

72-22  
ORIGINAL

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**Title: SFPO/NMSS PUBLIC MEETING ON P DRAFT  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR  
THE PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE FACILITY**

**Location: Salt Lake City, Utah**

**Date: Monday, August 21, 2000**

**Pages: 1 - 87**

**ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.**  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 842-0034

NMSSOIPublic

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 \*\*\*

4  
5 PUBLIC MEETING ON THE P DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL  
6 IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE  
7 PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE FACILITY  
8

9  
10 Little America Inn  
11 500 South Main Street  
12 Salt Lake City, Utah  
13 Monday, August 21, 2000  
14

15 The above-entitled meeting commenced, pursuant to  
16 notice, at 2:00 p.m.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.  
Court Reporters  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 842-0034

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

[2:00 p.m.]

DR. SHANKMAN: Well, we've conferred, and we've decided it's about 2:00, so we'll start the meeting.

My name is Susan Shankman. I'm the deputy director of the division of -- in the NRC Corporate Spent Fuel Project Office. That office has the responsibility for licensing independent spent fuel storage facilities, and what we're considering today has to do with that -- that responsibility.

Let me start off by saying we're holding two of these hearings today. One is from 2:00 to 4:00, and the other meeting tonight is from 6:00 to 9:00.

This meeting is being held with four federal agencies: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, as I mentioned, the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, who's represented to my right by Dave Allison; the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, who couldn't be with us because of the wildfires; and the U.S. Surface Transportation Board, who's represented by Charles Gardiner, also to my right.

With the NRC, we have the senior project manager who has the responsibility overall for advising this facility, Mark Delligatti; our contractor, the Oakridge National Labs, represented by Greg Zimmerman; and Scott Flanders, who is the senior project manager for

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.  
Court Reporters  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 842-0034

1 environmental impact, specifically the Environmental Impact  
2 Statement for this facility.

3 The purpose of our meeting today is to accept  
4 public comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
5 -- I'll explain that in a minute -- and I should let you  
6 know what our schedule is and our process for submitting  
7 those comments.

8 I'd like to just say that I hope today that we can  
9 maintain the same kind of relationship we had with the group  
10 that we met with in July, which is that we respect the fact  
11 that everybody has a comment, and that we let them finish  
12 their comments.

13 From the signup list, I think we have over two  
14 hours, so I think we'll have plenty of time to allow people  
15 several minutes to talk.

16 We're only going to talk about environmental  
17 issues today, and the time frame is, as I said, until 4:00.

18 The environmental impact process is covered by the  
19 NEPA, which is a legislation that was passed in the 70's,  
20 which basically says for major federal action you will do an  
21 environmental impact statement, in which you will take the  
22 application that's submitted for you for whatever the  
23 federal action is, you will notify the public, which we've  
24 done. We had a scoping meeting -- we've had several of them  
25 last fall? Sorry, June of '98 and April of '99. That's the

1 fall, isn't it? Yeah.

2 We also did a site visit. We took documentation  
3 from the application and from existing documents, and we  
4 also requested additional information where we didn't have  
5 enough information. We put that together into a Draft  
6 Environmental Impact Statement, which is extensive, but the  
7 executive summary is available on the front table. And I  
8 think you may find that that's easier to read. But the  
9 whole Environmental Statement, in draft form, is available  
10 for anybody out at the -- in the other room. And that's out  
11 for public comments until September 21st, at which time we  
12 will -- all the comments we hear today, which are being  
13 transcribed by Kerry, who will keep up with all of us, and  
14 any comments we get in writing, and any comments we get on  
15 the Internet, there are just -- at the end I'll tell you all  
16 the ways you can make comments. All of those comments will  
17 be responded to in writing, and we hope to have final  
18 Environmental Impact Statement out in the spring.

19 And if you make comments today, and you give us  
20 our name and address, we will be sure that you get a copy of  
21 the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

22 Once the Final Environmental Impact Statement is  
23 out, it is just part of the licensing process. And I want  
24 to make that clear, because I think the last time we were  
25 here it wasn't clear to everybody that this is one part of

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.  
Court Reporters  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 842-0034

1 the licensing process.

2 The reason that we have four agencies cooperating  
3 is because each of them has a federal action to take. The  
4 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission has to decide whether to  
5 grant a 20-year license for Private Fuel Storage, Limited  
6 Liability Corporation to receive, transfer, and possess  
7 nuclear material, and operate this independent spent fuel  
8 facility.

9 The Bureau of Indian Affairs has to approve a  
10 25-year license -- lease, I'm sorry, for -- between this  
11 Private Fuel Storage Corporation and the Skull Valley band  
12 of the Goshute Indians.

13 The Bureau of Land Management must approve a right  
14 of way request for a rail line on Bureau of Land Management  
15 land, which if you've seen outside, there's a diagram of  
16 where that rail line would be from the main spur going down  
17 into the Goshute reservation.

18 And the Surface Transportation Board, another  
19 government agency, has been asked to grant a license to  
20 construct and operate this proposed rail line.

21 So each of the cooperating agencies would have had  
22 to do an Environmental Impact Statement alone, and to make  
23 it more efficient, we've all cooperated and used our  
24 resources collectively, to have one Environmental Impact  
25 Statement.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.  
Court Reporters  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 842-0034

1           The period we're in now is the comment period  
2 related to this Draft Environmental Impact Statement.  
3 There's, also, for the NRC, a Safety Evaluation Report,  
4 which I will discuss a little bit later.

5           Melanie, go back -- oh, that's fine. Okay.

6           The Safety Evaluation Report has many issues in it  
7 that I believe are of interest to people who may be here  
8 today, and I wanted to make it clear that although we look  
9 at those issues to some extent, some of them in the  
10 Environmental Impact Statement we look at them in great  
11 detail in the Safety Evaluation Report, and that includes  
12 accident analysis, earthquakes, and military use of the air  
13 space, physical protection. And security and safeguards,  
14 theft, diversion, terrorism, that's all figured under  
15 physical protection.

16           And then the financial qualifications and the  
17 decommissioning fund assurance; that is, can this company  
18 operate this facilities safely? Do they have the  
19 wherewithal, financially, to do that, and will there be  
20 enough money to clean it up and bring it back to the same  
21 state it was before it had this federal -- federally  
22 licensed operation there?

23           The Environmental Impact Statement, on the other  
24 hand, looks at those things only from the aspect of will it  
25 have an impact on the environment?

1 Can you go back to the slide before.

2 To -- just to make it clear that we're talking  
3 about environmental issues today, and based on this  
4 Environmental Impact Statement, each of the federal agencies  
5 that I mentioned will have a Record of Decision, it's  
6 called, and that Record of Decision --

7 Oh, hi. The Bureau of Land Management did arrive.

8 MR. CARPENTER: I'm still a little smokey.

9 DR. SHANKMAN: No, you're not. Well, thank you.

10 And each of those records of decision will be made  
11 independently by each agency, so I hope it's clear that the  
12 Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the Final  
13 Environmental Impact Statement are jointly made by the four  
14 agencies, but each agency has an independent decision to  
15 make, and will make it based on the findings of their own  
16 review process, in our case, a safety review and the  
17 Environmental Impact Statement.

18 Skip to the next -- I guess that's it, right?

19 Okay. So let me review quickly. We're going to  
20 talk about environmental impact issues. We want to hear any  
21 comments anybody has. You can make them to us either today,  
22 orally, and they will be transcribed; you can also -- there  
23 is a form in the back, it looks like this (indicating), and  
24 it folds like this (indicating), so the address is there.  
25 So if you prefer to make your comments in writing, you don't



1 even have to find an envelope, it's preaddressed. We have  
2 an Internet site.

3 Do we have a slide with that? Maybe not.

4 Anyway, we have an Internet cite. We have -- in  
5 the slides in the back. You can make it -- email to  
6 Distribution at NRC.gov, you can fax it to (301) 415-2289,  
7 and -- that's wrong.

8 Okay. Before we finish -- oh, I'm sorry. Okay.  
9 The address to make comments is NRC.gov, and then there's a  
10 whole line. But you can find that under documents New Reg  
11 1714 and make your comments that way.

12 There you go. Thank you. Can you leave that one  
13 up. Okay. Let's leave that up. My point being that we  
14 want your comments, we need your comments, and all comments  
15 will be responded to in writing in the Final Environmental  
16 Impact Statement.

17 So with that, we'll go to comments, and Mark  
18 Delligatti will call out -- so just step up to the  
19 microphone so we can get you on the record.

20 And thank you all for being here.

21 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you, Susan.

22 We had number of speakers sign up in advance, and  
23 several of them represented your elected officials. I don't  
24 see a couple of them here, but if they arrive, we'll  
25 certainly ask them to come forward. Congressman Cook I

1 don't believe has arrived yet. I've gotten word that Mayor  
2 Anderson is on his way. He will be a little bit late. And  
3 I don't believe that Chairman Bear has arrived. However, we  
4 do have one speaker representing local government, and at  
5 this time I'd like to call forward Mayor Tom Waggoner from  
6 the City of Clearfield.

7 MAYOR WAGGONER: Good afternoon, ladies and  
8 gentlemen. I come before you today, and I appreciate the  
9 opportunity to speak with you. Today I'm wearing two hats.  
10 I'm a member -- I am the mayor of Clearfield City, which is  
11 about 30 miles north of Salt Lake City and approximately  
12 27,000 inhabitants, and, also, I'm a member of the Utah  
13 Defense Alliance, which is an organization that is rallying  
14 to keep Hill Air Force Base, the largest employer in the  
15 state, open and active and operating, which also includes  
16 the Utah Test and Training Range.

17 First of all, as mayor, I'd like to say that,  
18 representing the citizens of Clearfield, they are very, very  
19 concerned about the nuclear waste. If it does enter through  
20 Evanston, Wyoming, by rail or by truck, it most likely will  
21 come through Clearfield. We have the -- the railroad that  
22 comes right through the center of town and the freeway that  
23 skirts our east boundary. So they are very concerned.

24 We don't know that these containers and things are  
25 safe. They've never been tested in horrible accidents and

1 things, like we hear. It's just that they're concerned that  
2 this will happen. Also, the rail line passes right east of  
3 the largest manufacturing center in the state of Utah, which  
4 is the Freeport Center. If something was to happen there  
5 with the switching lines or that, and this would be  
6 contaminated, then we would -- we get 60 percent of our  
7 taxable revenue, which we operate the city with, from the  
8 Freeport Center. And if this was to shut down, we doubt  
9 that it would open again. So we're very protective of that  
10 part of our city because it means so much to us, and that --  
11 so I bring those concerns of the citizens and let you know  
12 of the things there.

13 As a member of the Utah Defense Alliance, I --  
14 you're talking about your environmental impact study.  
15 There's a dying breed out in the west desert. It's a gray  
16 airplane that flies the speed of sound and drops bombs. And  
17 it's in danger because people are trying to shut the range  
18 down. The nuclear storage facility, they say there's no  
19 rules or regulations that says we cannot fly or use the air  
20 space over that storage area, but would you, as a commander  
21 of an air- -- aircraft wing, send planes or aircraft over  
22 that area with loaded bombs? Would you fly cruise missiles  
23 or smart bombs over that area? True, legally we could do  
24 it, because there's nothing that says we can't, but just the  
25 common sense would tell you that accident potential is

1 there.

2 The -- the Test and Training Range is the largest  
3 in the continental United States. It's one of the last  
4 areas where we can drop live air drops with thousands and  
5 thousands of pounds bombs. Each day they're inventing new  
6 smart bombs, as they're called. The cruise missiles are  
7 developing more and getting starter. They need a place to  
8 fly those to test these. We don't just fly them in a  
9 straight line, and then they blow up. They turn and they  
10 twist and they hug the mountains, they go up high, they come  
11 down low.

12 A while back we had a cruise missile go off track  
13 and was detonated. It was exploded by the controlers, and a  
14 piece of the debris -- part of the debris fell and  
15 demolished a Japanese monitoring trailer out there. And  
16 we're -- we're worried that the same thing could happen  
17 there once we destroy it, because if it is going awry we  
18 cannot be responsible for the debris that takes place.

19 As I talk to young airmen and the young pilots  
20 that fly out at Hill Air Force Base, I had an opportunity to  
21 fly with one of them, and I asked him, as we were heading  
22 out to the range -- we had a small corridor, from 6- to  
23 8,000 feet over the lake, because of the expansion of Salt  
24 Lake Airport. Once we get out there we can go as high as  
25 want and go as fast as we want. I asked him if he'd been in

1 combat. He says, yes, he had. I said, "Did you ever drop  
2 bombs?"

3 He says, I was on a mission one day flying escort,  
4 and we are locked on by radar. He says, "The next day I was  
5 flying the bombs and my buddy was flying, and he said they  
6 locked on us again." He says, "I was able to drop bombs on  
7 them. They never locked on anybody else."

8 So I said, "What did the range do for you?"

9 He said, "The range gives me a chance to practice  
10 and hone my skills, not with little 40-pound practice bombs,  
11 but with the real thing."

12 Out at the range we have mock-ups of sand slides,  
13 there are mock-ups of trains, they have mock-ups of  
14 aircrafts they are mock-ups of runways, where the pilots can  
15 actually go into battle and do those things.

16 Because of the air space we have, we can have dog  
17 fights up above, we can have aircraft refueling up above,  
18 there can be 20 different things going on over the air space  
19 at once. This is a lot of traffic and a lot of area. And  
20 the way we get in right now into the -- the southern part of  
21 the range where the live target drops are, we come right  
22 down to Skull Valley, and we fly down that. And once they  
23 get into restricted air space, the space that starts the  
24 G-11 planes, especially if they're loaded, they see to the  
25 bombs to make sure they're not going to shake loose before

1 they go into their runs.

2 So it is an important avenue for us. If this  
3 facility is based there it will highly disrupt and possibly  
4 be an avenue for people who want to shut down the range, to  
5 have it shut down. A lot of people in Skull Valley may say,  
6 "Well, it's good. I don't like the noisy aircraft anyway."  
7 But the noise comes and goes. If there's an accident out  
8 there, with the nuclear waste and the fallout, the things  
9 that are left there will not go away for hundreds and  
10 hundreds of years.

11 I don't know what incentives there -- that the  
12 Goshute tribe is receiving from this, but if I was them, if  
13 I received anything in monetary value, I would take that  
14 monetary -- money and move as far away from Skull Valley as  
15 I could.

16 Thank you very much.

17 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you, Mayor.

18 All right. I don't see any of our other elected  
19 officials having arrived yet. Therefore, we'll go to the  
20 folks who signed up in advance.

21 Robin Jenkins?

22 MS. SHANKMAN: While Robin is coming to the  
23 microphone, I did want to tell you that the room was set up  
24 this way, but we are not here as -- it looks as if we're  
25 judges up here, and I wanted to make it very clear that that

1 is not our intention, we just want to hear what you have to  
2 say. If we could arrange it and be more there (indicating),  
3 we would. So, I wanted to make that comment. Sometimes we  
4 get the illusion that the federal government is sitting  
5 there. That's an artifact of the way the room was set up.  
6 And so I apologize, because its not our intent to do that  
7 today.

8 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you. Thank  
9 you all very much for hearing us today.

10 I hear comments that I would like to submit in  
11 writing today, also. I have excerpts from them that have  
12 helped me understand the process, and by listening to others  
13 I understand the process better, also.

14 The -- I -- I have a lot of problems with the  
15 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, because it does not  
16 follow the NRC's own protocol, new Reg. 15-55. I found  
17 numerous examples of that in the thousands of pages that I  
18 reviewed, exhaustively -- everyobdy that's reviewed it is  
19 exhausted, I'm sure.

20 The Draft EIS fails to meet the purported  
21 objectives of the NRC's scoping report of September '98,  
22 following that June '98 supposed meeting. And these  
23 specific violations I've itemized.

24 The new Reg. 15-55, the protocol for preparing a  
25 Draft Environmental Impact Statement must stand on its own

1 as an analytical document that fully informs decision makers  
2 and the public of the environmental effects of a proposed  
3 action. And this Draft EIS does not do that. It fails to  
4 correctly present data, it fails to find the correct data  
5 that exists in -- in the public documents in all state  
6 agencies in Utah; for example, the seismic features, as --  
7 which I -- I realize that those are going to be addressed in  
8 the Safety Evaluation Report, but -- but they have to be  
9 correctly identified and evaluated, to some extent, in the  
10 Environmental Impact Statement. And I found numerous errors  
11 in the correct characterization of seismic features.

12 I've got some maps, too, that -- it's just  
13 alarming. It shows an epicenter just five miles -- a modern  
14 epicenter five miles from the proposed location.

15 Okay. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement is  
16 not complete because it referred to other documents, which  
17 it is not supposed to do, as specifically stated in the new  
18 Reg 15-55, and fails to discuss salient elements of concern  
19 that characterize Skull Valley and the proposed location and  
20 so forth. For example, in the -- the Draft EIS's discussion  
21 of findings from the subsurface investigation at the site,  
22 the compenetronomy test and the soil borings, and all of  
23 that, leave the -- only a determined reader who wants to  
24 know the truth about this area can find it, because it's  
25 available. That information is available. It's easy. I



1 find stuff on water rights in ten minutes. The document  
2 misses by a mile.

3 The document fails to emphasize issues that are  
4 significant. That's one of the criteria of new Reg. 15-55,  
5 is to emphasize significant issues. And what it's doing is  
6 -- instead, is overemphasizing nonsignificant issues. Some  
7 examples are the -- the distance to capable faults. There  
8 -- one capable fault is only a half a mile, and another one  
9 is only .2 miles away.

10 Oh, it's also five miles from a modern epicenter.  
11 Here's Skull Valley (indicating). Here's the restricted air  
12 space (indicating). The gentleman from Clearfield probably  
13 has seen these maps before. And these red dots are  
14 epicenters, modern epicenters -- that's post-glacial, that's  
15 pretty modern geologically. There's one right in the south  
16 end of the reservation, and there are five more in the  
17 valley alone. Not in the other valley, not in the mountain,  
18 right in Skull Valley. And I'm telling you that that modern  
19 epicenter is on one of those capable faults that cuts rights  
20 through the proposed location.

21 Oh, there's many contradictory statements about  
22 water rights and water resources, the availability of water.  
23 The hydrology was improperly characterized. I told you last  
24 time that the depth of water was wrong. The -- I found,  
25 since then, that the well depths are wrong. I -- I really,

1 as a Utahan, argue most vigorously about water, being that  
2 we are the driest state in the nation.

3 And this -- I'm still on this point about it being  
4 necessary to characterize -- or excuse me, emphasize  
5 significant issues. And when I -- I see that ten percent  
6 wetlands, that's 48,000 acres, in -- in Horseshoe Springs,  
7 which the BLM has designated an area of critical  
8 environmental concern, and -- and -- and de-emphasizing ten  
9 percent water in Skull Valley is -- it's wholly  
10 inappropriate. If you're from Maine and New York and the  
11 eastern seaboard, I understand ten percent is not a whole  
12 lot, but ten percent is just standing in a mud puddle. In  
13 Utah ten percent is significant. So I don't know how anyone  
14 with any authority in this Draft Environmental Impact  
15 Statement process can -- can fail to see the importance of  
16 water. Plus, you cannot go taking water rights from these  
17 people out there. Half of those wells aren't very  
18 productive anyway.

19 And then, finally, it -- it appears -- it -- it is  
20 apparent and -- that after reading the scoping minutes from  
21 '98 -- June '98, that these Utah top officials were there,  
22 an official Dr. Thaynes with BLM, the Department of Natural  
23 Resources director, and our Department of Environmental  
24 Quality director, Governor Leavitt, and people that worked  
25 hard for this state were there expressing concerns. They

1 were warning the -- for example, the -- they -- they were  
2 warning you of the elements in Utah that are critical to  
3 properly understand. And the director of the Department of  
4 Natural Resources said you cannot just take water rights.  
5 You can't go get a rig and drill a well and stick a pump in  
6 it. And, also, you cannot buy water from the cattlemen --  
7 well, I -- I guess you can try, but it's not legal. You  
8 cannot change a water right with -- with agricultural  
9 purposes to -- to an industrial facility and so forth.

10 So, again -- again, you know, here we are again,  
11 two years later, still urging that these valuable resources  
12 be properly evaluated, that -- that accurate data be -- be  
13 presented, and not inaccurate data being blown out of  
14 proportion, that -- to me, as a scientist, you know, it's  
15 rough, it's really rough reading that. I just -- I don't  
16 see any other alternative than the no alternative action.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. The next speaker will  
19 be Mr. Bill Peterson, and he will be followed by Mr.  
20 Sandquist, if he is present.

21 DR. SHANKMAN: I'm going to ask Mark to call two  
22 speakers at once, and ask you make sure you are up close to  
23 the microphone. We have about 21 speakers, and if we divide  
24 that up evenly, it leaves maybe three to five minutes per  
25 person, if we are very efficient. So thank you.

1 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I -- I want to thank  
2 the NRC for this opportunity. I've -- I'm an engineer, I'm  
3 a rocket scientist, but I work on industry. I've designed  
4 shipping containers to ship missiles, Utah manufactured  
5 missiles.

6 And I want to tell you what we're shipping here  
7 with nuclear spent fuel is a whole lot safer than shipping a  
8 rocket motor. And I know there's been some concern  
9 expressed here, but when I designed training equipment to  
10 ship rocket motors, we never had hearings like this. The  
11 public never had input like this. This is a great  
12 opportunity for the public, and the public should realize  
13 the opportunity they have and use it, and they should use it  
14 fairly.

15 We're not just judging a nuclear storage facility  
16 at this point, we're judging a whole power industry. We've  
17 got a power industry that is in very dire trouble because  
18 they do not have an energy policy because they're being  
19 confined by the power -- the way they can produce power.  
20 They can't produce power by coal and expand that anymore,  
21 because of the global warming affect.

22 We've also got another industry, what to do with  
23 the plutonium that's coming off of weapons. That needs to  
24 be made into fuel and needs to be burned up in reactors.

25 All indications are our nation needs to turn to

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.  
Court Reporters  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 842-0034

1 nuclear power, and nuclear power cannot happen until we  
2 solve this issue of storage of spent fuel. This -- this  
3 storage was promised to the industry 20 years ago, and it  
4 needs to be provided. It was -- it was guaranteed by  
5 contract from the federal government, and the federal  
6 government is trying, and the public officials and the  
7 public needs to cooperate. And this is an opportunity.  
8 This is how we can do it.

9 Now, also coupled with this thing, we need to  
10 consider reprocessing, because we're talking about if we  
11 store this away, we're talking about 10,000 years of  
12 storage. And from my point of view and from the point of  
13 view from the science, I'm finding this is not necessary.  
14 Government -- President Carter and Ford wrote executive  
15 orders disallowing reprocessing, but President Reagan I  
16 understand revoked those orders, and it's now possible for  
17 the industry to reprocess. But the industry's looking for  
18 some help. They're looking for a sign from the government,  
19 they're looking for a sign from the -- from the public as to  
20 how to proceed. And in order for them to proceed, they need  
21 to know that this power is needed and wanted. They know  
22 it's needed, but they've got to realize -- they've got to  
23 see the government officials allowing them a way to come  
24 forth and providing this power. And the first thing that's  
25 got to happen is relief from storage of spent fuel.

1           So it's got to happen. And what's being proposed  
2 here in Utah is very -- is -- is very well worked out,  
3 thought out, and presented, and it's -- it's an opportunity  
4 -- it's a great opportunity for this country, and it needs  
5 to happen, and we today are involved in this.

6           And I want to compliment the people for coming  
7 here, and I hope that they will talk and they will talk in  
8 the vein of -- of what is needed and the spirit of what  
9 needs to be done.

10          Thank you.

11          MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

12          Is Mr. Sandquist present?

13          Mr. Barrowes, to be followed by Mr. Hoffman.

14          MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I am Steven Barrowes.  
15 I got my Ph.D. at the University of Utah in 1971. I've  
16 taught physics at several universities. I live in south  
17 Salt Lake City. I'm also a member of Scientists for Secure  
18 Waste Storage, which is headed up by a professor at Harvard  
19 University, and has about five Nobel prize winners alive  
20 that are part of that -- that group.

21          When I taught classes on energy and the  
22 environment at Illinois State University, I taught that one  
23 very valid reason for wanting to protect a large diversity  
24 of species from pollution damage was to ensure we have a  
25 healthy human environment. And there were other reasons,

1 but we all want a healthy environment for our children.

2 The issue of safety from radiation exposure due to  
3 transportation and storage of spent nuclear fuel is worthy  
4 of close scrutiny, until we can be confident we're taking  
5 the right step.

6 To add scientific insight to the dialogue, I've  
7 written a -- the editorial that was published in the Salt  
8 Lake Tribune August 18th, and copies are available at the  
9 back of the room. It points out the impossibility of  
10 radiation damage to even one onlooker if the trains carrying  
11 the spent nuclear fuel move at their prescribed 30 miles per  
12 hour. It would take the passage of 19,000 shipping casks to  
13 give one person leaning against the fence an exposure  
14 equivalent to one chest x-ray. Only 4,000 casks would be  
15 stored at the Private Fuel Storage, so, as you can see,  
16 nobody could even get the equivalent of one chest x-ray by  
17 watching these casks go by.

18 In the event that an accident stops the train,  
19 then it's necessary to keep people back, and the distance  
20 you must keep them back is 30 feet, or, for workers, you  
21 limit them to two hours per day within arm's reach of the  
22 shipping casks, and that assures that they're within safe  
23 limits.

24 For catastrophic accidents that breaks open a  
25 cannister and exposes fuel rods, the prudent distance would

1 be half a mile, until you can measure the radiation and tell  
2 that you could approach it a little closer. You'd have to  
3 employ robots to pick up the fuel pellets or rods and use  
4 geiger counters. They could all be found and located; put  
5 the lid back on, and then you can move it on.

6 Now, I can't see how that process, even when a  
7 catastrophic accident would cost billions of dollars, as  
8 some people claim, the -- in the past decade 3,000 shipments  
9 of spent nuclear fuel have been moved in the United States.  
10 None of these had an accident which exposed radiation to the  
11 public in that manner. That's a pretty good safety record,  
12 and it's -- it's the best indication that it's going to be  
13 very rare, if it ever happens, that we would have that kind  
14 of an accident.

15 Some worry about exposure to the people living in  
16 the Goshute village near the storage site, so I did a  
17 calculation, and the exposure, to be equivalent of one chest  
18 x-ray for one of the residents of that village, you'd have  
19 to live there 20 years, when the site is fully loaded with  
20 spent nuclear fuel, 20 years to get one x-ray equivalent.

21 Just by living in Utah, our background radiation  
22 is equivalent to 36 chest x-rays per year, and part of that  
23 is from radon in our basements, radioactive developments in  
24 the rocks and soil. And flying in airplanes, cosmic rays  
25 gets you some of that. We live with this radiation, our



1 ancestors lived with this radiation. When you get something  
2 equivalent to far less than one chest -- chest x-ray, you're  
3 not talking about a harmful dose.

4 I -- I find that there's been some highly  
5 exaggerated things said about the safety of transporting or  
6 storing this nuclear fuel, and I want to set the record  
7 straight and get a -- more of a focus on how safe these  
8 things can be transported. It's far more dangerous to have  
9 a truck loaded -- a tanker truck full of gasoline running  
10 down the highway at freeway speeds. They can crash and have  
11 terrible accidents, the same with acids and other chemicals.  
12 Those are really hazardous things, and they kill people  
13 every year.

14 In coal mines, the average for the last five years  
15 is 36 coal miners killed per year. And this is much better  
16 than it used to be. Back in the '60's, it was in the  
17 hundreds back then, but they've improved the safety.  
18 Federal regulations have improved the safety in the coal  
19 mines. And that is a big improvement, but, still, 36 miners  
20 per year in coal mines. And yet nobody's been killed from  
21 radiation in the nuclear industry in -- in this country, not  
22 yet.

23 And "nuclear" is a very scary word. People  
24 associate it with atomic bombs, and, of course, that's one  
25 use of nuclear power. However, the same science that

1 understands the difference between nuclear bombs and nuclear  
2 electric power plants can -- can tell us how to safely use  
3 nuclear materials to get the electric power we need without  
4 aggravating the global warming problem.

5 Of all the fuels we have to give us energy, you  
6 have a small number that -- that are not going to burn  
7 fossil fuels and aggravate the global warming. You have  
8 hydroelectric, but all the good dam sites are used and some  
9 are being threatened with removal. That's not an option to  
10 expand our energy base.

11 Coal and oil and natural gas all add to the global  
12 warming problem. Nuclear is the only available source right  
13 now that we can use to cut down on global warming. We need  
14 to get this storage site up and running so that the nuclear  
15 plants are not constantly under -- under the threat of  
16 having to close down. If you -- if you've got too much fuel  
17 on site, you don't know where you're going to put the next  
18 amount, and you say, "Well, where's another nuclear site  
19 that's going to accept that." Well, they have the same  
20 problem. If they accept your fuel, what are they going to  
21 do when they run out of space? They don't really want it  
22 there.

23 A site that is remote, such as the Skull Valley  
24 site, is the way to clear that log jam and allow the nuclear  
25 industry to expand the way it should. We should not let

1 fear be our guide. We could say that that napalm bombs have  
2 gasoline as a component; therefore, we should not use cars  
3 or trucks that use gasoline. Well, that -- that makes no  
4 sense. But it's the same kind of logic as saying that bombs  
5 are -- nuclear bombs are terrible, therefore, we shouldn't  
6 have electric nuclear power. It's the same logic.

7 And so I think we need to recognize the safety  
8 that's involved, recognize the science that's able to come  
9 up with a safe solution, and take advantage of the best  
10 opportunity that we have available to us.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

13 I notice that Mayor Anderson has arrived. And,  
14 sir, if you'd like to speak.

15 MAYOR ANDERSON: Thank you. I appreciate the  
16 opportunity to share my concerns with the Nuclear Regulatory  
17 Commission.

18 As the Mayor of Salt Lake City, representing  
19 180,000 city residents and hundreds of businesses, I  
20 strongly oppose the establishment of a temporary storage  
21 facility for high-level radioactive waste on the Goshute  
22 reservation in Tooele County, for several reasons. First of  
23 all, the waste does present significant health and financial  
24 risks, both in its transport to and storage at the site.

25 I just heard the closing remarks of the gentlemen

1 that preceded me, and we're not talking about bombs here but  
2 we are talking about the same kind of risks that we saw at  
3 Three Mile Island and that much of this world experienced at  
4 Chernobyl.

5 This proposal carries enormous health and  
6 financial risks. Although rail transport is relatively  
7 safe, the recent derailment of a train near Scofield  
8 illustrates that no one can guarantee the safe transport of  
9 these radioactive materials. While the risks of an accident  
10 may be small, the consequences are imponderable, especially  
11 if there were a terrorist attack.

12 Cleanup costs of a major incident are estimated  
13 between 13 billion and \$300 billion. Such an effort would  
14 have to include containment of spilled material,  
15 decontamination of radiated areas, and evacuation and  
16 relocation of residents. And this does not account for the  
17 potential -- potential impact on wildlife, vegetation, or  
18 water supplies, nor can anyone calculate the long-term  
19 residual affects on an area directly exposed to these  
20 materials. It is not clear who would bear those costs or  
21 who could conduct the cleanup effort.

22 Furthermore, few, perhaps none, of the hundreds of  
23 communities through which these shipments would pass have  
24 the equipment or training necessary to respond to an  
25 incident of this kind. The costs of the train accident or

1 terrorist attack involving these high-level radioactive  
2 materials are enormous, and we must consider them carefully  
3 before allowing these materials to pass through our  
4 communities.

5           There is nothing that I've heard or that I can  
6 imagine that could justify taking these materials from on  
7 site where they were produced, and shipping them through our  
8 communities, at incredible risk to everybody along the way,  
9 and in surrounding communities.

10           This proposal is driven by the unwillingness of  
11 eastern utilities to pay for proper handling of the waste  
12 products they have generated. We have grave concerns with  
13 the fact that the utilities proposing this site are  
14 unwilling to store the waste they have generated at its  
15 point of origin. They argue they have no more space to  
16 store the materials, yet they continue to produce them.  
17 They claim the materials can be stored safely, yet they are  
18 unwilling to store them locally.

19           Third, although this facility would generate  
20 substantial income for the approximately 125 members of the  
21 Skull Valley band of the Goshute Indians, about 25 of whom  
22 live on the reservation, this proposal is clearly an attempt  
23 by this consortium of utilities and the Department of Energy  
24 to exploit these impoverished and desperate people. The  
25 proposed storage site would generate an amount of money that

1 is, as yet, undisclosed for the tribe. With the economic  
2 conditions on the Goshute reservation at an extremely dire  
3 state, it is no wonder this consortium of utilities has  
4 chosen this site. They know that no matter how high the  
5 risks, the Goshute tribe is not likely to refuse. Not only  
6 will the Goshutes be paid off, but also the utilities are  
7 facing enormous costs for storing the materials on site, and  
8 the Department of Energy is facing litigation filed by the  
9 utility companies for the DOE violation of federal mandates  
10 requiring the establishment of storage facilities nearly two  
11 years ago.

12           The terms of the proposed lease have not been  
13 disclosed, but the savings in on-site storage costs for the  
14 utilities and the avoidance of litigation for the Department  
15 of Energy would dwarf any amount the tribe will be paid.  
16 The utilities and the DOE are taking unfair advantage of the  
17 Goshutes, and the Goshutes are just desperate enough to  
18 accept it.

19           While the Goshute reservation site is being  
20 promoted as a temporary facility, there is no assurance that  
21 the waste will ever be moved. This facility is billed as a  
22 temporary storage site, to be used until a permanent  
23 facility is completed at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. However,  
24 at the end of the 50-year term of the lease agreement  
25 between PFS and the Goshutes, and the 40-year term of the

1 license issued to PFS by the NRC, there are no guarantees  
2 that a permanent storage facility will be established. Once  
3 the eastern utilities have moved their wastes off site,  
4 there is nothing to prevent them from decommissioning their  
5 nuclear power plants permanently, providing no place to  
6 return the spent fuel. This would cause the Goshute  
7 reservation to become a permanent facility, contrary to what  
8 is being proposed and promoted.

9 Finally, Utah and Nevada have long been the  
10 dumping and testing grounds for the nation's nuclear waste  
11 and weapons. We must not allow this to continue. The real  
12 and potential consequences that would come with moving  
13 thousands of metric tons of high-level nuclear waste through  
14 major urban areas, such as Salt Lake City, are far greater  
15 than maintaining the high-level nuclear waste on the sites  
16 where it was produced. Utah and Nevada are just beginning  
17 to dispell their images as nuclear testing grounds and waste  
18 dumps for the nation. With each cask of high-level nuclear  
19 waste containing 40 times the long-lasting radiation that  
20 was released from the Hiroshima bomb, there is no way to  
21 hide the perception that Utah is an 85,000 square mile  
22 hazardous waste dump.

23 Salt Lake City and Utah would suffer from  
24 decreased tourism and businesses, and families would  
25 reasonably hesitate to move here upon learning of Utah's

1 radiation stockpiles.

2 Communities through which the waste would be  
3 transported have been denied the opportunity for meaningful  
4 involvement in the decision making process. Economics and  
5 the threat of litigation are driving the decision, and the  
6 Department of Energy is doing whatever it can to steamroll  
7 this process along.

8 As evidence of this, communities along the  
9 transportation routes have had minimal or no opportunities  
10 to voice their concerns, and when they have, documents have  
11 been scarcely available, and hearings are scheduled with  
12 short notice. In fact, most of the communities through  
13 which this waste may pass have not had their concerns heard.

14 Last week I sent a letter to mayors of Utah and  
15 Wyoming communities along the proposed transportation  
16 routes, alerting them of this devastating plan to transport  
17 high-level nuclear waste through their back yards in route  
18 to the Skull Valley site. These mayors and their  
19 constituents must be given an opportunity to voice their  
20 concerns regarding this project and the impact it would have  
21 on their communities.

22 The Department of Energy's broken promises and  
23 unfulfilled obligations throughout this process are clear  
24 indications of what would be in store for the residents of  
25 the Goshute reservation, the residents of Salt Lake City,

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.  
Court Reporters  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 842-0034



1 and all residents along the proposed transportation route.  
2 Congressional mandates requiring the DOE to establish  
3 permanent storage facility by January 31, 1998 were not  
4 satisfied, and now in its haste to comply, the federal  
5 government is pressing the Goshute site proposal as  
6 aggressively as possible, with little regard to process and  
7 notice to persons who may be affected along the proposed  
8 routes.

9 No one can be assured that this high-level nuclear  
10 waste will ever be moved off this proposed temporary holding  
11 site at the end of any lease or license. Likewise, no one  
12 can guarantee either the safe transport of these materials  
13 through the communities, nor the resources to avert a  
14 catastrophe in the event of a rail accident or terrorist  
15 attack.

16 Finally, the Private Fuel Storage consortium and  
17 the Department of Energy are clearly exploiting the economic  
18 difficulties of 125 Goshutes to solve their self-imposed  
19 problems and to get a good deal.

20 For all of these reasons, I vigorously oppose the  
21 development of the proposed high-level waste storage  
22 facility.

23 Thank you very much.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you, Mayor.

1 The next speaker would be Mr. Hoffman.

2 Mr. Andrus?

3 Mr. Warner?

4 Mr. Warner, to be followed by Ms. Schitzel, Diane  
5 Schitzel.

6 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: All right. First --  
7 first, I'd like to thank you guys for setting additional  
8 meetings. I think that they are -- they are necessary. A  
9 lot of people of kind of wait to choose part of the process  
10 to get involved in, but I think it's important that the word  
11 does get out and you schedule more of these meetings.

12 What I want to talk about is a couple things I  
13 felt were left off the Environmental Impact Statement. One  
14 of those alternatives, one of the things I -- I think about  
15 when I think about this, is yeah, those -- all those things  
16 may be safely shipped here, who knows, and, you know, the  
17 engineers come up with some pretty amazing feats, but what I  
18 worry about is some of the psychological harm that -- to the  
19 tribe that would be there. Tell me who's going to want to  
20 live there when knowing just a little bit over there, you  
21 look up, when your face melts off. And I don't think a lot  
22 of -- I think there's -- there's psychological power, and  
23 it's going to be a lot worse than some of the other things  
24 that we've been -- that have been talked about today.

25 When I think about this, I had to wonder, what

1 could bring the tribe to this point that they would be  
2 willing to consider this? And I think you have to look at  
3 their history. They have been -- they used that range over  
4 the whole basin range province, working out and making a  
5 living. It's obvious that they are survivors, because it's  
6 not a very friendly place. And one of the things that --  
7 Tooele County is known as one of the most degraded counties  
8 in the country. In fact, I think there's like four  
9 superfund sites there, and I don't know how many others that  
10 are being considered to be included, that might be listed as  
11 superfunds.

12 Now, if the spent rods are here, are we going to  
13 lose the incentive to clean up up the other -- the other  
14 sites? And what is going to -- where does that leave us?

15 Another thing that -- is that I think it's brought  
16 the tribe to a crossroads. Obviously, they're looking to --  
17 they want jobs, they want something that can give them  
18 financial security that they see other people have. Now, I  
19 see this as a crossroads, because if they -- the spent rods  
20 come, then I -- I feel that a lot of them are going to lose  
21 the connection they once had to this traditional range land  
22 that's no longer there, and at the same time, it's under --  
23 it -- it like ironic, almost, that a study came out earlier  
24 this year pointing out this range province was under threat  
25 from endangered species. There's many problems here, and so

1 our -- and I feel like if the spent rods are allowed to come  
2 there, that's basically writing off this county.

3 I'd like to come up with another proposal. A lot  
4 of times those environmental impact statements include a  
5 no-action proposal and a couple other actions. Well, I'd  
6 like to look at one action that turns the situation around.  
7 It turns a negative into a positive. And you can look at  
8 all the surrounding -- the -- the Goshute tribe's  
9 reservation. Are these superfunds sites, these other sites  
10 -- what would be the impact to the environment if this state  
11 and other agencies worked with this tribe into forming a  
12 reclamation company? If they were out there getting  
13 training, working on reclaiming these superfunds sites and  
14 these other sites on their traditional range land, that  
15 could -- that could be a great way to provide jobs for them,  
16 meaningful jobs that would restore maybe a sense of  
17 connection they have to the land. They could -- that --  
18 jobs like the reclamation company and a consulting company  
19 require all types of skill levels that -- and could provide  
20 an immediately opportunity, and it wouldn't -- it wouldn't  
21 involve using a fund. The superfunds are already paid for.  
22 All I'm talking about is helping the Goshute tribe become  
23 subcontractors and contractors and giving them an  
24 opportunity to turn the situation around.

25 And since some money is already being spent, I

1 don't see why see Goshutes couldn't get a share of that, and  
2 it would give them a good way to earn an honest living.

3 They could also be involved with assessing the  
4 problem in the basin, arrange problems. This is the range  
5 that their ancestors traditionally used. I think they  
6 should -- we should seek out and ask their help to get back  
7 on this land and help come up with a -- a solution to the  
8 problem.

9 And, also, this land around their reservation  
10 could be used as a test bed for new technology. This is a  
11 great -- an excellent opportunity to have, rather than the  
12 fuel rods. And I think that we should turn this into a  
13 scientific hot bed, where we can learn the techniques to  
14 restore the soil and clean up things. We could work at  
15 universities, grants could be obtained, they could work with  
16 the BLM and other federal agencies. I really think we could  
17 turn this into a positive situation instead of looking at it  
18 as a negative one.

19 I think there's a lot of people that signed up as  
20 opponents to this, could be key players in working with the  
21 tribe to establish and help get this company off the ground,  
22 getting equipment and getting the necessary knowledge to go  
23 out and carry out and be part of the reclamation effort.

24 And the real path to this plan I believe would be  
25 in five to ten years down the line, but the experience the

1 tribe has gained becomes expertise, and they are -- and they  
2 would be sought out by other indigenous people around the  
3 world, because this is not just a problem here, many tribes  
4 around the world I think, especially, have been pushed  
5 aside, from mining and other aspects. And this could be  
6 something to go national, and we could help clean up these  
7 problems, not just here by around other reservations around  
8 the country.

9 And I think that this -- the proposals already  
10 seem to drive the -- put a wedge between the tribe. And I  
11 think a project like this could bring the tribe together for  
12 something that's good. No one's going to be opposed to  
13 cleaning up stuff. And I think that that would be -- I  
14 think this -- if this alternative were looked at and  
15 pursued, we could turn this around, and I think that it  
16 might be something the tribe would embrace because it would  
17 be well paying jobs, and it's not asking for any additional  
18 money, it's giving the money that's already out there and --  
19 and supporting it to their way.

20 That's it. Thanks for your time.

21 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you very much.

22 (Applause.)

23 The next speaker would be Diane Schitzel, to be  
24 followed by James O'Neal.

25 Ms. Schitzel.

1                   Maybe that's -- yes. Is that you?

2                   FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It's Dina.

3                   MR. DELLIGATTI: Yeah. They have it written here  
4 as "Diane." I'm sorry. And -- and, again, followed by Mr.  
5 O'Neal.

6                   FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Hi. My name is Dina  
7 Schitzel, and I am a real estate professional.

8                   We were contacted last week by our Utah  
9 Association of Realtors, which there is supposed to be a  
10 delegation of those here at this evening's public hearing,  
11 but I was not able to make that, and I wanted to make sure I  
12 was able to voice at least some of the concerns that I have,  
13 both as a resident of Utah and as a real estate  
14 professional.

15                   The -- the one thing that I'm most concerned about  
16 is the fact that there has not been more public awareness  
17 made of what is going to be happening here in Utah. And I  
18 think that we need to let the population of the state of  
19 Utah, in fact, know the pros and cons about this facility.  
20 If you can see, there's really not very many people here,  
21 and that's not good. I mean, I went around with a petition,  
22 and the petition is -- is actually saying that at the very  
23 least that you should extend the comment period for at least  
24 another six months, to give everybody an opportunity to  
25 understand the impact of having this storage facility

1 located here in the state of Utah, or just in the licensing  
2 process altogether. And I was able to, in just one hour,  
3 get close to 75 names. That was just in one hour. Now, if  
4 I had been able to spend weeks or months at this, I probably  
5 could have gotten thousands of signatures, because the  
6 public does not understand the impact of what is going to  
7 happen here in the state of Utah, with bringing a nuclear  
8 storage facility here.

9 Now, one of the things that -- that affects me as  
10 a property owner and as a real estate professional is that  
11 the property values and home sales will drop. And in states  
12 where nuclear waste is already transported, sellers are  
13 required to disclose to buyers that the home is near a  
14 nuclear waste transportation route. And in 1992 the New  
15 Mexico Supreme Court case found that property values do,  
16 indeed, decline, because people are afraid of the dangers  
17 associated with nuclear waste transportation.

18 A public opinion survey referenced by the court  
19 showed that 71 percent -- 71 percent of respondents believed  
20 that residential property value will decrease because of its  
21 location near a nuclear waste transportation route. Now,  
22 Utah will suffer economically from this stigma of having  
23 large volumes of nuclear waste stored here in the State of  
24 Utah.

25 The governor's office, as we understand, is also



1 concerned that taxpayers will have to pay for anything that  
2 would happen as a result of accidents that could occur, that  
3 there could be some costs involved. There's no provisions  
4 for emergency personnel. And -- and the fact is that the  
5 consortium of the eight out-of-state utility companies are  
6 set up as a limited liability company, which would protect  
7 them and limit them in their responsibilities, should any  
8 accident occur. So -- the report also states that the cost  
9 of training and providing emergency personnel would also  
10 fall on the state of Utah, and we are not set up for that.  
11 And it also states that Utah will receive a stigma as the  
12 single largest receptacle of high-level nuclear waste in the  
13 United States, and that stigma will have a negative impact  
14 on our entire economy. It will actually stigmatize our  
15 produce, our dairy, and other agricultural products, as well  
16 our raw land. From a development standpoint, we don't know  
17 the impact that developers will have to have to have now  
18 that we transport nuclear waste, or are proposing to  
19 transport nuclear waste through our state. How will that  
20 impact developers, and will they want to go through the --  
21 they already go through enough hoops, as it -- as it is now,  
22 to try to develop lands, and you -- you just stick this on  
23 with it, it's just another thing that they're going to have  
24 to do in order to be able to develop land. And they may  
25 simply say, "No, I'm not going to do that, I'm going to go

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.  
Court Reporters  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 842-0034

1 somewhere else."

2 Thank you.

3 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you very much. And if you  
4 have a card with you, before you leave, could I get your  
5 name right for the record? That would be super. Thank you.

6 Mr. O'Neal, to be followed by Corey Hoopiaina.

7 DR. SHANKMAN: At the end of this meeting there  
8 are some statements that are made that are, in point of  
9 fact, not accurate, so if anybody's interested in talking to  
10 any of the NRC personnel at the end of this meeting about  
11 anything that they've heard, we'll be glad to answer,  
12 factually, any of the comments, okay? Just as an example,  
13 Price Anderson covers transportation.

14 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you. Thank you  
15 for scheduling another meeting, because the other two were  
16 more -- very short, and we couldn't put forward what we had.

17 And I'll be here at the end of the meeting, too,  
18 if anyone wants to talk to me about what I have to say.

19 DR. SHANKMAN: Okay.

20 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: The first thing I  
21 would like to do is address any -- any of my Indian brothers  
22 and sisters that may be here. I'm part Cherokee, so I have  
23 a little story that I need one of the Goshutes to review, if  
24 they'd like to, after the meeting, before I put it on the  
25 Internet. I don't want to offend anyone, but it's an

1 interesting little story.

2 I was looking on the Internet, and we're getting  
3 information on the Internet, and looked up the Skull Valley  
4 Goshutes, and found this site that -- that certain is pro a  
5 storage facility. Right at the top of the header it says  
6 here, "Nothing in life is to be feared, it is only to be  
7 understood." It's hard to read the mark. Someone said  
8 that. Well, I don't fear the facility, I don't fear nuclear  
9 radiation, I understand it. I've studied it all my life.  
10 But there's a quotation in the scriptures that says "The  
11 fear of God is the beginning of wisdom." There are things  
12 to fear. Whoever said this particular thing was a little  
13 bit myopic in his assessment.

14 Speaking of assessments, I do not subscribe to the  
15 present standard of risk assessments. If you try to trace  
16 it back to its sources, it goes back into the American  
17 history of the army's nuclear tests. There's really no  
18 sound basis for what we are -- if you talk about x-rays,  
19 it's not the most dangerous type of radiation, anyway. With  
20 alpha radiation and beta radiation, it causes cancer much  
21 more than x-ray, so let's not be simplistic about this, some  
22 of these people that are arguing it.

23 DR. SHANKMAN: I just want to say that I do want  
24 to let you know that we've asked the hotel staff, the people  
25 next door, to modulate that, so I apologize.

1 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay. It doesn't  
2 bother me. I work in the store. I blank it out. I'm sorry  
3 for the other people.

4 DR. SHANKMAN: Well, I live with teenagers.  
5 (Laughter)

6 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay. I would have to  
7 -- I would have to express my thanks to the -- to the mayor  
8 here for stating things in a very clear and precise way and  
9 an orderly way. And I'm trying to point out that you that  
10 we have legitimate concerns here.

11 I'm from Utah County, from American Fork. I can  
12 assure you that the general public in Utah does not know  
13 this issue even exists, okay, but they will. They will.  
14 The general public will. And when they do, this particular  
15 public will react in a very, very monolithic way, okay. If  
16 you understand Utah, those people in Utah know it's a very,  
17 very integrated society, in terms of race, which it is, but  
18 in terms of communication and ideas, okay?

19 I'll have to say that I'm very disappointed with  
20 some of our politicians, about -- they're supposed to be or  
21 leaders, supposed to inform the public. If we were under  
22 threat here, which I think we are under threat, Governor  
23 Leavitt has been been very -- he's against it, but he's a  
24 reluctant battler, if you will. He reminds me of General  
25 McClellon in the Civil War. I'm an old southerner. And

1 General McClellon kept making preparations, and this and  
2 that, but he never fought. And Lincoln says -- talking  
3 about General McClellan's army, he says, "It's called the  
4 army of the Potomac, but it is only McClellan's bodyguard,  
5 because McClellan is not in the army. I should like to  
6 borrow it for awhile." I wish some of our other politicians  
7 would this political army would do something about this  
8 situation.

9 Now, since we're addressing environmental concerns  
10 and my major concern is of -- of a terrorist infiltrating  
11 into the site after it's established -- I've mentioned this  
12 now twice in the other two meetings. I won't discuss that  
13 -- how this would occur exactly, because that's not -- not  
14 germane to what your subject is, but let's talk about the  
15 effects. Let's assume -- let's make a hypothesis that a  
16 tactical nuclear device was exploded in the middle of this  
17 complex, where your two aisles -- aisles meet. Now, this  
18 would exceed -- you're talking about a temperature of  
19 millions of degrees, you're talking about tremendous force.  
20 All these things are slammed out against each other; force  
21 and heat and radioactive material. There's never been a  
22 test of this particular type that I know of, and on this  
23 scale it's -- it could be absolutely catastrophic. It's --  
24 let me -- if only from -- if only from the radioactive  
25 particulate that was generated, okay, and not even assuming

1 anything else, okay, it could render -- this whole area is  
2 down wind -- down wind roads from that area, you know,  
3 uninhabitable for a millenia. And that's a possibility.

4 Your security's good. The security's not good in  
5 the nuclear power industry. How many of you know who David  
6 Orreck is? Show by hand. Who's David Orreck? Do you know?  
7 The lady knows. Well, a lot of other people maybe don't  
8 know who David Orrek is. David Orreck was in charge of a  
9 government program that's called -- it's one of those  
10 acronyms, OSRE, and it's about the safety of public  
11 utilities from terrorist attack. And he took his team in,  
12 and 20 times he was able to penetrate the -- more than 20  
13 times he penetrated these facilities, okay? So, you know --

14 DR. SHANKMAN: He works for NRC.

15 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's right. So, you  
16 know him. Okay.

17 Suffice it to say, then, I think there's a grave  
18 environment risk of terrorism when the site is established.  
19 I think it is a poor choice of a place to put it. It needs  
20 to be put somewhere where it can be protected, and it  
21 shouldn't be -- this stuff is not just nuclear waste, it's  
22 like the gold in Ford Knox it should be protected that way.  
23 It worked be protected like Norad. It really needs -- it  
24 really needs that.

25 I thank you for your time.

1 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you, sir.

2 (Applause.)

3 Cory Hoopiaina, to be followed by Sean Warner.

4 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'd just like to thank  
5 you for coming and listening to our concerns I'm very  
6 envious of Mayor waggoner for being able to fly over that  
7 valley. And it's -- there's -- there's a whole lot of  
8 beauty, to me. We have property out there in that valley.

9 And I'd like to thank Rocky Anderson for his  
10 comments. I think they hit the nail right on the head.  
11 Everything he said I believe is totally true. Why should  
12 we, as the state of Utah, be willing to -- to accept or even  
13 consider having their nuclear spent waste dumped on our  
14 state? I think that's an atrocity to even consider that. I  
15 understand the plight of the Goshutes. I've been out to the  
16 reservation several times. I've been to the Pony Express  
17 out there, I've been to their store. And I understand that  
18 Leon Bear, who is the commission- -- he's the counselor, I  
19 guess the chairman of the Goshutes. I -- you know, from his  
20 standpoint, he probably wants to bring the tribe back  
21 together. I think that's -- that's a wonderful thing, to  
22 think of being able to figure something out where he could  
23 get his tribe members back together. And a recent article  
24 said, "Well, you know, we've looked at different  
25 possibilities," and he said, "If I were to grow tomatoes out

1 here would you buy them from me?" Well, probably not,  
2 because he's got -- he's got MagCorp to -- to the north, and  
3 he's got Dugway to the south, and he's got -- there's two  
4 other cleaning facilities that handles hazardous materials  
5 to the west of him. But as this one gentleman said, I think  
6 proposing different ideas for the Goshutes to help them  
7 financially would be better than considering having nuclear  
8 waste dumped out there.

9 And what I sort of thought -- you know, we spent  
10 about \$80,000 in that valley last year in developments, and  
11 we're trying to continue to develop the property that we  
12 have out there. To bring a gathering of the Polynesian  
13 people together out there -- just to give you a little bit  
14 of history, because I don't know exactly where any of you  
15 are from or, for that matter, anybody in the audience, but  
16 my grandparents were one of the first group of people to  
17 leave their islands and to come to the United States, take  
18 out their temple endowments, and they settled in the Iosepa  
19 Valley. And so I -- we formed a committee that I'm the vice  
20 president of the Utah -- the Iosepa Historical Association,  
21 and I've actually worked with Rocky Anderson's office to  
22 help us to get some funding out there, and Trudy Thomas is  
23 going to help us with different trees and things. But  
24 there's a cemetery out there that's listed on the historical  
25 register. And listening to Mayor Waggoner, I mean, if



1 they're flying out there all the time, and -- you've got --  
2 we hear the bombs, we hear the testing going on all the  
3 time. We spend -- I spent three and a half months out  
4 there, living out there, and I was able to witness things  
5 out there that most people wouldn't believe even happened.

6 Just to gave you a quick example, the northern  
7 lights, I view them all the time out there. And people say,  
8 "Well, you can't see northern lights, they don't come down  
9 this far." Well, two weeks ago the northern lights were as  
10 bright as day out there, and yet -- and somebody's out there  
11 to record it, and then it was -- the picture was taken and  
12 -- and published in the Deseret News, and it was beautiful.

13 But the impact on the -- the wildlife out there,  
14 you know, I sort of question that. I mean, I think it's  
15 safe for them. There was a -- a leak of MX gas that wiped  
16 out a whole bunch of sheep. I don't know why any humans  
17 that were out there at that particular time weren't killed  
18 from that. But I've got articles that show ditches,  
19 trenches that were dug up, and hundreds, if not thousands of  
20 sheep were dumped in them.

21 And you're with the BLM, is that correct, so you  
22 know all about that. You know what one little leak can do  
23 out in that area.

24 And so I just sort of want to, real quickly -- I  
25 know we're -- we're limited on time, but what I would like

1 to propose -- you know, I can't understand why we'd even  
2 consider having a nuclear dump site out there and not allow  
3 them to have gambling. I'm all for gambling out there. I  
4 mean, what's the -- I'd rather have that out there and save  
5 people an extra hour drive to Wendover to spend their money,  
6 and let them have gambling out there. I mean, that's going  
7 to help.

8           There's a couple of other things I would like to  
9 just quickly propose. As far as where are you going to dump  
10 your nuclear waste, what's wrong with the midwest? What's  
11 wrong with Iowa or North Dakota or South Dakota? I hunt in  
12 South Dakota and North Dakota, and there's nothing there.  
13 And it's like why do you want to ship this hazardous  
14 material from the east coast clear across the Rocky  
15 Mountains? Why not dump it halfway between the two of us?  
16 I mean, you could -- it would seem to me that it would be a  
17 lot more plausible to have a dump site a lot closer to the  
18 interior and where the threat of a nuclear -- of a nuclear  
19 exploding or -- or terrorist coming in, it would be easier  
20 to protect that in the middle of a field like -- I've never  
21 seen Fort Knox, but I assume it's out in the middle of a  
22 place where it's very hard to infiltrate. So, I mean,  
23 safety, why couldn't they just look at some place that's not  
24 quite so far removed from anything?

25           Utah, we are a dumping ground for other things.

1 They've tried other things. And I -- I just can't  
2 understand why they would do that.

3 And as far as the Goshutes, you know we've been  
4 thinking about trying to develop that property out there,  
5 and I've talked to several developers about buying trees.  
6 You know, Leon makes a point. Would you buy a tomato from  
7 him? Perhaps not. But I would buy a fir tree, I would buy  
8 various types of shade trees, flower and plumbs, shrubs. I  
9 mean, all sorts of different plants could be grown out on  
10 that property. The soil is very rich, because whatever we  
11 put in the ground out there grows. As long as we can water  
12 it, we've got growth out there.

13 Another thing that -- you know, from the -- I  
14 don't know if any of you have been to Hawaii, the Polynesian  
15 Cultural Center, but we thought why not have a mainland  
16 Polynesian cultural center, for my standpoint, because  
17 there's -- we had about 1200 people show up this year to a  
18 memorial celebration that we have out in the desert. And  
19 last year there there were about 1500 people that came out.  
20 And each year the LDS church, they have about five million  
21 visitors go through the temple or through the visitors'  
22 center. And I thought, well, if we get a little funding  
23 from the state to help advertise that there's a mainland  
24 Polynesian cultural center, coupled with a Goshute or an  
25 Indian type festival or program that goes, you know, three

1 or four nights a week for people who go out there to help  
2 build revenue for the -- for the Ute -- for the Goshute  
3 tribe, then maybe that would help bring in some revenue to  
4 their tribe to help bring their people back together. I  
5 know, from the Polynesian standpoint, we are trying to -- to  
6 get the Polynesian people interested in their roots. And  
7 their roots are in the Iosepa Valley. They're in -- excuse  
8 me. In Skull Valley at Iosepa. And I've always felt like  
9 there's other alternatives to turning Utah into a waste  
10 site. And, like I say, I would rather turn into a gambling  
11 state than a nuclear test site.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

14 (Applause.)

15 DR. SHANKMAN: Just -- just to give people a sense  
16 of where we are, a few additional speakers have signed up,  
17 so we now have 14 speaker in the approximately 45 minutes  
18 that we have left, so if you can limit your remarks, again,  
19 let me encourage you that if you can't get everything said  
20 you can give it to us in writing. And after this session is  
21 over we'll be glad to speak with anybody who has questions  
22 about the project, okay?

23 MR. DELLIGATTI: Okay. Mr. Northard will be  
24 followed by M. Bushnell.

25 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay. My name is

1 Scott Northard, and I'm with Northern States Power Company,  
2 and I am project programmer for the Private Fuel Storage  
3 project.

4 First of all, I wanted to thank the NRC for having  
5 this additional meeting. It is the right thing to do. The  
6 public's comments and public input in this process is very  
7 important. I encourage everybody to make not only verbal  
8 comments here but follow up with written comments, if you  
9 feel strongly about the issue.

10 I've spent the last 23 years working with spent  
11 nuclear fuel. I've been involved in the handling of fuel,  
12 the storage of fuel and transportation of spent fuel. And  
13 it can and is done safely. Our company has been involved in  
14 all of those areas, and we've always used safety and high  
15 standards as a part of the process. I think the key is that  
16 you respect the technology, and you always prescribe and use  
17 high standards. That's why the safety record of spent fuel  
18 transportation, for example, is so good.

19 Dr. Barrowes earlier mentioned that in over 30  
20 years and more than 3,000 spent fuel shipments throughout  
21 the United States, including through Utah, there have been  
22 no major injuries or fatalities and no leakage of the  
23 contents of the casks. And you ask, "Why is that so?"  
24 Well, it's because of the preparation that goes into the  
25 shipments, but it is also because of the design of the

1 transportation containers and how it's accomplished. Most  
2 people really aren't familiar with nuclear technology, but  
3 they are familiar with black boxes on airplanes, and you  
4 know that when an airplane crashes the one thing that does  
5 survive is the black box. And that's because it's a robust  
6 container that's surrounded by a crushable surface that  
7 takes all of the shock from the accident. Well, that's the  
8 same technology that's used in designing transportation  
9 casks. And that's why they survived all of the stringent  
10 tests that they applied to these. And I wish all industries  
11 that transport hazardous materials would use these same  
12 standards, because then we wouldn't see the -- the  
13 consequences of accidents that are happening on our  
14 highways.

15           Recently in Nevada there was a double-trailer  
16 gasoline tanker that crashed and burned on the freeway. And  
17 people tried to use this as an example as to why we  
18 shouldn't ship spent nuclear fuel. The truth is if they  
19 used the same standards for shipping gasoline that they use  
20 for nuclear fuel, we'd have far fewer fatalities every year  
21 in this country.

22           PFS intends to use the same standards that have  
23 been used in the past for rail shipments, plus additional  
24 standards. We are looking at improvements to the technology  
25 that are used for shipping spent fuel and making it even

1 safer. And we're working very closely with the American  
2 Association of Railroads, and we're trying to petition  
3 Technology Center of Pueblo, Colorado to incorporate those.

4 I think as -- as you review the Draft  
5 Environmental Impact Statement you'll see that the  
6 environmental impacts are minimal. This is truly a passive  
7 environmentally benign facility. There's nothing released  
8 to the air, nothing released to the ground or water, and  
9 nothing left behind when the fuel is eventually shipped to a  
10 federal waste repository, such as is being worked on in  
11 Yucca Mountain. And I believe and I'm optimistic that Yucca  
12 Mountain will eventually be accomplished, and not really  
13 because of commercial spent fuel, like we're planning to  
14 store at the Skull Valley facility, needs to go there, but  
15 it's because our nation has a lot of other material: left  
16 over weapons production programs, for bringing spent fuel  
17 back to foreign countries. As we speak, it's being shipped  
18 through states like Utah every year, in order to store that  
19 on Department of Energy sites. And that has to go somewhere  
20 eventually.

21 So we have a pressing national need to get on with  
22 Yucca Mountain, and I believe we will get on with it. Sure  
23 it's behind schedule and it's over budget, like a lot of  
24 federal programs, but eventually it will get done because it  
25 is the right thing to do.

1 I would also ask people to educate themselves and  
2 don't believe all the mischaracterizations you may see in  
3 the papers and in documents about this facility. People try  
4 to compare this to Hiroshima and Nagasaki, to the outskirt  
5 weapons test, that, unfortunately, represents a very bad  
6 legacy that we have in our country. This is not the same as  
7 releasing radioactive materials in the atmosphere. It's far  
8 above that. And -- and don't take my word for it, either.  
9 I mean, look at the experience in the management of  
10 commercial spent fuel. Educate yourself on the technology.  
11 Learn about PFS, who we are.

12 I think I should remind people that Southern  
13 California Edison doesn't consider itself to be an east  
14 coast utility, and all of our nuclear power plants are west  
15 of the Mississippi, for instance.

16 So I think you can't just believe everything that  
17 you hear. I think you have to go out and learn for  
18 yourself. I also encourage people to learn about radiation  
19 and the fact that it's a part of our everyday life and it's  
20 part of nature. And, really, what you have to do is manage  
21 the magnitude of radiation that you're exposed to.

22 I think it makes sense to store and manage it  
23 centrally. It can be done safely until Yucca Mountain is  
24 ready. There certainly is a need of nuclear power plants,  
25 which provide about 21 percent of our nation's electric, and



1 allow our country to have the clean air that it does. I  
2 would like to remind people that if it weren't for three  
3 large nuclear reactors in Arizona, that the air quality in  
4 Utah would be even worse than it is. And we have an air  
5 alert base here already. If reactors like the ones in  
6 Arizona had to shut down, we would suffer here in Utah, and  
7 the air quality would suffer.

8 I wanted to also just, finally, I guess in closing  
9 -- and I'll give up the rest of my time for other comments  
10 -- thank the NRC again for holding this meeting. It's  
11 important that the public speaks so the NRC can address your  
12 concerns.

13 I also want you to -- to encourage you to look at  
14 the Private Fuel Storage website, [privatefuelstorage.com](http://privatefuelstorage.com).  
15 We do also respond to public concerns. If you'll sent us  
16 email or if you'll leave us a message or 1-800 number, which  
17 is also listed on our website, we will respond to your  
18 concerns. We're very interested in coming out and talking  
19 to groups who have concerns about the facility so we can  
20 hopefully address those issues.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thanks. M. Bushnell, to be  
23 followed by K. Backlund.

24 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Good afternoon. I'm  
25 Mark Bushnell. I'm, along with Mayor Waggoner, a member of

1 the Utah Defense Alliance, but I'm also the director of  
2 operations and maintenance of the technical equipment on the  
3 Utah Test and Training Range.

4 We have a major discomfort with the location of  
5 the facility in Skull Valley. As Mayor Waggoner said, that  
6 -- that is a primary corridor for the aircraft out of Hill  
7 Air Force Base. As they transport their bombs for training  
8 to the south range they overfly this area. And there is not  
9 a practical alternative, any other route, because of the  
10 constraints of the FAA traffic and so on. So what we have  
11 to think of environmentally is the possibility of one of  
12 these aircraft, laden with many 2,000 pound bombs, going  
13 into this -- into this storage area. Because of this threat  
14 of this possibility, I think aircraft will not be allowed to  
15 overfly, and I don't know where or how they would get to the  
16 south range. But if an aircraft were to go in, the -- the  
17 results of that at this time are uncalculated. I would say  
18 environmentally it's quite likely that you would have enough  
19 damage and raise a cloud of radioactive dust that Salt Lake  
20 City itself would be -- would be jeopardized. So certainly  
21 this is something that we have to be very concerned about.

22 Now, there's another type of very frequent  
23 activity on the -- on the range, and that is what we call  
24 testing, not of the aircraft themselves, but what they're  
25 carrying. They're carrying very high speed long-range

1 self-propelled weapons. And, also, there are unmanned air  
2 vehicles that fly through the range. We watch these very  
3 closely, and as Mayor Wagner said, if one is going somewhere  
4 where it's not programmed to go, we will actually destroy it  
5 in flight. But it has been known that we have vehicles  
6 impacting outside the boundaries of the ground range, and  
7 because that area is so unpopulated, generally, there's very  
8 little damage, but it has been known, there has been damage.  
9 And this is what we worry about with the location, is that  
10 there could be an impact of some high-speed long-range  
11 unmanned weapon into the -- into this facility. To  
12 accommodate this, we would probably have to take a big bite  
13 out of the existing range so the footprint of these weapons  
14 would not include the facility, where today it probably  
15 does.

16 The point is that the location is very poorly  
17 chosen for the adjacent activity that takes place in the  
18 Utah Test and Training Range.

19 I want to point out, finally, that if we impact  
20 and draw down on capability of the Utah Test and Training  
21 Range, which is unique as a United States national  
22 resources, if we were to draw down on that, then the  
23 viability of Hill Air Force Base as a -- as an institution  
24 would also be degraded. And the Base Realignment and  
25 Closure Commission looks very closely to what's happening

1 with these -- these military locations. It's quite possible  
2 that the net result of locating the storage facility there  
3 would result in Hill Air Force Base being eliminated as an  
4 institution here in Utah.

5 One last remark: My understanding -- I might be  
6 mistaken -- that the Department of Defense, the Department  
7 of the Air Force, and Department of the Army were not  
8 consulted in your initial Draft Environmental Impact  
9 Statement. If that's so, it's quite important that they be  
10 consulted. They have a great deal of environmental  
11 experience themselves and understand the entire story on  
12 environmental studies. I would say that if you were  
13 properly doing this investigation, you would consult with  
14 those departments and you would include their remarks in a  
15 draft for public comment before you went final.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. DELLIGATTI: I just want to make one  
18 clarification regarding -- are you representing Hill today,  
19 or are you representing yourself as an individual?

20 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I -- I need to make it  
21 clear I'm not representing the military. I'm a civilian,  
22 and I'm representing the Utah Defense -- thank you. And we  
23 did meet with both the air force and the Pentagon and at  
24 Hill, as well as the folks at Dugway.

25 MR. DELLIGATTI: Okay. The next speaker will be

1 Kaitlan Backlund, to be followed by Mac Brubaker.

2 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Good afternoon. My  
3 name is Kaitlan Backlund. I'm the executive director of  
4 Citizen Alert. We are a 25-year-old grassroots organization  
5 from Nevada, well experienced in examining U.S. nuclear  
6 waste policies.

7 I would like to start off by thanking you for  
8 actually putting a list of acronyms and -- and abbreviations  
9 in the EIS, and, also, indexing your table of comments.  
10 These sound like small items, but it's a big change compared  
11 to anything I ever see in the DOE's.

12 I would say that this document is one of the  
13 better documents that I've ever seen supporting the no  
14 action alternative. Three items in that include -- for  
15 justifying this project, include shutting down reactors  
16 prematurely. Well, quite frankly, I think that this  
17 industry -- while we don't want to judge this industry, it's  
18 been largely subsidized by the federal government. It was  
19 at one time called "too cheap to meter." And due to the war  
20 effort I think it was largely subsidized, and it has managed  
21 to get to the place where it is today. If we had put  
22 possibly half of that -- of those financial resources into  
23 renewables many years ago, we might be in a much different  
24 position to come up with a -- a power source that's more  
25 friendly to our environment.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.  
Court Reporters  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 842-0034

1           Secondly, I would say the delay in reactor  
2 decommissioning, that's probably a good thing, as well. As  
3 far as I can see, so far, decommissioning -- one of the  
4 techniques that I've heard about that is rubblizing, and it  
5 pretty much sounds like what it is. From what I understand  
6 of it, as much as I have read -- and I certainly don't have  
7 more education than you in this area, but I've heard about  
8 grinding these things down into rubble and burying them. I  
9 -- I know that there's a little -- I don't mean to be  
10 cynical, I know that people put a little more attention into  
11 that than I state, but, then again, I do I think that needs  
12 to be looked into further.

13           The third item is to construct independent spent  
14 fuel storage installation facilities on site. What a grand  
15 idea. I think that this is right where we need to go. Dry  
16 cask storage technology was not around when Yucca Mountain  
17 was isolated as the only site to be studied for a possible  
18 repository, and here we go. Let's take a look at this. I  
19 think this really is a very viable option. Your agency  
20 itself, the NRC, has said that this technology could  
21 possibly be safe for on-site storage for as close as  
22 possibly a hundred years. We've got this immediate  
23 temporary solution right in front of us. It would not put  
24 us, the 53,000,000 people, at risk who are possibly going to  
25 be exposed due to the transportation across the country.

1           You know, this -- this project triggers -- in  
2   essense, it triggers the largest transportation progress --  
3   of transportation process of high-level spent nuclear fuel  
4   in history of our world, and that's not something to be  
5   rushed into.

6           Transportation: You basically dodge addressing  
7   national transportation impacts, saying that it was done in  
8   the 1999 Draft EIS for the Yucca Mountain project. I  
9   completely disagree with you. I think that that was quite  
10  inaccurate. And it was pointed out during that public  
11  hearing process that most people felt that the -- the  
12  transportation analysis in that document was insufficient.  
13  That includes your Chairman Mercer, who has met with Citizen  
14  Alert on several occasions, who's also stated -- the NRC  
15  chairman, Mercer, has stated that he did, too, feel that the  
16  analysis by the DOE of national transportation was less than  
17  admirable. So that is something I'm very concerned about.

18           I'm also concerned that the national routes are  
19  not well defined. There's one approximately listed out in  
20  this document, but, clearly, there's an awful lot of  
21  communities and states that are going to be impacted by this  
22  project, and they're not well educated, they are not well  
23  informed, they don't know very much about this issue at all.  
24  So I would recommend that your transportation analysis be  
25  much better done and in a much more in-depth way.

1 I think you also need to request that every  
2 shipment that goes onto those casks is characterized, so we  
3 know exactly what's going into those casks. That has been  
4 something that's been a big problem, and we need to know  
5 that. And it takes a lot of -- and I won't go into depth on  
6 that right now, but that's certainly an issues.

7 You're only going to use rail? Well, that's  
8 interesting. There is no rail transportation route to Yucca  
9 Mountain right now. They're all proposed. What happens if  
10 those don't get approved? That's a problem.

11 DR. SHANKMAN: I'm sorry. Are you speaking to  
12 Yucca Mountain or to Private Fuel Storage?

13 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Well, Private Fuel  
14 Storage has an obligation to transport the waste from  
15 Private Fuel Storage to a permanent repository, as indicated  
16 in your DEIS document, so I think this speaks to the issue.

17 I want to -- I would also like to say that your  
18 use of resources collectively, as far as doing a compiled  
19 EIS between all these different agencies, is of great  
20 concern. It's not well designed what parts of this EIS  
21 apply to which agency. And that presents a confusing  
22 picture to the public.

23 I'd also like to remind the NRC -- and I know,  
24 you're you making progress in this direction, but as far as  
25 I understand, the casks, to this date, has still not gone



1 through any full-scale testing.

2 I'd also like to go ahead and move on to health  
3 concerns. There are -- you often refer to latent case --  
4 latent cancer fatalities. Well, I would just like to  
5 encourage the NRC and other agencies like the DOE that you  
6 might want to consider other health effects besides just  
7 cancer. There are a lot of other things that can happen as  
8 a result of radiation exposure than just cancer.

9 Oh, another thing: The Executive Order 13045  
10 protecting children from environmental health risks, I don't  
11 think that that was all calculated in, the potential impacts  
12 to children, as far as looking at the long-term health  
13 impacts, and that probably should be added.

14 Socioeconomic impact: I really didn't see too  
15 much about something else that was mentioned here in this  
16 room about property values and the potential impact to  
17 property values decreasing all along the transportation  
18 routes in this country. Now, the Nuclear Waste Project  
19 Office in Nevada did an independent analysis for the Yucca  
20 Mountain project, and it showed that as many as 30,000 jobs  
21 could be lost in Las Vegas alone, due to that permanent  
22 repository being sited there. I certainly would think that  
23 that might be something you'd want to look into and  
24 consider.

25 In addition to that, I'd also like to say that I'm

1 very heartened to see the people making public comments here  
2 today offering suggestions to the Goshute tribe about what  
3 else could happen out there, but it's a -- it's a sad day  
4 that it took a project as aggressive as this one to bring  
5 that forward and bring that issue forward and not have  
6 people address it sooner.

7 I only have a few more things, but I'll wrap up.

8 DR. SHANKMAN: Thank you.

9 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay. I would like  
10 to say that you have not addressed what would happen if  
11 Yucca Mountain does not open as a permanent disposal site  
12 for high-level spent fuel. I do not believe the emergency  
13 responders are prepared, and I would like to see some kind  
14 of something addressed to that issue, to see whether or not  
15 people are prepared across the country.

16 I'd like to request a 180-day extension period, as  
17 well as hearings be held at communities that will be  
18 directly impacted by the transportation of the high-level  
19 spent fuel.

20 I would also like to say -- no, I'll close there.

21 Thank you very much.

22 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

23 DR. SHANKMAN: Thank you.

24 It's now 3:30. We are planning on ending at 4:00.  
25 I would extend it; however, we have another meeting tonight

1 starting at 6:00. So in order to keep at a time table,  
2 we'll have to close at 4:00, and as I said, we'll answer any  
3 general questions for half an hour afterwards. So we have  
4 11 speakers left, and if my math is correct, if you can keep  
5 it under three minutes, we can end on time, everybody will  
6 have a chance to speak. And I will interrupt you at the end  
7 of two and a half minutes.

8 MR. DELLIGATTI: Okay. Our -- our next speaker  
9 has indicated that the next speaker will speak this evening  
10 rather than this afternoon session. The next speaker, then  
11 -- and forgive me, I'm just having some trouble reading your  
12 name, Vani or Jani Iwamoto? I'm terribly sorry. That's the  
13 -- please correct me.

14 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Jani.

15 DR. SHANKMAN: And -- and, please, could you spell  
16 it for the benefit of the court reporter.

17 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: J-a-n-i, Iwamoto,  
18 I-w-a-m-o-t-o.

19 MR. DELLIGATTI: And as soon as Ms. Iwamoto is  
20 done, the next speaker listed would be Anita Davis. Thank  
21 you.

22 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'm here today just  
23 as a concerned citizen. I moved here two years -- from the  
24 Bay area two years ago, mostly for a better environmental  
25 place for my children. And then I heard about all this --

1 all the Goshute residents have been very interested in this.  
2 I was and shocked and certainly oppose it, that high-level  
3 nuclear waste would be transported here.

4 My knowledge comes from newspaper articles,  
5 talking with other people. The environmental impact report,  
6 which to me, seems quite boilerplate, it talks about the  
7 "best scenario," and in the best scenario there's increased  
8 exposure to people. It doesn't address any other scenarios.

9 And the other experience is that I have is in  
10 litigation. I was a partner in a firm that did toxic torts  
11 in San Francisco. And so what I see is all the -- this  
12 fallout from all of these chemicals and nuclear waste and  
13 help with a -- there's a group called the Friends of  
14 Hebotshan from people who are still suffering from the  
15 effects of the atomic bomb.

16 Now, there are many issues that, to me, aren't  
17 answered. The environmental impact report, again, talks  
18 about the best scenario. It does even say it, the best  
19 scenario that will -- there will be an increased exposure,  
20 and that the only -- the only other reason maybe other  
21 scenarios are are addressed, maybe they're just later. But  
22 any leak could be horrific to people and to the environment.

23 The Goshute land I understand is sovereign, so  
24 they can make this contract, but there are laws, I know in  
25 California, and I'm sure there's some in Salt Lake, where

1 you cannot do something on your property that can harm  
2 somebody else's property or people. Those are called  
3 ultrahazardous activities, which I think this would fall  
4 into. In California they even have smoking, if the smoke  
5 gets in there. These are things that are not anywhere near  
6 the affect that nuclear -- nuclear waste could have on the  
7 public.

8 And so I know that the Goshutes are in a  
9 predicament. They were given land that is practically  
10 wasteland, and I agree that something should be done to help  
11 them out so that they can make this land something they can  
12 be proud of to pass on to their children.

13 And I do feel that, from a public standpoint,  
14 offended when they say "temporary," but it's -- it's a joke  
15 to me. It's so risky to transport, why would you just do it  
16 temporarily? You should be looking for a permanent place  
17 putting the energies and money into a permanent home. And  
18 it seems more safe to keep it where it is, and, also, the  
19 location of where it is, by the Utah testing range. The  
20 questions are -- investigation on this is South Carolina  
21 that has been accepting this and doesn't want it any more,  
22 is that the place?

23 MR. DELLIGATTI: South Carolina's low-level.

24 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Low-level. So  
25 there's no other high-level? They don't want it there,

1 either.

2           There is investigation into the new site, that the  
3 people that are going to store it there. I've read about  
4 violations and things, and a permanent site, investigation  
5 into that, investigation into other temporary sites closer  
6 to where the origin is. And another new litigation thing  
7 that is happening in the Bay area is -- is fallout from  
8 things going into the groundwater, a lot of this nuclear.  
9 And this isn't even being stored beneath the ground; rather,  
10 it's going to be on top with the elements, and if it leaks  
11 it's going to go into the ground. And that could effect  
12 everyone in the state of Utah.

13           And reading this in the paper and from other  
14 situations, it seems like a horrible scam on the public and  
15 our children. The feds aren't a dumping ground. The  
16 governor doesn't want it, but then you hear about the tax  
17 money coming in from people that are interested. The  
18 American Indians want the money because their land is  
19 useless, so they can't be blamed. The new seismic shakings,  
20 there's also this whistle-blowing and things going on with  
21 things in that area. And, of course, the Fremont City  
22 Council wants money. And who gets hurt is the public and  
23 the children, and American Indians, those who are being  
24 shunned by the tribe because they did not go along with the  
25 vote, and their children and offspring will suffer.

1           And I think -- what a -- what a nice thing to show  
2 off the Olympics; we're now a place where environmental  
3 community is really a cesspool. And it's not going to be a  
4 boon for tourism.

5           And the great Huntsman Cancer Research Center,  
6 well, you know, that's for genetics but not environmental.  
7 And what's the point?

8           And the property values.

9           And I think that the government should be helping  
10 the Indians to improve their hand.

11          Thank you.

12          (Applause.)

13          MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. Anita Davis, to be  
14 followed by Denise Doebbeling.

15          FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay. Thank you.  
16 I'm going to read some of this, and I'm going to skip some  
17 of it also, to make the process more expedient today.

18          In the early 1990's a trainload of toxic waste was  
19 traveling through the country, but none of the other states  
20 would accept it until Governor Bangerter finally solved the  
21 problem and said that Utah would take it. Within days we  
22 had calls from as far away as Hawaii and Alaska requesting  
23 us to dispose of their toxic waste. When this happened, it  
24 is my understanding that Governor Bangerter responded by  
25 writing to all the states informing them that the waste

1 generated in each state must be disposed of at its source.

2 That was in the early 1990's, and the problem here  
3 in Utah has since magnified, with Utah having the highest  
4 rate of toxic emissions in the country. As you know, we  
5 have two chemical weapons incinerators, a garbage -- a  
6 garbage incinerator, two hazardous waste incinerators, and  
7 14 medical waste incinerators. We also have MagCorp, the  
8 nation's worst polluter of chlorine, and Kennecott, who  
9 emits a toxic -- the most toxic emissions in the country.

10 We've had confirmed releases of deadly GB nerve  
11 gas -- or nerve agent, sorry, on May 8th of this year, and  
12 we know that in addition to nerve agents the incinerator  
13 emits toxins like PCB's, dioxins, and mercury, which can  
14 affect the nervous, immune, and reproduction systems.

15 For those who don't know, dioxin was the key  
16 ingredient in the Viet Nam era, defoliant Agent Orange, and  
17 it stores in the fat of humans, interfering with hormonal  
18 activity. A correlation has been established between high  
19 levels of dioxin pollution and the declining ratio of male  
20 to female births after an explosion in '76 in a chemical  
21 plant in Seveso, Italy.

22 We know that high levels of mercury have long been  
23 linked to trash incinerators, which is five to 20 times more  
24 -- when it is -- when it is placed in water it is  
25 transformed into methylmercury by the bacteria in the water,



1 which is five to 20 times more toxic than organic mercury.

2 Oh, I'm sorry.

3 It bio-accumulates by algae and plankton, and then  
4 it increases many thousands of times in fish, a process -- a  
5 process known as bio-magnification. This is of a special  
6 concern to us here in Utah, as the contamination of those  
7 foods and perhaps the water supply -- what goes up comes  
8 down -- is directly linked to incineration's toxic  
9 emmissions.

10 We are already a compromised community because of  
11 these problems. Our rates of breast cancer have recently  
12 gone, in the last ten years, from one in 20 to one in eight.  
13 We have higher numbers of MS per capita than the rest of the  
14 country, high incidences of thyroid problems and cancers  
15 among our young -- our young women, and, also, alarming  
16 numbers of endromitriosis.

17 Faced with these problems, we are now faced with  
18 those proposals to bring radioactive toxic waste to the west  
19 desert. This problem seems to be similar to the problem we  
20 faced in the early 1990's with trainloads of toxic taste.  
21 We know the problem can only magnify. The stockpile will  
22 continue to grow. Not only do we have 104 nuclear plants  
23 and 40,000 metric tons of spent fuel in this country, but we  
24 recently appropriated funds to Russia to build 200 nuclear  
25 plants, perpetuating the problem on a worldwide scale. This

1 action reflects a genocide mentality. It is non-creative  
2 and destructive, and such a mentality can only destroy  
3 itself.

4 At an earlier hearing the remark was made that  
5 compensation would be made to the state for loss of image.  
6 How do you compensate a state for its rising levels of  
7 radiation, which, like dioxin, one cannot see its rising  
8 levels of cancer, birth defects, and stillbirths? How do  
9 you compensate a state for loss of life, not only human life  
10 but wildlife and the environment itself? The Great Salt  
11 Lake and the wetlands are part of an ancient freeway, a  
12 refuge used by migratory birds from all over the world, to  
13 winter and nest before moving on.

14 I recently spoke with a young man who had left his  
15 native state because of a nuclear plant because it continued  
16 to operate even though it was leaking radiation. We cannot  
17 all leave Utah or our states of origin.

18 This is a collective problem. It involves more of  
19 the population than the Goshutes and the citizens of Utah.  
20 Thus, it is imperative that we have a 180-day extension on  
21 the public comment period and more hearings, not only here  
22 in Utah, but elsewhere in communities along the  
23 transportation routes. To give us only two weeks notice  
24 about such an important hearing is to circumvent the  
25 democratic process and the decision making process.

1           Furthermore, I support a no action policy. We  
2 must leave the nuclear waste at its place of origin, and  
3 follow the lead of Germany to ban nuclear energy and all its  
4 toxic waste. Let us also follow the examples, instead, of  
5 Washington and Vermont, who retrofitted and repaired their  
6 states' infrastructures to conserve water and electric --  
7 electricity. Washington has been so successful in their  
8 conservation efforts they were able to accommodate new  
9 growth without having to construct another dam.

10           Let us dispense with this genocide mentality and  
11 genocidal attitude toward Native American people and other  
12 nations and our own citizens. We must raise our  
13 consciousness and solve this serious problem together.

14           Thank you.

15           MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

16           (Applause.)

17           DR. SHANKMAN: If you have a written statement,  
18 and would like to give us the whole written statement and  
19 not just what you speak into the microphone, that would be  
20 fine. So --

21           MR. DELLIGATTI: Denise Doebbeling, to be followed  
22 by Jeff Salt.

23           FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Hi.

24           Nuclear waste should stay at point of origin, in  
25 my opinion, regardless of -- of cost. The health and

1 financial risks are too high. Just this weekend, for  
2 example, a pipeline -- a pipeline explosion killed ten  
3 people in eastern New Mexico. This is an example of what  
4 can happen. We can't assume that high safety standards will  
5 be maintained. The risk to the residents of Utah are too  
6 high to allow this idea to come to pass. The reputation of  
7 our state is also at risk. In addition, there is no  
8 assurance that it will ever be moved.

9 And I have one question. If nuclear waste is not  
10 dangerous to be moved, then why the perceiving -- why isn't  
11 it left where it's at, if it's not so dangerous?

12 Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. DELLIGATTI: Jeff Salt, to be followed by  
15 someone from Citizen Alert from Nevada. I'm sorry. I can't  
16 make out your name.

17 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you. Thank you  
18 for the opportunity to address this commission. My name is  
19 Jeff Salt. I work for the a Audubon Society of Great Salt  
20 Lake.

21 I'm making comment to support the no action  
22 proposal for this project, and the grounds that I have for  
23 taking no action here in Utah, if you look at the  
24 groundwater assessment in your EIS, you used the Hood Wadell  
25 study of 1968 for the groundwater of Skull Valley. That's

1 seriously outdated information. If you look at the project  
2 that Utah embarked on to pump the level of the great Salt  
3 Lake into the west desert, the hope was that this pump would  
4 syphon off the level of the lake and create a reservoir for  
5 a safety valve. Well, it turned out that the water  
6 recharged into the lake faster than the pumps could pump it  
7 into the west desert. They didn't understand the hydrology  
8 of that area of the lake. So I'm suggesting to this  
9 commission that the hydrology study is flawed, and it needs  
10 to be actually redone and provided with new, updated  
11 information that is accurate and that is time-wise relevant.

12 The one reason why we're concerned about  
13 groundwater, or the Audubon Society, is that the water would  
14 go, eventually, into the lake, and if they were  
15 contaminated, that would further inhibit -- would hinder and  
16 damage the critical habitats of the international migratory  
17 wetlands and supply habitats of the Great Salt Lake. So  
18 we're suggesting -- I'm suggesting that the commission take  
19 this study back and do a groundwater study that it is  
20 relevant, and at this time support the no action opportunity  
21 for this proposal.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. Again -- okay? Thank  
24 you. If you could -- if you give your name. I -- I'm  
25 sorry. I couldn't read it. To be followed by B. Macri or

1 Macri.

2 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'm the mysterious  
3 person. I'm Jo Anne Garrett.

4 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

5 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I live -- I lived in  
6 the west desert just over the Nevada line and, this is --  
7 this is - I wanted to say this is not the first time that --  
8 that the people in the Great Basin have been victims of --  
9 of nuclear projects and facilities. I took up with Citizen  
10 Alert during the MX days, and -- and have kind of had to  
11 stay with it ever since because of the Yucca Mountain  
12 threat.

13 I -- I was shocked at reading on Page C2 of this  
14 EIS, and I quote, "After the proposed repository at Yucca  
15 Mountain, Nevada opens SNF stored at the Skull Valley site  
16 will be transported to the repository." This is from the  
17 NRC that is the impartial licenser of -- that oversees  
18 whether or not Yucca Mountain is to -- to be found suitable,  
19 which Yucca Mountain we all know looks worse every day. And  
20 this EIS, the present EIS for Skull Valley, refers to Yucca  
21 Mountain as a foregone conclusion. That's really shocking.

22 And a -- a proponent, or I should say a member of  
23 the -- of the PFSS, in reassuring us that radiation is no  
24 big thing and is a natural phenomenon, simply advises us  
25 that we must manage the magnitude of radiation to which we

1 are exposed. I've live with many people who have fought for  
2 over 30 years to get the compensation for their injuries  
3 from radiation, people who were told there was no danger.  
4 And there are a lot of them geting that compensation now,  
5 and -- and still -- still more to come. So it's not so easy  
6 to manage the magnitude of radiation to which we are  
7 exposed, when we invite it in to our -- to our Great Basin.

8 I'm hoping that -- that this proposed facility  
9 will mobilize Utahans the way they were mobilized and joined  
10 forces with Nevada to fight the MX. It's matter of clout in  
11 congress, and I'm hoping that the Utah congressional  
12 delegation will join with -- with Nevada politicians and  
13 that -- and that the two governors certainly see eye to eye  
14 on this.

15 The -- the matter of cumulative -- cumulative  
16 doses hasn't been addressed properly in this EIS, and that,  
17 of course, refers to the fact that it's in the area -- area  
18 of downwinders. And that's a serious -- really serious  
19 matter because we know this has a creeping effect.

20 It would seem to me that -- I don't see how you  
21 can license this facility if you don't know for sure that  
22 there will be another place for the waste in 20 years. It  
23 -- it surely it can't be that you've already sealed the fate  
24 of Yucca Mountain in Nevada. And if that is not the case,  
25 then this -- then this facility can't be licensed, or, if

1 so, you must thoroughly examine the implications of the  
2 return of all fuel to each or any of the facilities that  
3 ship waste to Utah. So that would be double transportation,  
4 and we have not yet really looked at single transportation.

5 Thank you very much.

6 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 Bonnie Macri, to be followed by Francis Garcia.

9 MS SHANKMAN: How many names are there?

10 MR. DELLIGATTI: Including Macri, one, two, three  
11 four five, if Mr. Mancuso is going to speak this afternoon  
12 -- yes, five.

13 DR. SHANKMAN: Well, I think that's a problem, in  
14 that we have not much time left. Is there anybody who would  
15 choose to speak tonight instead of this afternoon? No? Or  
16 could you submit your comments in writing?

17 Okay. Well, we'll extend it to 4:15, and we can't  
18 stay later than that; otherwise, the staff here will not  
19 have a chance to be ready for the 6:00 meeting. So if  
20 you'll keep your comments -- comments brief; otherwise, we  
21 will stop at 4:15.

22 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'll make it short.

23 We've been lied to in Utah on many occasions. I'm  
24 sure you've been lied to by the government. And in 1986 we  
25 had the nerve gas brought here, and we're now burning it.



1 Our people no longer want this kind of thing to happen.

2 We tried to put a news release out so that the  
3 public would know about this hearing. It didn't -- didn't  
4 get in the papers. I guess the safety of our people are no  
5 -- is no longer important to the State of Utah. We're going  
6 to start forming coalitions. This has to stop. We want it  
7 left where it is. Let them deal with it, because we don't  
8 want this sewage here.

9 We have a sovereign nation within our state that  
10 is a third-world country. We do nothing for them, you know,  
11 so they have to go so far as to bring in the largest nuclear  
12 waste dump in the United States. I -- what we need to do  
13 here in Utah is take care of these people who live within  
14 our boundaries who -- that are a sovereign nation, give them  
15 some -- some way into take care of themselves.

16 JEDI Women is for leaving the nuclear radiation  
17 where it is. We don't want it here in Utah, and we'll do  
18 everything that we can do make sure that the public knows  
19 about this.

20 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you very much.

21 (Applause.)

22 Francis Garcia, to be followed by a representative  
23 of the Greater Ogden Association of Realtors. Again, I'm  
24 sorry, I can't quite make out the name.

25 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'm concerned about

1 the earthquake potential, the underground shifting that  
2 could occur, the leakage. That's -- you know, it could  
3 affect our groundwater, which somebody already mentioned.  
4 Is there, you know, a -- I understand there is expensive  
5 technology available that can -- to neutralize nuclear  
6 waste. I don't know if there's -- you know, if that's been  
7 explored or -- you know, burying waste seems an inexpensive  
8 way to go. And how are our great, great children's great,  
9 great grandchildren going to remember where the nuclear  
10 wastes are going to be 10,000 years from now or something?

11 And I also understand the Goshute tribe has been  
12 divided by this issue, so I think it does need to be  
13 discussed further, and I also agree that the nuclear waste  
14 should stay where it's at.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 Again, I'm sorry, I can't make out your name, but  
19 the Greater Ogden Association of Realtors, followed by Dr.  
20 Nielson from the state of Utah.

21 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Is that -- does that  
22 name look like Curtis? Curtis Daton- --

23 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Dagelton.

24 MR. DELLIGATTI: I'll -- I'll take that.

25 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'll hold my comments

1 until this evening.

2 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you very much, Mr.  
3 Dagelton.

4 Dr. Nielson, to be followed by Mr. Matusow.

5 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you very much.  
6 I realize that this is a hearing, not a debate, although we  
7 would welcome a debate, but I think it is important to  
8 clarify a couple statements that were made. When the public  
9 looks to the NRC, I think, appropriately, they expect and  
10 respect the answers which you provide. And there were a  
11 couple of statements made today that I think fall a little  
12 bit short of complete disclosure in that fact.

13 The first concern, the Coverage for Transportation  
14 Accidents, under Price Anderson, in fact, Price Anderson  
15 does cover the costs of transportation accidents, with a  
16 limit. It -- the limited liability to -- is limited to the  
17 nuclear utility companies to approximately \$9 million -- I'm  
18 sorry, \$9 billion. Any costs in excess of that are assessed  
19 under Price Anderson and are paid by the federal government,  
20 the taxpayers.

21 Transportation accidents in Salt Lake City have  
22 been estimated to cost between 14- and 330 billion, thus,  
23 five to 321 billion would be left to the cost of the  
24 taxpayer.

25 Secondly, there was a discussion about talking

1 with or consulting the air force, both through the  
2 Department of Defense and Hill Air Force Base. I know we're  
3 all aware, but I think, again, it's important for the  
4 public, as we look at this issue, to remember that it isn't  
5 an issue of talking to operations and facilities that could  
6 can be impacted by the proposed storage facilities. The  
7 objective of an Environmental Impact Statement is to analyze  
8 the impacts individually and cumulatively, the costs and  
9 benefits to the facilities and operations that would or  
10 could be impacted by the construction of the proposed -- and  
11 operation of the proposed facility. That includes the Utah  
12 Test and Training Range, Hill Air Force Base's operations on  
13 that range, and between the base and the range. It includes  
14 Dugway and Dugway Proving Grounds, the storage and  
15 destruction of chemical weapons at Tooele, and any other  
16 number of military activities, none of which are addressed  
17 within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, in terms of  
18 individual or cumulative impacts, cost, and benefits.

19 I think these are two good examples of exactly the  
20 need for more discussion; in fact, the need for debate, the  
21 opportunity for people to understand; more people and more  
22 places through more hearings, the rest of the story.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. DELLIGATTI: Dr. Nielson.

25 If you could provide us with a copy of your

1 written comments that would be useful. Thanks.

2 DR. SHANKMAN: Yes, it's part of the information  
3 that the state's presenting in their contentions before the  
4 NRC.

5 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you very much.

6 Mr. Matusow, you're -- you're the last speaker of  
7 the afternoon.

8 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Joe  
9 Matusow. I am the chairman of the Ghandi Peace Center, a  
10 non-profit organization here in Utah. Much of our work over  
11 the last 16 years has been with native peoples. And I'm  
12 very concerned. Like nine of the ten poorest counties in  
13 America are Native American counties. The poverty, there is  
14 unemployment from 50 to 80, 90 percent in some case. And  
15 native peoples have been taken advantage of because the  
16 level of poverty that exists on native reservations.

17 But I also remember when I was a young infantry  
18 soldier in Germany at the end of the World War II. I had  
19 just finished fighting the war. And I'll never forget the  
20 day that they told us that the atomic bomb had been dropped.  
21 I and the rest of my company celebrated, because as a result  
22 of that bomb being dropped the orders sending us to the  
23 Pacific were torn up. We were going to leave three days  
24 later to the Pacific, and we didn't have to go. So we had  
25 an emotional love for the atomic bomb because it ended the

1 war for us.

2 I remember in the Korean War when I went back to  
3 active duty I was in the air force then, and I was sent to  
4 Nevada on few occasions, and was down at the basins where  
5 they were doing the testing, and I was just a Bronchs --  
6 Jewish Bronchs street kid in the air force. I wasn't a  
7 Mormon at that time, I am now. And I'll never could get  
8 people talking before the test for the atomic bomb, and I  
9 heard it more than once: "Is the wind blowing to Utah?  
10 Let's send the radioactivity over to the Mormons." If I  
11 heard it once I heard it a dozen times, during the times of  
12 the testing of the bombs in Nevada. And it's a very  
13 emotional thing with me because people didn't care. The  
14 poverty of the Native peoples, nobody cares about, or very  
15 few do. And -- and it's just an emotional feeling that I  
16 have, and somewhere along the line it has to stop. We have  
17 to stop dumping on our poverty and taking advantage of the  
18 poverty that exists and the hunger that exists among those  
19 who are impoverished, to try to alleviate that poverty with  
20 things such as nuclear waste.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 DR. SHANKMAN: Okay. I want to thank all of you  
25 for being here. If you have any factual questions, we'll be

1 glad to answer them. The staff is around.

2 The other thing is I wanted to make it clear to  
3 everybody that the Safety Evaluation Report which analyzes  
4 some of the things that people have expressed concern about  
5 today, will be available after September 30th. And if you  
6 will sign up, we have two people in the back of the room;  
7 one is Nichole Herbert and the other is Sarah Gillespie. If  
8 you will sign up with them we will make sure that you get a  
9 copy of the Safety Evaluation Report when it's issued. So  
10 not only will you have a copy of the Draft Environmental  
11 Statement, but you will also be able to have a copy of the  
12 Safety Evaluation Report.

13 Also, there will be limited appearances before the  
14 hearing board on both the safety aspects and the  
15 environmental aspects of this project. So if you contact  
16 Mark Delligatti at NRC -- and it's m- --

17 MR. DELLIGATTI: nsd@nrc.

18 DR. SHANKMAN: nsd@nrc.gov, or you can call on  
19 that 800 number, which is 1-800-368-5642, and just ask for  
20 Mark Delligatti. You can call him, and he will put you on  
21 the list of people to get the Safety Evaluation Report.

22 So I wanted to make it clear that those documents  
23 are available, and we'll be sure to send them out to  
24 everybody once they're published.

25 Thank you.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.  
Court Reporters  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 842-0034

1 (The hearing was concluded at 4:11 p.m.)  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.  
Court Reporters  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 842-0034



CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached description of a meeting of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission entitled:

TITLE OF MEETING: PUBLIC MEETING ON P DRAFT  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE  
PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE FACILITY

PLACE OF MEETING: Salt Lake City, Utah

DATE OF MEETING: Monday, August 21, 2000

was held as herein appears, is a true and accurate record of the meeting, and that this is the original transcript thereof taken electronically by me, thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company

Transcriber: Kerry J. Sorensen

Reporter: Kerry J. Sorensen