interest. There's a lot of people that get involved  
21 and question waste confidence. And like I said, it  
22 just generates a lot of public interest. The  
23 Commission recognized this would be a vital matter  
24 for the public. And so, they elected to use their  
25 discretionary authority to instruct the staff to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 conduct an environmental impact statement as opposed  
2 to an EA. Environment impact statement is a broader  
3 effort.

4 And so, that's what we've done. That's  
5 what we've started doing.

6 MR. MEADOW: Okay. But are you going to  
7 have to consider each of the -- I think it's 64  
8 nuclear power stations individually? Or can some  
9 general principles be enunciated and then have them  
10 adapted to each site when issues arise at that site?

11 MS. LONDON: Well, as Paul had mentioned  
12 earlier in his presentation, we are basically putting  
13 in some bounding assumptions to try to capture the  
14 broad range of conditions that we would see  
15 throughout the country. We are not dealing with  
16 site-specific issues.

17 If a party feels that there is a site-  
18 specific issue that is somehow not addressed by the  
19 waste confidence rule and they seek to get redress in  
20 an individual hearing, the party can file under 2.335  
21 to bring to the Court's attention an individual  
22 matter for a site-specific condition they feel was  
23 not adequately capture in the waste confidence  
24 ruling. But I think the basic message is that waste  
25 confidence is a generic rulemaking.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Does that answer your question?

2 MR. MEADOW: Yes. Yes, it does. Thank  
3 you.

4 MS. LONDON: Okay.

5 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. And to your second  
6 question which I believe was on a delay in licensing  
7 --

8 MR. MEADOW: Yes.

9 MS. JUCKETT: -- Keith would like to  
10 respond to that question.

11 MR. McCONNELL: Yes. There is the  
12 potential for delays. Those delays are most likely  
13 to occur for renewals. The impact on existing  
14 operations is not significant in the sense that these  
15 facilities would be in timely renewal and could  
16 continue to operate.

17 We're less likely to have a significant  
18 impact on any new builds or licensing new facilities.

19 MR. MEADOW: Okay. So you don't  
20 anticipate any one -- any reactor would be denied a  
21 continuation of its license to wait for this final  
22 rule to be published?

23 MR. McCONNELL: They would not be denied  
24 for this particular reason --

25 MR. MEADOW: Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. McCONNELL: -- for waste confidence.  
2 Because the issuance would be contingent on other  
3 factors in addition to this waste confidence  
4 decision.

5 MR. MEADOW: Oh, yes. There are many  
6 factors. You know, I'm not aware of anything that  
7 seems to be close enough that 2014 would be a  
8 problem. But I wasn't sure of that.

9 MR. McCONNELL: Yes. There are two  
10 independent spent-fuel storage installations that are  
11 in the renewal phase now -- the one at Prairie Island  
12 and the one at Calvert Cliffs -- where the  
13 environmental assessments have already been issued.  
14 The final licenses and final renewals for those two  
15 facilities wouldn't be issued until the Commission  
16 makes its revised waste confidence decision.

17 MR. MEADOW: Okay. Okay. The reactors  
18 wouldn't have to shut down though?

19 MR. McCONNELL: Correct.

20 MR. MEADOW: Okay. Thank you.

21 MR. McCONNELL: And the last question I  
22 think although we may have people here that could  
23 address that, I don't know that we're prepared to  
24 address the details of the Yucca Mountain EIS in this  
25 particular meeting.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. MEADOW: Okay. Yes, I realize. I  
2 mean, it's something I really ought to try to  
3 research myself. I just thought someone there might  
4 know whether the estimates have been seriously  
5 challenged or not.

6 Okay. Thank you very much.

7 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. I think we do have  
8 several more people in the queue, and we're already  
9 over our time for Q&A. But we'll go ahead and take  
10 one more. The next person on the queue is David  
11 Agnew.

12 MR. AGNEW: Hello?

13 MS. JUCKETT: Yes. David, you're  
14 connected. David, we can hear you. Are you there?

15 I think we may have lost David.

16 Let's go ahead and hear instead from  
17 Julius Kerr.

18 MR. KERR: Yes, this is Julius Kerr.  
19 Can you hear me?

20 MS. JUCKETT: Yes, Julius, you're  
21 connected.

22 MR. KERR: My question is two-fold. I  
23 was wondering because of the possibility of an  
24 accident if you couldn't require some kind of  
25 distinctive visual die marker or like the natural gas

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 does there's an odor with the gas so that all the  
2 radionuclide emission releases become readily  
3 identifiable as such in order to protect the public  
4 from this very real public health danger?

5 MS. JUCKETT: I heard one question in  
6 there, but I think Keith would like to go ahead and  
7 address that.

8 MR. McCONNELL: Yes, there is quite an  
9 extensive monitoring system around these facilities.  
10 While they aren't die markers, the inherent  
11 monitoring that exists at these facilities is  
12 sufficient to pick up any releases. So that's why  
13 die markers or something similar to that aren't used.

14 MS. JUCKETT: Did you have an additional  
15 question, Julius, or did that answer your question?

16 MR. KERR: Yes. I have a second  
17 question, if that's okay.

18 MS. JUCKETT: Sure. Go ahead.

19 MR. KERR: I wonder if it could be  
20 required that the public be alerted via the news  
21 reports like the pollen alerts to each release of  
22 radiation from venting or fuel transfers or other  
23 accidental or intentional or unintentional releases  
24 of radionuclide emissions into our air, land or  
25 water?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. McCONNELL: This is Keith McConnell  
2 again.

3 I don't have all the specifics, but  
4 there are emergency procedures that power plants use  
5 to alert the public in the event of a breach from  
6 that facility. It involves sirens and other  
7 mechanisms to communicate.

8 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. Thank you, Keith.

9 That wraps up our time that we have for  
10 the question and answer session.

11 We'd like to take a short, ten-minute  
12 break. And we will come back on the line to continue  
13 to hear your comments at that time.

14 So if you would like to come back in ten  
15 minutes, we'll reconvene at approximately 10:15 p.m.  
16 Eastern Time. And we'll be back at that time.

17 (Whereupon, at 10:06 p.m., off the  
18 record until 10:15 p.m.)

19 MS. JUCKETT: Welcome back, everyone, to  
20 the comment portion of our meeting this evening.

21 At this time if you would like to make a  
22 comment, please call our 1-800 number and press \*1  
23 and that will put you in the queue to make a comment.

24 Our first person in the queue is Diane  
25 D'Arrigo. Diane, are you on the line?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MS. D'ARRIGO: Yes.

2 MS. JUCKETT: Welcome.

3 MS. D'ARRIGO: Thanks.

4 I somehow missed the first slide, but I  
5 don't think it matters for what I wanted to ask.

6 This has to do with the confidence over  
7 that they'll be somewhere to send the waste from  
8 reprocessing from West Valley. They're planning now  
9 at West Valley which is the only commercial  
10 reprocessing that took place in the country although  
11 a portion of it was weapons. They're planning to  
12 take the solidified high-level waste out of the  
13 building that was used for reprocessing where it's  
14 been stored and put it in 50-year license -- well --  
15 yes, casks that there's confidence will be good for  
16 50 years on a pad on the road. And so, is there a  
17 portion of this process that you're going through, is  
18 it going to look at that as well as the irradiated  
19 fuel from the different reactors?

20 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. Thank you.

21 MR. McCONNELL: This is Keith McConnell.

22 I think you're talking about the  
23 vitrified waste that still exists at West Valley that  
24 they're moving out of the processing building so they  
25 can decommission the processing building.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           That material is now managed by the  
2 Department of Energy.

3           MS. D'ARRIGO: Right.

4           MR. McCONNELL: It would become material  
5 that would go to a geologic repository. But while  
6 it's managed by the Department of Energy, that would  
7 be the Department of Energy's responsibility. Should  
8 the license revert back to the State of New York,  
9 then the disposition of that material would then  
10 become an NRC actionable activity.

11           MS. D'ARRIGO: Well, what you're doing  
12 here though is you're looking at -- isn't this  
13 scoping to deal with the confidence that the Nuclear  
14 Regulatory Commission has over -- confidence that you  
15 have that there will be somewhere to permanently I  
16 guess dispose of this waste -- of the waste from  
17 nuclear power? Is that right?

18           MR. McCONNELL: What we deal with is  
19 that the storage of spent fuel between --

20           MS. D'ARRIGO: Waste confidence decision  
21 is only on the irradiated fuel then?

22           MR. McCONNELL: Well, I think you ask a  
23 good question. And I think it's a question that we  
24 need to go back and think about.

25           And I don't know that we have the answer

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 tonight. But we will have the answer on terms of  
2 whether vitrified waste that is a commercially-  
3 licensed activity is included.

4 MS. D'ARRIGO: Yes. I mean, 40 percent  
5 of it was commercial irradiated fuel and 60 percent  
6 was from AEC activities. And the people around  
7 western New York were thrilled to have DOE come in  
8 and try to make the reprocessing liquid into a solid  
9 so it wouldn't leak out. And now, they've got it.  
10 Yeah, it's in a solid. But it's being put in casks  
11 that are not going to last as long as it's hazardous  
12 and set by the roadside to -- and there's not even  
13 going to be any kind of wait or plans for re-  
14 containerizing it and then DOE wants to leave.

15 So my concern is that they're going to  
16 do this transfer taking it out of a shielded area  
17 where it's got better shielding than it will at the  
18 road in the canisters and that we don't have -- I  
19 don't have confidence -- not that I trust the old  
20 waste confidence decision before -- but trying to see  
21 if the NRC's claiming it's got confidence over this  
22 reprocessing waste.

23 MR. McCONNELL: I mean, we'll take your  
24 comment. We're outside of the question and answer  
25 period. But the one thing I would --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. D'ARRIGO: Yes. What are we in now?  
2 I missed the beginning.

3 MR. McCONNELL: The comment period. The  
4 question period was before and now we're in the  
5 comment period.

6 But let me just speak to one issue -- I  
7 guess there were two -- one that this vitrified waste  
8 is going to be stored in a facility that is not next  
9 to the road. It is off the road a substantial  
10 distance.

11 MS. D'ARRIGO: Well, now it's in a  
12 shielded building that's far from the road. But  
13 they're going to move it to a pad that they're going  
14 to put and there's not going to be any building over  
15 it. There's no structure. You can call it a  
16 facility, but it's just dry casks.

17 MR. McCONNELL: Correct. And those dry  
18 casks are certified by the NRC. So just like an  
19 independent spent-fuel storage facility, those  
20 facilities are safe as long as the material is stored  
21 correctly and handled correctly and consistent either  
22 with NRC regulations or DOE orders.

23 MS. JUCKETT: And Diane, I think we also  
24 are interested in getting these comments. If you  
25 have additional comments in writing, you're welcome

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 to submit them as well.

2 And Anna, I think we have several other  
3 people in the queue who would like to make comments.

4 And I just want to go ahead and remind  
5 all of our callers that if you press \*1, that will  
6 put you in the queue to make comments.

7 And at this time, we're taking comments  
8 that are being transcribed and these will be  
9 considered with equal weight to any written comments.  
10 But we also welcome your written comments to be  
11 submitted online as well.

12 The next person we had in the queue is  
13 Mary Olson again.

14 Mary, would you like to make a comment?

15 MS. OLSON: I would.

16 We will -- Nuclear Information Resource  
17 Service will be doing written comments and hopefully  
18 not very long from now.

19 But this is sort of more of the Mary  
20 Olson comment. And I kind of threw it on this on the  
21 14th, but I'm going to go back here because to some  
22 degree every organization exists in a topological  
23 state because it has have a little bit of identify  
24 that it maintains and a set of rules and what you  
25 call that homeostasis and all that stuff sort of you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 kind of get into these circular arguments. But  
2 tonight, I really want to say as a direct comment  
3 that there's a difference between compliance with NRC  
4 regulations and environmental impact.

5 I think there's a big discussion in my  
6 community right now about whether to stay focused  
7 specifically on irradiated fuel because we believe  
8 strongly that there's a difference between the fuel  
9 pool and dry storage and we'd really love to see the  
10 Agency have enough support for making that  
11 differentiation and beginning to really grabble with  
12 the safety issues on the site and understand that at  
13 Fukushima the dry casks did pretty well. I can't say  
14 they did perfect because I haven't seen an inspection  
15 report. But they didn't blow up, and they didn't  
16 burn, and they didn't take massive amounts of liquid  
17 to cool them. And so, golly, that's pretty good  
18 compared to what we saw happen with the fuel pools in  
19 the Courts.

20 So we really want to go there with you  
21 and be on that page. But I also need you to really  
22 stop and understand that you're going to do so much  
23 better in this process if you actually look at  
24 environmental impact versus just plain compliance  
25 with your regulations.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           And I heard you do it tonight. Mr. Kerr  
2 asked you a question that quite frankly, I don't know  
3 how technically feasible it is to put smell or color  
4 in radioactivity. But his question was about routine  
5 releases. It wasn't about accident-level conditions.

6           And you said you monitor or a licensee  
7 monitors. We don't have access to that information.  
8 We don't have anywhere in the United States real-time  
9 monitoring available 24/7 online. We could. It  
10 would make a huge difference. What a public  
11 relations move that would be if in fact there's no  
12 problem. Right?

13           So if there is a problem, wouldn't it be  
14 great if we could all know it, too? I mean, this is  
15 where you have to kind of step outside your comfort  
16 envelope of needing to look like it's altogether and  
17 be willing to actually step in a little bit.

18           And I'm not going to go on and on, but I  
19 want to say that in my view, you do not have nuclear  
20 fuel without the nuclear fuel chain. And NEPA is the  
21 one place where the federal government's actions are  
22 supposed to look at all of the consequences, all of  
23 the impacts, no truncations, no separations, no  
24 cutting off this part over here that's causally  
25 related.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           So I'm not sure how many times you're  
2 going to hear this but I'm going to say it tonight.  
3 you can't really look at an environmental impact of  
4 waste storage without looking at environmental impact  
5 of waste generation, and you can't look at that  
6 without fuel generation, and you can't look at that  
7 without the whole fuel chain. It's all kit and  
8 caboodle, right?

9           And that's why NEPA is the way it is  
10 because our life is that way. Our environment is  
11 that way. Our resources are that way. Our water and  
12 our air and the rest of the comments that we share  
13 are that way. And you are privileging corporate  
14 citizens with a "right" to create this stuff. What  
15 does it really mean? That's the environmental impact  
16 statement that would be revolutionary. You would  
17 have an amazing career recognition if you would  
18 actually do that. I mean, that is so needed.

19           So I know you're not setting off to do  
20 that. You're setting off to meet a two-year timeline  
21 and make the Court happy hopefully. But please,  
22 don't look at compliance. Look at impact. And one  
23 of the key impacts that nobody's looking at is the  
24 disproportionate effects of radiation. Maybe it's an  
25 appendix. Maybe it's we don't know the causation but

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 there's evidence. Maybe it's I don't know what. But  
2 if it's silent, oh, my God, oh, my God.

3 We know children are impacted many times  
4 more. We now have strong data showing that little  
5 girl children are twice as impacted as little boy  
6 children. We know that elders are more impacted.

7 That disproportionate impact is a reality  
8 whether your regulations reflect it or not. But you  
9 are not doing compliance here. You are doing impact  
10 here.

11 So I'm going to stop and say yes, you'll  
12 get more in writing. But in my humble opinion, this  
13 is a watershed moment. And how you play these cards  
14 truly impacts the ability of this industry to  
15 function as a credible and upright citizen or to be  
16 revealed that that's just plain not a possibility  
17 given the reality of this stuff that it makes.

18 Thanks.

19 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you very much, Mary.  
20 We appreciate your comments.

21 Next on the line, we have David Agnew  
22 that has joined us again.

23 David, can you get through to us this  
24 time?

25 MR. AGNEW: Yes. I hope so. Can you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 hear me?

2 MS. JUCKETT: Yes. Perfect. Great.

3 MR. AGNEW: Okay. I managed to hang up  
4 instead the last time.

5 Well, so it's just as well that I missed  
6 the questions because I mostly have comments.

7 MS. JUCKETT: Great.

8 MR. AGNEW: The topic being rad waste.  
9 That means that we're considering a hazard that will  
10 last for many thousands of years. I think given  
11 that, the term waste confidence is an oxymoron. If  
12 there were confidence, we wouldn't be putting fresh,  
13 high-level waste into temporary pools.

14 We're seven decades into too cheap to  
15 meter, and nobody knows what to do with this toxic  
16 waste that we're generating daily at 65 site and more  
17 around the nation.

18 I live near a Mark I reactor that's on  
19 the flight path for a major airport. There's no  
20 airspace restrictions. The only thing between a 747  
21 and a spent fuel pool is a tin roof. I have no  
22 confidence that it's safe.

23 The public comment on the scoping  
24 process I understand goes until January 2nd. That's  
25 less than a month away. That strikes me as a sick

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 joke. This is a busy time of year for many people.  
2 If you actually expect public involvement, you should  
3 extend that comment period for several months.

4 Let's see. Two years to complete the  
5 generic environmental impact statement is far too  
6 short. My understanding is that NRC staff has said  
7 that it would take seven years to do the job  
8 properly. I believe that all relicenses that have  
9 been issued should be rescinded pending compliance  
10 with new standards. According to the way the NRC  
11 works, people -- operators -- licensees whose license  
12 is out of date get to continue operating anyway. So  
13 that shouldn't be a problem for your industry.

14 Certainly no new licenses to generate  
15 more radioactive waste should be allowed given that  
16 we don't know what to do with it and you're trying to  
17 rush through this process of figuring out what can be  
18 done with it.

19 And any analysis that is done for the  
20 GEIS should include sabotage, terrorists' acts. It  
21 should include leaks from spent-fuel pools, those  
22 current and future leaks.

23 I guess in short I concur with the 92-  
24 year-old woman who asked for a different process. I  
25 feel that the current NRC process for public

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 involvement has been carefully constructed to exclude  
2 the public while giving the appearance of openness.  
3 People would have to be wealthy to participate. They  
4 have to hire lawyers or be lawyers. And even then,  
5 they don't have much of a chance. Highly technical,  
6 highly legal.

7           And I'll just close I guess by making a  
8 rhetorical question since it's not the question  
9 period. And that is that I heard earlier that there  
10 would be no new research regarding spent-fuel pool  
11 fires, and I would ask why not. We're planning  
12 something for tens or hundreds of thousands of years.  
13 Why not continue to do research?

14           That's it. Thank you.

15           MS. JUCKETT: Thank you very much,  
16 David.

17           And one of our presenters -- Paul --  
18 would like to actually respond to that.

19           MR. MICHALAK: David, what I meant to  
20 say is in this effort, this isn't a research effort.  
21 But there is research underway and analyses underway  
22 at the Agency concerning spent-fuel pool fires.

23           But this particular action is not a  
24 research action. We're going to look at the existing  
25 record and take relevant information and apply it to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this environmental impact statement.

2 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Paul, for that  
3 clarification.

4 Next on the line we have Laura Sorensen.

5 Laura, can you connect through to us?

6 MS. SORENSEN: Hi, this is Laura.

7 MS. JUCKETT: We can hear you. Go  
8 ahead.

9 MS. SORENSEN: Okay.

10 I remember a while back sitting at the  
11 first EIS hearing in Gaffney, South Carolina, and it  
12 was concerning the new licensing of the W.S. Lee  
13 Nuclear Station. And that was my first hearing.

14 And the NRC staffer said they had  
15 received some feedback and complaints about their  
16 relationship to citizens. And they did an official  
17 report analysis by an NRC staff person who worked on  
18 that probably -- I don't know -- you probably know --  
19 maybe a year and compared the NRC's relationship to  
20 the industry, the utilities, the Congress and  
21 citizens. And the official concluded that the NRC's  
22 relationship really was lacking seriously in  
23 communication.

24 And I feel like I'm sitting here  
25 experiencing that conclusion. I think it's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 disregarding and insulting for the NRC to expect the  
2 average citizen to respond to a scoping process on  
3 the nuclear waste issue in 20 days to the November  
4 14th hearing when the NRC and our federal government  
5 hasn't responded to it for over 50 years in our mind.

6 In addition, we're expected to attend  
7 that hearing, no expenses paid. We all have jobs and  
8 homes. We live far away from where the hearing is.  
9 So if we can't do that, we have to navigate a  
10 technology that's really unfamiliar to the average  
11 person. But it's everyday business to the NRC.

12 But I'm a mom, I'm a grandmom. And I  
13 have to speak for the future and the future of  
14 humanity.

15 It's not if we have a nuclear accident  
16 and the spent fuel is affected. It's when and where.  
17 And I really pray for the people exposed to this  
18 horrific technology. And that's why I'm having my  
19 civic duty here in sharing the comments in this  
20 process.

21 I know that the Court ruling says that  
22 this can be generic. I'm asking the NRC -- I think  
23 you know why it shouldn't be. I think you understand  
24 that each reactor has a different situation. They  
25 each are a different age. Some are on the ocean.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Some are on a river. Some are cooled with a lake.  
2 There's climate issues in different parts of the  
3 country. There's temperature. There's weather  
4 patterns and storms. There's fault lines. And the  
5 effects of global warming. And then we have  
6 evacuation issues that are different for different  
7 populations. And we have the issue of how many  
8 reactors are there in one area, for example,  
9 Charlotte, North Carolina. They've got many reactors  
10 just within 70 miles. And I know up north some of  
11 those are even bigger numbers.

12 The next issue would be with the spent  
13 fuel that's in the fuel pools, these are packed over  
14 capacity. There needs to be a very strict, clear in  
15 the EIS how many are you allowed to have in there.  
16 And it needs to be strict and you can't go over it.  
17 That's it.

18 And there needs to be in the EIS a list  
19 of scheduled inspections on those pools -- the dates  
20 for each sight of when they're going to be inspected  
21 with a timeline that's very reasonable for safety.

22 The next point is the safest solution to  
23 the storage of the waste is to stop making it in the  
24 first place. It's proven that there isn't anywhere  
25 safe for it. Nobody wants it in their backyard. And

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 there's been so much arguing about it. So let's just  
2 stop making it and deal with what we have.

3 Also, of course, the leaking and  
4 contamination in the groundwater. I don't think  
5 those reports are really -- it seems like the  
6 response to that has always been well, it's safe  
7 levels. We never get a report of well, what do you  
8 mean by that. What are the numbers and what are the  
9 markers that we're going by? And who invented those  
10 markers and what's really legal with that? And who  
11 are we listening to?

12 Also the issue of reprocessing, it's  
13 never solved a waste issue in any country. It  
14 creates more waste at a high price, both financially  
15 and environmentally. We don't need to reprocess.

16 And then there's the issue of we're  
17 keeping this spent fuel there so long. What is the  
18 structural wear and tear of the storage and the  
19 maintenance and the inspection schedules?

20 And I think also the dry cask storage  
21 needs some help, for example, the effects of the  
22 earthquake at the North Anna Nuclear Plant. It  
23 actually moved it some inches. And that's why that  
24 site specific is really important because you may not  
25 have earthquakes in one area and if you know dry cask

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 storage is accessible to that, it needs to be looked  
2 at. And of course, there needs to be the advances in  
3 the hardened on site storage.

4 And then finally I just want to say the  
5 decision process creates radioactive substances that  
6 do not exist in nature. We cannot change the length  
7 of time they need to be isolated from the  
8 environment. And we can't change the health effects  
9 that radiation has on human beings. There's no cure  
10 for that. The NRC must operate by the scientific  
11 rule of thumb. There is no safe dose of radiation --  
12 period. If nuclear power and waste was safe, we  
13 wouldn't be discussing this matter. We wouldn't have  
14 court orders. We wouldn't have scoping hearings. We  
15 wouldn't have EIS statements. We would just stop  
16 making it. And I think it's time to stop making it.

17 Thank you.

18 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Laura, for your  
19 comments.

20 And next on the line, we have Diane  
21 D'Arrigo again.

22 MS. D'ARRIGO: Yes. I just want to say  
23 that I think there should be more than three or four  
24 hearings on this issue. I think that there should be  
25 hearings at every reactor site and every proposed

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 storage area if the people in those communities want  
2 it -- want to have a hearing. And certainly the  
3 listing those that would like to have it, but I'd  
4 like to say that three or four is not enough.

5 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. Thank you, Diane,  
6 for that comment.

7 If you are joining us on the line and  
8 you would like to make a comment, press \*1 to be  
9 added to the queue to make a comment.

10 And Anna, do we have anyone else on the  
11 line at this time?

12 OPERATOR: We have no one else in the  
13 queue. But a reminder, you may press \*1 at any time.

14 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you. And the staff  
15 will be happy to wait until the midnight end of this  
16 webinar to ensure that we do get a chance to hear all  
17 of your comments.

18 And as you may have heard in some of our  
19 previous meetings, we have several topics that were  
20 of interest to NRC staff to hear from. Some of them  
21 were questions about what should be included and the  
22 scope of this EIS, as well as where we may benefit --  
23 where you would benefit from regional public meetings  
24 when those are held during the draft EIS phase.

25 So again, if you're joining us, press \*1

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 to make a comment. And I see that we have some  
2 additional people on the line.

3 Julius, welcome. Please make a comment.

4 MR. KERR: Yes. This is Julius.

5 I think since you're doing this scoping  
6 program for the waste confidence rule, you really  
7 might want to look at the transportation issue that's  
8 already taking place across the United States.

9 And I agree with the comments made  
10 earlier. Any exposure to radioactivity -- no matter  
11 how slight -- boosts your risk of cancer. And that's  
12 according to the National Academy of Sciences. So we  
13 know that the radioactivity is dangerous -- very  
14 dangerous.

15 The nuclear waste shipments cannot be  
16 made safe. And the NRC, I'm sure, is aware of this.  
17 And they need to generate more regulations. If they  
18 are monitoring the waste casks, they'll know because  
19 there's going to be gamma radiation emitted from  
20 these things. And it's going to allow a certain  
21 amount of neutrons to be emitted from the shipping  
22 casks during routine operations and transportation.

23 Even without a transport accident -- I  
24 know we've been doing it for over 30 years; the  
25 gentleman spoke about that earlier -- the people are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 exposed to this ionizing radiation from the nuclear  
2 waste shipments. So whoever made the nuclear waste  
3 should keep the nuclear waste right where it's at and  
4 not expose the public by transporting from here to  
5 there. There's no reason for that. The casks  
6 radiate radiation, and they're very, very dangerous.  
7 And I know you guys know that because you say you're  
8 monitoring it.

9 And I hope you'll make some stronger  
10 regulations that are really going to protect the  
11 public. That's the mission statement of the Nuclear  
12 Regulatory Commission to protect the public and the  
13 environment. I want to see you guys do it.

14 Thank you for allowing me to speak.

15 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Julius. We  
16 appreciate your comments.

17 Next on the line, we have Ruth Thomas.

18 Ruth, welcome back. Please feel free to  
19 make your comment.

20 MS. THOMAS: Thank you.

21 When I hear people talk, they do it so  
22 well and I'm not very good at that. But I'm better  
23 at writing and researching. So I'm going to be  
24 sending in -- and one of the sources that I want to  
25 have used are the 30 -- I don't mean the whole 36

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 volumes -- but excerpts from them where the answers  
2 that witnesses gave under oath are sent in that this  
3 documents what we're saying.

4           And as it happened, we -- our  
5 organization -- Environmentalists, Incorporated --  
6 didn't have much funding. So I did some of the  
7 cross- examination. In fact, I did all of the cross-  
8 examination on transportation. So I agree with the  
9 importance of this subject, and I'm going to be  
10 working with other people in submitting this  
11 information -- this evidence -- and looking forward  
12 to it being used because it hasn't been used at any  
13 time that I know of, and I've looked at a lot of  
14 environmental impact statements.

15           Thank you.

16           MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Ruth.

17           And for those of you who may just be  
18 joining us --

19           MR. MICHALAK: For Ruth, we were curious  
20 as to what 38 volumes she was referring to.

21           MS. JUCKETT: Ruth, are you still on the  
22 line with us?

23           OPERATOR: One moment and I'll retrieve  
24 her line.

25           MS. JUCKETT: Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 OPERATOR: And Ruth, you're open again.

2 MR. MICHALAK: Ruth, did you hear? This  
3 is Paul Michalak.

4 We were curious which 38 volumes are you  
5 referring to?

6 MS. THOMAS: What was that? What  
7 proceeding?

8 MR. MICHALAK: Yes.

9 MS. THOMAS: It was the Allied General  
10 Nuclear Services reprocessing plant. It's docket 50-  
11 332. And I don't know. I may sound angry. But it  
12 isn't that I'm angry. It's that I -- well, I just  
13 want to do more than I'm doing. And I find I can't  
14 do as much as I used to.

15 MS. JUCKETT: Well, Ruth, we appreciate  
16 you taking the time to talk to us today. And thank  
17 you for coming back on the line to make that  
18 clarification for us.

19 And so that those who are just joining  
20 us know, you are welcome to call and make comments  
21 this evening. We are keeping these lines open until  
22 midnight Eastern Time, 9:00 o'clock Pacific Time.  
23 And you can press \*1 to be added to the queue to make  
24 a comment.

25 And we'll also be welcoming comments in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 written form through Regulations.gov as was presented  
2 in the presentations earlier.

3 Anna, do we have anyone else in the  
4 queue at this time?

5 OPERATOR: Yes, we do. It looks like  
6 Gregg Levine.

7 MR. LEVINE: Yes. Hi. Thanks again.

8 I guess I would ask that if there was  
9 some way to incorporate into the waste confidence  
10 decision process and the EIS, the Post-Fukushima  
11 Near-Term Task Force support recommendations and some  
12 of the additional recommendations made in hearings  
13 after the MTTTS.

14 I'm thinking specifically I remember an  
15 interview with the former Commissioner Jazcko where  
16 he was talking about extending the expected life of  
17 dry casks 100, 200, perhaps 300 years on site. And I  
18 think he was doing that partly based on the fact that  
19 yes, after the Tohoku quake, they seemed to survive  
20 better than the pools. But I think also he was  
21 saying without any particular research assumptions --  
22 research evidence -- about the actual survivability  
23 of current cask technology. So I think that while I  
24 appreciate I think too dry casks are a better option  
25 than fuel pools for no other reason than they don't

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 require a power source to keep water flowing through  
2 them, I think that you need much more research and  
3 you have to take that into account when you're  
4 looking at scenarios for long-term, on site storage.

5 I would also ask with that in mind that  
6 perhaps it's examined that we roll back re-racking  
7 permits for the pools that in some sort of generic  
8 environmental impact or generic licensing guideline  
9 overall that we mandate a decreased density of spent  
10 fuel in the pools because one of the problems is that  
11 these pools were originally designed -- I believe --  
12 for less fuel in them than they have now so that if  
13 for some reason there's a power interruption or a  
14 loss of coolant accident, pools heat up more quickly  
15 or lost their cooling water more quickly exposed the  
16 cladding to air more quickly and thus run the risk of  
17 fire more quickly and that survivability of or the  
18 safety parameters of pools indicates that accidents  
19 could be lengthened a little if we would bring the  
20 quantity of fuel in the pools down. So I think there  
21 should be some sort of consideration in the ruling  
22 that would force plants to move fuel out of pool  
23 storage into dry storage. And I also think that we  
24 need to mandate a better form of onsite dry storage.

25 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Gregg, for your

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 comments. We appreciate that.

2 MR. LEVINE: sure.

3 MS. JUCKETT: Anna, is there anyone else  
4 on the line at this time?

5 OPERATOR: Not at this time.

6 MS. JUCKETT: As a reminder to those who  
7 are on the phone, if you would like to make a  
8 comment, press \*1 to be added to the queue and the  
9 NRC staff will be happy to listen to your comments.

10 And since we don't have anyone else in  
11 the queue at this time, we'll continue to wait here.  
12 Again, press \*1, and you can be added to the queue to  
13 make a comment.

14 I believe we have Tom Rielly on the line  
15 who's just joined us. Tom?

16 MR. RIELLY: Yes. Thank you.

17 Earlier there was a reference by one of  
18 the presenters relative to having follow-up meetings  
19 of a regional, city, reactor-based location. And  
20 there was a request for assistance or input relative  
21 to possible locations. We'd like to participate in  
22 that and wonder if the staff member could provide us  
23 a contact information.

24 MS. JUCKETT: Yes. Andy will address  
25 that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 MR. IMBODEN: Yes. I mean, you could  
2 tell us right now.

3 MR. RIELLY: It would take some work.

4 MR. IMBODEN: Yes, okay.

5 MR. RIELLY: It was a challenge, and we  
6 accept the challenge.

7 MR. IMBODEN: Okay. And you're more  
8 than welcome to submit that through Regulations.gov  
9 on the docket.

10 MR. RIELLY: Regulations.gov. Okay.

11 MR. IMBODEN: And you could search for  
12 waste confidence or type in the docket number. You  
13 could submit by mail or by fax that information as  
14 well.

15 MR. RIELLY: And that information is at  
16 the -- that's at  
17 [http\www.NRC.govwaste\spentfuelstorage.wcdhtml?](http://www.NRC.govwaste/spentfuelstorage.wcdhtml?)

18 MR. IMBODEN: That's correct. And for  
19 those of you on the computer, we have that  
20 information up right now on the webinar.

21 MR. RIELLY: Okay. Thank you very much.

22 MR. IMBODEN: All right. Thank you.

23 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Tom.

24 Anna, do we have anyone else in the  
25 queue right now?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 OPERATOR: At this moment, no. But a  
2 reminder, you may press \*1.

3 MS. JUCKETT: And again, the NRC staff  
4 will be here until Midnight Eastern Time, 9:00 p.m.  
5 West Coast Time to hear your comments. If you would  
6 like to call in, there's an 800 number to call, and  
7 you can press \*1 to be added to the queue to make a  
8 comment.

9 And again, for those of you have may not  
10 have been on the line for t his entire conference,  
11 the NRC staff is interested in hearing several issues  
12 such as what should be included in the scope of the  
13 EIS as well as where public meetings should be held  
14 for the draft EIS in regional public meetings. If  
15 you have comments on those topics, please feel free  
16 to call and make a comment.

17 Additionally, we'd be interested in  
18 hearing how NRC can improve their outreach and  
19 whether there are additional venues that the public  
20 would like to see the NRC use for better  
21 communication.

22 We have Julius joining us again.  
23 Julius, welcome back. Your line is open.

24 MR. KERR: Yes. A friend of mine just  
25 came in and would like to make a comment. Is that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

1 okay?

2 MS. JUCKETT: Sure. Please introduce  
3 yourself. We'd appreciate that.

4 MS. WYRICH: Hello. My name is Lilly  
5 Wyrich. And I just came in and have been listening  
6 to this conversation. And I'd like to address  
7 environmental justice.

8 MS. JUCKETT: Sure. Thank you, Lily.  
9 Go ahead.

10 MS. WYRICH: I think we've forgotten  
11 environmental justice because I'm hearing about how  
12 these people are struggling with the system that  
13 you've set up for them. And for me, I have to say I  
14 don't have a computer. I don't have a television. I  
15 don't have Internet access. And I'm just wondering  
16 how I'm supposed to take part in these discussions.  
17 I didn't even know about it.

18 And it worries me because I'm close to a  
19 nuclear facility. And I'm just beginning to  
20 understand the dangers of it. And I think that I'm  
21 being left out.

22 And I pray that you will think about  
23 people like me who don't know what's going on. And I  
24 heard you say that people are made aware of problems  
25 that there are alarms that go off, that people are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 told. But I don't think that's right. And I think  
2 if you talk to people who live near nuclear  
3 facilities, they're not aware of it, and I think you  
4 need to investigate how much people are reached  
5 because there's an environmental injustice going on  
6 here. And I'm just glad that I came in tonight to  
7 hear this and that Julius let me speak.

8 So please take it seriously that the  
9 people that need to know, the poor people that don't  
10 have access to the complicated systems that you're  
11 using, they're the ones you need to reach.

12 So thank you for listening to me. And  
13 God bless you.

14 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Lily. We  
15 appreciate it and we're glad you could join us.

16 And Andy Imboden, one of our staff  
17 members, would like to talk to you.

18 MR. IMBODEN: Hi, Lily. My name is Andy  
19 Imboden.

20 Do you have a pen and a pencil? And  
21 Operator, if you could revive her line.

22 MS. WYRICH: Yes.

23 MR. IMBODEN: Okay. Can you hear me?

24 MS. WYRICH: Yes, I can hear you.

25 MR. IMBODEN: Okay. We've established a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 1-800 number that I'd like for you call to get any  
2 information that we can get to you. Are you ready?

3 MS. WYRICH: Yes, I'm ready.

4 MR. IMBODEN: Okay. It's 1-800-368-  
5 5642. And it's extension number 492-3425. And if  
6 you call during what are business hours on the East  
7 Coast, there should be somebody who could get you  
8 what information you need.

9 MS. WYRICH: Thank you very much.

10 MR. IMBODEN: All right.

11 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Lily. And  
12 thank you, Julius, for allowing her to comment  
13 through your line.

14 And next on the phone we have Gregg  
15 Levine. Gregg, would you like to make another  
16 comment?

17 MR. LEVINE: Well, yes. I've been  
18 sitting here. I've had some time to think, and I  
19 appreciate you guys taking the time.

20 It had just occurred to me that based on  
21 the waste projections of 150,000 metric tons by 2050,  
22 275,000 by the end of the century that we are many  
23 times over exceeding the original cap for Yucca. And  
24 I think that was at 70,000 metric tons. So that if we  
25 are going to put together scenarios for storing waste

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 long term, we have to assume not one, not two, but  
2 three different approvals for three different long-  
3 term sites assuming that's part of -- honestly, not  
4 politically or fiscally reasonable at this point. I  
5 mean, I can't imagine us getting three. But really  
6 your scenarios, if you're going to include the idea  
7 of a long-term centralized repository has to include  
8 three of them. And that's not including -- if I  
9 understand this -- DOE waste. It's not including  
10 return to sender from Atoms for Peace plants abroad.  
11 And I guess not including anything that comes out of  
12 say re-started MOX or reprocessing programs. And so,  
13 I think that needs to sort of be factored into waste  
14 confidence which is that we've got to come up with a  
15 way to account for three Yucca Mountains or sites.

16 And I guess the other comment I'd make  
17 would be just to second something I heard earlier.  
18 The woman from NIRS talked about real-time, online  
19 access to monitoring. And I can't second that  
20 strongly enough. As a person who tries to write and  
21 inform and talk right speak about these issues to  
22 people have found it incredibly hard to get the most  
23 basic sort of information. And if we are going to  
24 not only store more spent fuel at the sites but  
25 possibly develop interim sites and then also have to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 move radioactive fuel between different sites, I  
2 would love it to be able to just answer the need-to-  
3 know questions. And if there really is minimal  
4 danger to the public, then the amounts of  
5 environmental radiation -- so you say monitoring's  
6 just something that's classically off gas or  
7 strontium levels can be up like one marker element  
8 that measure that I can then report on so that people  
9 can get a sense of what the sort of daily operation  
10 loads are for these sites, what their burden is if  
11 they live ten, 20, 30 miles outside one of these  
12 sites. I would love to see that. I don't know  
13 if that comes under waste confidence or it comes  
14 under EIS or it comes under individual site  
15 licensing. But I think the NRC needs to find a way  
16 to regulatorily require the industry to make this  
17 information available. It's what government should  
18 do for people.

19 I guess those are my comments.

20 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you very much,  
21 Gregg.

22 MR. LEVINE: Certainly.

23 MS. JUCKETT: And for those of you who  
24 may be joining us on the phone, if you press \*1, that  
25 can add you to the queue to make a comment. The NRC

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 staff is standing by to hear your comments for the  
2 next hour.

3 And again just to remind you, the NRC  
4 staff has posed several questions that they're  
5 interested in hearing feedback on such as what should  
6 be included in the scope of the EIS, where it would  
7 be helpful for the public to have regional meetings  
8 held during the draft EIS phase and what other means  
9 of communication the NRC can use to better engage  
10 stakeholders.

11 We've heard several comments from people  
12 on those subjects. And NRC staff is interested in  
13 hearing more comments as you may have them.

14 We have Bonnie Bluestein on the line.  
15 Bonnie, welcome.

16 MS. BLUESTEIN: Thank you.

17 I'm going to ask about that 800 number  
18 that was just given out. There was a woman who was  
19 saying she was near a nuclear power plant and she  
20 wasn't getting information. And I was wondering is  
21 it possible to get any kind of the information that  
22 we were discussing earlier -- the monitoring -- to  
23 know if there's a leak, what kind of level of leak is  
24 happening or any of the real-time information that  
25 people are inquiring about. Because I was downwind

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of many nuclear power plants and occasionally I will  
2 hear on the news there was a leak -- an airborne leak  
3 or recently there was a plant that leaked a couple  
4 times. And I would just like to know as a citizen  
5 that was downwind of so many power plants if it leaks  
6 -- any of them leak -- I'd like to have the  
7 information what the leak comprises. And I was  
8 wondering if anybody could tell me if that 800 number  
9 would provide any of that kind of information or if  
10 there's a way to get the information.

11 I know there's a radnet or something  
12 like that that I believe the EPA has. And I don't  
13 know if it's actually working. I know after  
14 Fukushima I was trying to look at it. It didn't seem  
15 like there was any information that was working on  
16 that. And that's my question.

17 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. Thank you, Bonnie.  
18 I think the NRC staff would like to respond.

19 MR. McCONNELL: Yes. We don't have that  
20 information right here. But if you call the number  
21 that Andy mentioned, they can direct you to people  
22 who would address your issue.

23 And Andy, do you want to give the number  
24 now?

25 MR. IMBODEN: Yes. I would like to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 repeat that.

2 It's 1-800-368-5642. And that's a  
3 number that calls into the NRC operator. So if you  
4 know a further extension, you could do that. But the  
5 extension to the waste confidence environmental  
6 impact statement in particular is 492-3425.

7 MS. BLUESTEIN: And what kind of  
8 information would I get from just any of these?  
9 Would I be able to get the answers to anymore  
10 questions regarding what you're discussing tonight  
11 then from that specific extension number?

12 MR. IMBODEN: Yes. Or if you have other  
13 documents that you're having a hard time accessing or  
14 something like that, you'll talk to an NRC staff at  
15 that number, and we'll get that to you.

16 And if you have another question on  
17 another issue, we'll do our best to find out how to  
18 put you in contact with the right person in the  
19 Agency.

20 MS. BLUESTEIN: Okay. Thank you.

21 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Bonnie.

22 Anna, is there anyone else in the queue  
23 at this time?

24 OPERATOR: At the moment, there is no  
25 one else in queue. But as a reminder, you may press

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 \*1 if you would like to make a comment.

2 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you.

3 Just a reminder to those of you who may  
4 be on the line, if you haven't already called in to  
5 make a comment, you can press \*1 to be added to the  
6 queue to make comments. And even if you have already  
7 made a comment, if you do have additional comments,  
8 we have time this evening since we are going until  
9 Midnight Eastern Time, 9:00 p.m. West Coast Time.

10 Ruth, I see that you have joined us  
11 again. Welcome back.

12 MS. THOMAS: The reprocessing plant, so  
13 I was wondering if they wanted to know more about it  
14 if I could give my mailing address. Would that be  
15 all right?

16 MS. JUCKETT: I think it would be  
17 helpful for the staff if you would submit that to the  
18 contact number that was just given.

19 Sarah Lopas, who I believe you've talked  
20 to before, if you would like to give her that  
21 information, that would probably be helpful.

22 MS. THOMAS: I couldn't understand you.  
23 I'm sorry.

24 MS. JUCKETT: I'm sorry.

25 MS. THOMAS: What contact number should

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I call?

2 MS. JUCKETT: You can call the 1-800  
3 number that Andy has given before that has the  
4 extension. You've spoken before with Sarah Lopas.

5 MS. THOMAS: That 368-5642?

6 MS. JUCKETT: Yes, that's correct.

7 MS. THOMAS: Yes. Okay. Thank you.

8 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you.

9 Again, for those on the line, if you  
10 would like to make a comment, press \*1 to be added to  
11 the queue. And our operator will add you to the  
12 meeting.

13 And for those who would like to submit  
14 comments in writing, you can submit them through  
15 Regulations.gov by searching the Federal Waste  
16 Confidence docket.

17 And we do have another 45 minutes or so  
18 for comments to be called in to the meeting.

19 And just to remind you, the NRC is  
20 interested in getting your comments on some of the  
21 topics that were discussed during this meeting such  
22 as the scope of the EIS.

23 Paul mentioned in his presentation about  
24 three different scenarios that were included. And  
25 we'd be interested in hearing about whether or not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 those are the appropriate scenarios for this  
2 consideration or whether there should be other  
3 scenarios considered.

4 NRC is also interested in hearing about  
5 how to best communicate with the public and  
6 stakeholders to find out if there are other means of  
7 communication that should be used or other venues.

8 We've also already heard this evening on  
9 several topics such as environmental justice and  
10 cumulative impacts. And the NRC is interested in  
11 getting views from stakeholders on how those subjects  
12 could best be addressed in this type of environmental  
13 impact statement.

14 If you would like to make a comment on  
15 those topics or any of the other topics that have  
16 been addressed this evening, please feel free to call  
17 our 800 number and press \*1 to be added to the queue  
18 to make a comment.

19 And I see that we have Julius on the  
20 line again. Julius, feel free to make your comment.

21 MR. KERR: Yes. In light of Fukushima,  
22 there was a ten-mile setback issue. And then there  
23 was a issue brought out that they wanted the American  
24 people to move back 50 miles away from Fukushima, if  
25 I remember correctly. I think maybe in the scoping

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 process, we ought to look at the fact that we may  
2 need a 50-mile radius away from any nuclear power  
3 plant.

4 And another item too that might bear on  
5 the fact that we just heard from a friend of mine  
6 that doesn't have Internet and doesn't have a  
7 telephone. And I know there are 1,000s of people  
8 across the United States that fall into this same  
9 category. Maybe we ought to think about a bulk mail-  
10 type of information process for people that don't  
11 have access to the Internet.

12 And another thing, Ruth really inspires  
13 a lot of people. She's a very, very nice lady. And  
14 she might have a hard time expressing herself but  
15 when she expresses herself, she comes across loud and  
16 clear. And if we're really going to be checking  
17 these things out, I think it's important that all of  
18 this information that's been presented tonight be  
19 included in the final report so that everybody knows.

20 This is a very, very important issue for  
21 the people of America. And we need to realize how  
22 much nuclear energy is impacting the people of  
23 America. And I really think we need to stop. We  
24 need to stop nuclear energy. We need to move on to  
25 wind power and solar power which has absolutely no

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 waste product. That's the direction we need to go.  
2 And I think the NRC knows it. And I'd like to see  
3 these guys get jobs in solar power and wind power and  
4 keep on going.

5 Thank you for letting me comment.

6 MS. JUCKETT: Julius, thank you very  
7 much for your comment.

8 And we appreciate all of the commenters  
9 that have called in and want to be sure that everyone  
10 knows that these comments are on a transcript. And  
11 each of them will be considered in the writing of the  
12 EIS moving forward. So these comments are being  
13 recorded and will be considered.

14 And thank you again for your call.

15 If you are joining us on the line, you  
16 can press \*1 to be added to the queue to make a  
17 comment.

18 Anna, do we have anyone else on the line  
19 at this time?

20 OPERATOR: At this time, we do not. But  
21 a reminder -- oh, actually, we got another one from  
22 Gregg Levine.

23 MS. JUCKETT: Go ahead, Gregg.

24 MR. LEVINE: Thank you for all this  
25 time. I realize I get so many bites at the apple

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 here.

2 But I was just listening to Julius and  
3 thinking about a hearing schedule and sort of  
4 combining that with the idea of the evacuation radius  
5 which actually pre-dates the State Department  
6 advisories on Fukushima. You can see it in  
7 Presidential briefings after Chernobyl. I mean, they  
8 basically talked about 30- to 50-mile evacuation  
9 radius back then.

10 So perhaps we should look at major  
11 population centers within 30 to 50 miles of any site  
12 that is expected to have interim or medium- or long-  
13 term waste storage and have a hearing there. And I  
14 know that means a lot of hearings. But I think the  
15 process would benefit from a lot of hearings so that  
16 if we're looking at cities within -- I'm in New York  
17 City. We deserve a hearing because we are within 25  
18 miles as the crow flies from Indian Point. Folks in  
19 Chicago deserve a hearing. Folks in Los Angeles  
20 deserve a hearing. And obviously there are cities --  
21 major cities all across the country where they would  
22 be seriously affected if there was a long-term waste  
23 storage issue within 30 to 50 miles from them. So I  
24 think that should be the guideline for a sort of  
25 hearing plan.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   And obviously, I don't think I need to  
2 tell you guys, but it seems like you could probably  
3 use Facebook and Twitter better to get the word out  
4 about stuff like this. I know the communities that I  
5 respond to are constantly sharing information via  
6 both those mediums. And I know the NRC has a Twitter  
7 account. I subscribe to it. But they can probably  
8 do a better job of publicizing events such as this.  
9 Because I get the sense that you guys tend to hear  
10 from the same 10 or 20 of us a lot. And it would be  
11 great if we could expand that.

12                   MS. JUCKETT: Thank you very much,  
13 Gregg. And yes, we are certainly interested in  
14 engaging as many stakeholders as possible in this  
15 process. And we appreciate your comments on how to  
16 better engage the public.

17                   And Julius mentioned about contacting  
18 people by bulk mail as a suggestion for those who may  
19 not have Internet access. And the NRC staff is  
20 interested in what other ways might be useful to get  
21 in touch with people either through high-tech or low-  
22 tech access. If you have ideas about that, we'd be  
23 happy to hear from you.

24                   Again, if you would like to make a  
25 comment, press \*1 to be added to the queue.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 Julius, welcome back.

2 MR. KERR: You mentioned contacting  
3 other people. Bulk mail is one way, but also an ad  
4 in the local newspaper. I know it will be expensive  
5 to do it across the United States, but you would  
6 reach people, and you would get people to make  
7 comments.

8 And if the NRC really wants to hear from  
9 the people, it's going to take sitting down in the  
10 pews with them because that's where they're going to  
11 be. Most people still read the paper. And that  
12 would certainly be one way to connect.

13 And I'll guarantee you there's 1,000s of  
14 people out there around nuclear facilities that would  
15 like to say something. I know a man that said he had  
16 heard the alarms go off from his youth up until he  
17 was an adult. And he never realized what that alarm  
18 siren was. He thought it was the lunch call that  
19 they were broadcasting. And once he became an adult  
20 and moved further out in his education, he begun to  
21 realize that he wasn't hearing the lunch bell. He  
22 was hearing the alarm for the nuclear power plant.

23 And I think that kind of situation is  
24 hard to believe that that happens in America today.  
25 But there are people still in America that don't have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Internet, that don't have a telephone. And mail is  
2 about the only thing that they get and maybe a  
3 newspaper. So a newspaper and bulk mail would be a  
4 real issue for the NRC to take up. I mean, if you  
5 guys are serious about this, it would definitely be a  
6 way to progress into the next centuries. And it  
7 sounds like this problem is going to continue on  
8 because the half life of this thing is 1,000s of  
9 years. So we're going to have to keep this program  
10 going for 1,000s of years.

11 And I really hope that you'll hold the  
12 people that are making the money off of this nuclear  
13 energy accountable to taking care of this nuclear  
14 waste for 1,000s of years because it's not fair to  
15 give it to the American people and make them  
16 responsible for it.

17 When solar energy is something that will  
18 work and it's cheaper than nuclear energy. So why  
19 keep doing the nukes, gentlemen? Let's stop the  
20 nukes. Let's move to solar energy. Let's move to  
21 wind energy. I'd be glad to have wind energy in my  
22 backyard or solar panels.

23 And by the way, I live in the rural area  
24 in Graham, North Carolina. I bet you can't even find  
25 that on the map.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Thank you for allowing me to comment.

2 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Julius. And I  
3 think we'll all go look for Graham, North Carolina on  
4 a map just to make sure.

5 But thank you very much for your calls  
6 and your comments.

7 Anna, do we have anyone else on the  
8 line?

9 OPERATOR: At the moment, we do not.  
10 But as a reminder, you may press \*1 to make a  
11 comment.

12 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you.

13 And for those who are still connected to  
14 the call, just a reminder that the NRC is interested  
15 in hearing your comments on the scope of the EIS to  
16 support waste confidence and items such as what  
17 should be included in the scope of the EIS, how those  
18 analyses should be done and potentially even what  
19 kinds of references should be used. What kind of  
20 information should the NRC be considering in the  
21 development of the EIS?

22 Again, if you'd like to make a comment,  
23 please press \*1 to join the conference.

24 The NRC staff will be here for about  
25 another 30 minutes to continue hearing your comments.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 And I see that we have Tom Rielly joining us on the  
2 phone again. Tom, feel free to make your comment.

3 MR. RIELLY: Yes. Thank you.

4 I was wondering if based on the last  
5 comment made that this generic waste confidence  
6 environmental impact study is basically looking at a  
7 blank page at the moment, but that's kind of contrary  
8 to human nature. And I'm wondering if there is a  
9 work product out there that the NRC may think is  
10 somewhat analogous to how this effort may come out.  
11 In other words, except for its substance, is there a  
12 template in existence that may in fact mimic right  
13 now in the here and present -- because it's completed  
14 work product -- somewhat the end state of this  
15 current effort.

16 Thank you.

17 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Tom. And I  
18 think Keith will go ahead and respond to your  
19 question.

20 MR. McCONNELL: Yes. I direct you to  
21 the 2010 rulemaking on waste confidence as the most  
22 recent version of the Commission's waste confidence  
23 decision. There were also -- and we can get -- I  
24 don't know that we have the specific references to  
25 them -- but there was also a 1990 update of the waste

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 confidence decision, and then the original waste  
2 confidence decision that was done in 1984. So all  
3 three of those would provide some background  
4 information on the approach we're going to take in  
5 this generic environmental impact statement  
6 development effort.

7 MR. RIELLY: Very well. Thank you very  
8 much.

9 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you for your  
10 question, Tom.

11 Is there anyone else on the line who  
12 would like to make a comment at this time?

13 (No audible response.)

14 MS. JUCKETT: Okay. The NRC staff is  
15 going to continue to stand by for the next 30 minutes  
16 to take any additional comments that you may have.  
17 Press \*1 to make a comment.

18 We would like to thank those of you who  
19 are sticking with us to hear whatever remaining  
20 comments may come in. NRC staff will be here for  
21 another few minutes to continue to hear your comments  
22 as they may come in.

23 And if you'd like to access any of the  
24 information that has been presented tonight, you can  
25 find the information on the website on the NRC

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 website. And it will have the transcripts of this  
2 evening's webinar within a few weeks of this webinar.  
3 And there are already transcripts online from the  
4 November 14th meetings.

5 And comments can be received up until  
6 January 2nd, the end of the scoping period. Those  
7 comments can be submitted either by mail, by fax or  
8 through Regulations.gov.

9 And if you're still on the line with us  
10 and you'd like to make a comment about the scope of  
11 the EIS, our communications process or any of the  
12 subjects that are going to be included in the EIS,  
13 please feel free to call the 800 number and press \*1  
14 to make a comment.

15 And again, the NRC staff is standing by  
16 for your comments. If you are on the line with us  
17 and you would like to make a comment, press \*1.

18 OPERATOR: We do have a comment standing  
19 by.

20 MS. JUCKETT: Excellent. Thank you.

21 OPERATOR: Yes. Alicia Rivers, you're  
22 open.

23 MS. JUCKETT: Welcome, Alicia.

24 MS. RIVERS: Thank you.

25 I feel that I have so little background,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 particularly in previous EIS statements that have  
2 been prepared like in 1984 and 1990. And so, I have  
3 a general idea of what you're working toward. And it  
4 sounds to me as if Mary Olson's earlier urging you to  
5 actually provide something focused on environmental  
6 impact rather than compliance with regulations is a  
7 lot to ask for.

8           So I guess I'm thinking about in the  
9 area of public health in general. We have mechanisms  
10 for giving people over the radio, for example, pollen  
11 counts that help elderly people and others struggling  
12 with respiratory difficulties to know to stay inside.  
13 We have urgings very often, particularly over the  
14 radio I guess, for people to get vaccinations and flu  
15 shots and all of those kinds of things. I can't  
16 recall ever hearing anything, particularly in that  
17 radio venue, about warnings from nuclear facilities  
18 that are close by or 50 miles away. And I certainly  
19 have no information whatsoever on what to do if one  
20 of those were to be given to me -- if I were to  
21 receive a warning or notification that there had been  
22 an accident. I certainly don't have an evacuation  
23 route in my head or know where to go if I leave my  
24 home. And if that's not supposed to be a part of the  
25 EIS, I guess I'm thinking that I hope you guys -- I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 really appreciate your openness to all of these  
2 things that we are talking about with you. But I  
3 hope that if an EIS is not the appropriate place to  
4 be getting information that we need that the NRC with  
5 its mandate to protect our safety and our health  
6 would begin supplying that information in some other  
7 way, if not through an EIS.

8 It seems that as someone else said  
9 earlier, it's not if but when we're going to be in  
10 need of that information.

11 And I appreciate the opportunity to say  
12 those things. Thank you.

13 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you very much,  
14 Alicia. We appreciate your call and your comments.

15 And Keith McConnell would like to make a  
16 statement.

17 MR. McCONNELL: Just two clarifications.  
18 We agree that environmental impact statement is not a  
19 place where you make a compliance demonstration or  
20 termination with the regulation. It is a mechanism  
21 for disclosing impacts, both safety and  
22 environmental. So I think we are in agreement with  
23 that comment.

24 With respect to evacuation routes and  
25 things like that, there are around each plant, each

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com



1 licensee and each nuclear power plant licensee has an  
2 emergency plan. And they have mechanisms and defined  
3 measures in those plans for notifying people and  
4 evacuation routes and things like that. So that sort  
5 of information is outside the scope of what we're  
6 doing here, but is within the scope of the licensing  
7 of individual plants.

8 MS. RIVERS: Okay. Thank you. I guess  
9 I'm feeling that I'm not the only person out here who  
10 doesn't know that those kinds of things exist or most  
11 of us I think are not even aware that there might be  
12 a need for them. I just think we're very, very  
13 ignorant of our vulnerability to relation to nuclear  
14 energy and the dangers that it presents for us.

15 And I'm glad at least someone is giving  
16 some thought to it. I just hope it's enough thought  
17 and that it will carry for as long as the danger will  
18 last into those 100s of 1,000s of years.

19 Thanks.

20 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you, Alicia. We  
21 appreciate your comment and your questions.

22 MS. RIVERS: Thank you.

23 MS. JUCKETT: And additionally, you can  
24 find supplemental information on the NRC website.  
25 And if you get in touch with the NRC contacts,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they'll be happy to try to get you in touch with the  
2 right people to answer your questions as possible.

3 MS. RIVERS: Thank you.

4 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you for your call.

5 And for those of you are on the line, if  
6 you would like to make a comment, press \*1 to be  
7 added to the queue to make a comment.

8 We still have about 22 minutes left in  
9 this evening's webinar. And the NRC staff is  
10 standing by to take your comments.

11 Again, the NRC staff is taking comments  
12 this evening on the scope of the environmental impact  
13 statement for waste confidence. If you would like to  
14 make a comment on the scope of the EIS, please call  
15 the 800 number and press \*1 to make a comment.

16 Again, if you're with us on the line and  
17 you would like to make a comment, press \*1.

18 So we have about 15 minutes left in the  
19 webinar. For those of you who may be calling in from  
20 the public who would like to make comments on the  
21 waste confidence EIS being developed by the NRC  
22 staff, the staff has provided information this  
23 evening on how to present comments written through  
24 the mail or through Regulations.gov if you prefer to  
25 send in comments electronically. And we also welcome

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 your comments again this evening through this webinar  
2 by calling our 800 number and press \*1 to make a  
3 comment.

4 And again, all of the comments that are  
5 received, either through mail, online or in this  
6 meeting, will be considered equally and will be noted  
7 in the scoping summary report and addressed in the  
8 waste confidence EIS.

9 Anna, just to be sure, we're not seeing  
10 anyone on our queue to make a comment right now. Do  
11 you see anyone on the queue who would like to make a  
12 comment?

13 OPERATOR: Currently, I do not. But a  
14 reminder, all you have to is press \*1 to make a  
15 comment.

16 MS. JUCKETT: Thank you.

17 We have about ten minutes left this  
18 evening before we wrap up the evening. To continue  
19 taking comments, the NRC staff is standing by to  
20 continue taking comments.

21 If you'd like to make a comment about  
22 the waste confidence EIS being developed by the team,  
23 the scope of the EIS, the methods for communication  
24 being used, where we could hold scoping meetings, or  
25 subjects such as environmental justice, cumulative

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 impacts and other topics that should be included  
2 within the scope of the EIS, please feel free to dial  
3 our 1-800 number and make a comment by pressing \*1.

4 For those of you who are still remaining  
5 on the line, we have about ten minutes left before  
6 the NRC will be wrapping up this evening's meeting.  
7 So you have about ten more minutes to make your  
8 comments by dialing the 1-800 number and pressing \*1.

9 Again, for those who are on the line, if  
10 you'd like to make a comment, press \*1 to be  
11 connected.

12 We have just a few minutes remaining.  
13 If you'd like to make any final comments, please dial  
14 our 1-800 number, press \*1. We'll be glad to take  
15 your comments on the scope of the EIS, the methods of  
16 communication being used by the NRC team, additional  
17 ways that the NRC could communicate with the public  
18 such as those that we have heard from earlier  
19 commenters or other comments that have to do with the  
20 scope of the EIS, the resource areas being included,  
21 the scenarios and other related topics.

22 We have just a few minutes remaining, so  
23 please feel free to dial our 800 number and press \*1  
24 to be connected.

25 And again, we have five minutes

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 remaining before we wrap up this evening's webinar.  
2 If you have additional comments that you would like  
3 to make, we understand that several of you have  
4 called multiple times, and if you do have additional  
5 comments, we have another few minutes to take them.  
6 Or if you're a new caller and haven't made a comment  
7 yet but would like to, we are taking comments this  
8 evening on the scope of the EIS, and we'd be happy to  
9 hear from you. Dial the 800 number and press \*1 to  
10 make your comment.

11 With just a couple of minutes remaining  
12 in this evening's webinar for the NRC staff to take  
13 comments, we'd like to remind you that all the  
14 comments received tonight will be transcribed and  
15 will be added to the record.

16 If you did not get a chance to make  
17 comments tonight or if you have additional comments  
18 that you would like to make before the end of the  
19 scoping period on January 2nd, you can submit them  
20 online or through the mail or by fax.

21 Again, we have just a couple of minutes  
22 left for those of you who are still on the line to  
23 make your final comments in this evening's webinar.

24 Thank you for joining us, and we'll  
25 continue to stand by for another couple of minutes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Anna, I'd like to check with you one  
2 more time just to make sure that we don't have anyone  
3 in the queue to make a final comment.

4 OPERATOR: That is correct. No one else  
5 is in the queue. But a reminder, all you have to do  
6 is press \*1 to make a comment.

7 MS. JUCKETT: Well, at this time since  
8 we have no final comments, we'd like to conclude this  
9 evening's webinar with some comments from Keith  
10 McConnell.

11 We'd like to thank Anna, our Operator,  
12 for working with us and staying with us all evening.  
13 You've been very helpful. Thank you.

14 And also to our transcriber. Eric,  
15 thank you for your help, and to all the NRC staff and  
16 presenters who are present for this evening's  
17 meeting.

18 Keith?

19 MR. McCONNELL: Thank you, Miriam.

20 Again, we appreciate people taking the  
21 time to participate in these webinars and other  
22 meetings that we've had. We know that it takes an  
23 effort, and we appreciate you taking that effort.

24 And again, like the other meetings we've  
25 had on the scoping, we've found the comments that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 we've gotten tonight very thoughtful and heartfelt,  
2 so we appreciate that also.

3 We will attempt, as the commenters have  
4 suggested, to expand our outreach efforts to the  
5 extent that we can. But we would in the interim  
6 encourage people to -- those that can -- to check our  
7 website frequently for future opportunities for  
8 participation in our development of this generic  
9 environmental impact statement.

10 So with that, I adjourn the meeting.

11 Thank you very much.

12 (Whereupon, at 11:56 p.m., the webinar  
13 was concluded.)

14

15

16

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)