

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT TO SUPPORT AN UPDATED
WASTE CONFIDENCE DECISION AND RULE

NOVEMBER 14, 2012

1:00 P.M.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Public Meeting

1 proceedings but until State of New York versus NRC, the Commission has been
2 recalcitrant, but there is still no place for nuclear waste.

3 Third, and finally, this point might be entitled "duct tape" because all
4 nuclear waste solutions are temporary. I recommend the principles as a starting
5 point for the current scoping process already alluded to by Kevin Kamps of
6 Beyond Nuclear. In brief, they are require low density open frame layout for fuel
7 pools, for fire safety, and calling for dry storage after five-year period. Also,
8 establish hardened onsite storage, a storage system unattractive as a terrorist
9 target and retrievable. Protecting fuel pools to withstand an attack by air, land, or
10 water from a force at least equal in size and coordination to the 9/11 attacks.
11 Require periodic review of hardened on-site facilities and fuel pools with
12 meaningful participation from public stakeholders. There should be dedicated
13 funding to local and state governments to independently monitor these sites and
14 finally to prohibit reprocessing. The reprocessing of irradiated fuel has not solved
15 the nuclear waste problem in any country.

16 Thank you for the opportunity to make these comments. We did
17 cosign the November letter -- November 8th letter mentioned earlier, and we will
18 be submitting further remarks before the close of the comments. Thank you.

19 CHIP CAMERON: Operator, we're going to go to David Weisman
20 next if he is on the phone and then to Mary Olson.

21 DAVID WEISMAN: Yeah, David's here.

22 CHIP CAMERON: Hi, David.

23 DAVID WEISMAN: Are we live?

24 CHIP CAMERON: Yes.

25 DAVID WEISMAN: David Weisman, Alliance for Nuclear

1 Responsibility. In summary, we -- the Alliance agree with the others on the
2 procedural need to alter the calendar for comments and agree with others who've
3 suggested hearings need to be held specifically in the impacted communities.
4 We also agree with those who believe in the need to dispel with the concept or
5 notion that this is a generic and a generic environmental impact statement is
6 possible.

7 I'm speaking to this morning 11 miles from the confluence of the
8 most active earthquake fault surrounding any reactor here at Diablo Canyon.
9 We're looking ahead now at issues that need to be dealt with in one or two
10 centuries, if you look at your early chart, going forward now 100 to 200 years,
11 and I can tell you there are certainly sections of this coast of California that have
12 been reclaimed by the Pacific Ocean in the last century, and as mother nature
13 proceeds, is likely to reclaim much more of California's coast on which these two
14 reactors sit within half a mile of the Pacific Ocean. So, to say that you can
15 divorce these geologic uncertainties in a generic fashion wouldn't be prudent,
16 and recall, even in the case of the Mineral, Virginia earthquake, in that case
17 where the hazard had been underestimated was the spent fuel cask that suffered
18 the most visible damage in that event. It's not just California as well that suffers
19 these -- again, the ability [inaudible] flood waters near Oyster Creek as a result of
20 Hurricane Sandy or the flood waters on the Missouri River at Fort Calhoun. If
21 you're looking at a process that's going to look at spent fuel storage on site for
22 100 to 200 years then those 100-year flood zones which, as we've now
23 discovered, can happen. Then global sea level rise over the next century on the
24 riverine and coastal locations must be considered as well. And so that is our
25 statement on the inadvisability of considering this generic, especially from a

1 geologic point of view.

2 But finally, we raise a concern that the environmental impact
3 statement look at that's not necessarily environmental but real, and that
4 economic -- is an economic impact which we feel must be addressed as
5 ratepayer and ratepayer advocates because going forward on all this, who's
6 paying? We have understood that once the deal we accept the fuel for
7 permanent repository gets on the truck, the train, or whatever leaves the site,
8 that's the responsibility of the federal government. But in the 50 to 100 years or
9 more that may precede such an event, how can the agency ensure the fiscal
10 solvency of the utilities that are now in charge of maintaining the security and the
11 safety of all the pertinences that are required to keep spent fuel stored onsite?
12 Will the ratepayers be paying for this 100 years after the plants have ceased to
13 generate either revenue or electricity?

14 And so, the cornerstone somewhere in the EIS must be the ability
15 to maintain the fiscal responsibility because without that money the integrity of
16 the facilities, the ability to repackage the cask if necessary won't be there without
17 money unless the federal government is willing to step in and say that they're
18 going to accept those costs now and not at the time when it goes to a supposed
19 federal repository. Remember, there are many corporations, famous institutions,
20 once beloved brand names from Pan Am to TWA to Oldsmobile that are no
21 longer with us, they are insolvent, they are gone. So what would happen if a
22 private utility and their money goes away? Again, absent the federal government
23 assuming all cost responsibilities at that time, how is it paid for?

24 Remember too, as long as the waste remains on-site, again
25 according to the current rules, it is the local state municipal agencies who are

1 responsible for keeping the offsite responders, the emergency response teams,
2 the evacuation plans available. And absent the revenue that these provide now
3 to those communities who pays for this over the 50, 100, and 150 years that
4 would follow? So we would ask that economic issues cannot be divorced from
5 this process as well. And I guess that's the comment today of the Alliance for
6 Nuclear Responsibility.

7 CHIP CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much, David.

8 DAVID WEISMAN: Thank you, Chip.

9 CHIP CAMERON: Mary Olson?

10 MARY OLSON: Hello?

11 CHIP CAMERON: Hi, Mary.

12 MARY OLSON: Hi.

13 CHIP CAMERON: We hear you.

14 MARY OLSON: You know, it's funny, there's a really long lag time
15 between the phone and the Internet picture, by the way. Like, as in over a
16 minute. But I'm glad to be on and out of deference to the fact that Dominique
17 French has spoken I am going to be very brief, and I will say that although I work
18 for Nuclear Information and Resource Service, it was local people here in
19 western North Carolina who live around a site that was characterized to some
20 degree for a repository 30 years ago that I was urged to call in with a second
21 voice coming from the grandmother wing. We understand the interveners and
22 the legalisms, but we also want to show up and speak to NRC staff and
23 appreciate the opportunity to do that.

24 And listening today I understand this idea about scenarios, but I
25 also want to re-emphasize that this is, like, a -- worse than the game of battleship