

ORIGINAL

72-22

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

Location: Salt Lake City, Utah

Date: Monday, August 21, 2000

Pages: 1 - 180

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

NMSSD1Public

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3
4
5 * * *

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

9
10 Little America Inn
11 500 South Main Street
12 Salt Lake City, Utah

13
14 Monday, August 21, 2000

15
16 The above entitled meeting commenced, pursuant to
17 notice, at 6:00 p.m.
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

[6:00 p.m.]

DR. SHANKMAN: All right. Good evening. Let me introduce myself. I'm Susan Shankman. I'm the deputy director of the licensing inspection at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and I -- my group is called the Spent Fuel Project Office. We have both the licensing -- excuse me, the licensing and inspection functions for interim storage of spent fuel and for transportation of all NRC licensed radioactive material. So my group approves both storage configuration and transport.

We're here tonight in a series of public meetings that we have asking for comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement related to a proposal that we received in 1997 that asked us to approve and license the storage of radioactive used fuel on the reservation of the Goshute Indians, the Skull Valley band.

We're here with three other federal agencies, because the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that was published at the end of June, and on which public comment closes September 21st, was prepared by four agencies. It was prepared by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, as represented by Dave Allison on the end; and the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Alice Stephenson is here from that agency today; and the

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

1 U.S. Surface Transportation Board. And we have Charles
2 Gardiner representing them tonight.

3 With me today from the U.S. Regulatory Agency --
4 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, I'm sorry, is Mark
5 Delligatti, at the end, who is the senior project manager
6 for this whole effort; Greg Zimmerman, who is the manager of
7 the effort at the Oak Ridge National Lab, who serves as our
8 technical consultant, and Scott Flanders. He's a senior
9 environmental project manager.

10 And we're all here, and I apologize for the fact
11 that we're up on this table. It was the only way that we
12 could see you and you could see us. It sets us up as
13 looking as if we're making a judgment. Our goal tonight is
14 to hear public comments, and that is the simple goal of
15 tonight's meeting. So we will accept public comments on the
16 Draft Environmental Impact Statement tonight, orally, and at
17 the end I'll give you a slide. You can make it in writing,
18 you can make them over the web site. We have forms in the
19 outer area where you can write your comments tonight. If
20 you choose you can put them in later. But we also want --
21 I'll make a brief presentation, no more than five or ten
22 minutes, talking about how we got to where we are tonight.

23 I ask tonight that everybody who participates
24 follows three simple ground rules: that you respect the
25 fact that everybody has a chance to speak. And we will take

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

1 the number of people that signed up and divide it by the
2 time available, and that's why I'm going to speak briefly,
3 so we have more time available, and that will be the time
4 that we'll ask people to limit their comments. We should be
5 able to hear about two or three minutes from everybody and
6 make it through the whole list.

7 We're also going to start with people who have not
8 commented before, because there are several people who have
9 signed up who made comments when we were here in July, and
10 we'd like to give everybody as much of a chance as possible.
11 But, remember, you can send your comments to us in writing.

12 We're going to talk about environmental issues
13 today, not for tonight. We're not going to talk about the
14 Safety Evaluation Report. And I'll explain the difference
15 between those, so you'll understand that you can get a copy
16 of the Safety Evaluation Report. And it's a two-part
17 analysis that the NRC does in deciding whether to grant or
18 deny the license.

19 And the time frame, as I said is -- I'll tell you
20 a little bit about the time frame. Tonight we have 'til
21 9:00 in this room, so we'll try to get as many comments in
22 as possible. NEPA, the Environmental Projects Act --
23 National Environmental Project Act, basically says that you
24 have to have a systematic approach for environmental
25 impacts, and the Environmental Impact Statement has to be

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

1 done for any major federal action. Clearly, storage on the
2 Goshute reservation of a significant number of spent fuel
3 rods in casks, approximately 4,000, would be a significant
4 federal agency action.

5 And each of the federal agencies has an action
6 that this Environmental Impact Statement is supporting. For
7 the NRC, our action is to grant or deny a 20-year license
8 for Private Fuel Storage, the name of the company that
9 applied to us to receive, transfer, and possess nuclear --
10 spent nuclear fuel and operate the independent spent fuel
11 storage facility.

12 The Bureau of Indian Affairs has, as their action,
13 to decide whether to approve a 25-year lease between Private
14 Fuel Storage and the Skull Valley band of the Goshute
15 Indians.

16 The Bureau of Land Management needs to decide
17 whether to approve a right-of-way request for the rail line
18 that would need to be constructed from the main line down to
19 the Goshute reservation.

20 And the Surface Transportation Board needs to
21 decide whether or not to grant the license to construct and
22 operate the proposed rail line. And each of these four
23 decisions are federal actions, and so, as agencies, we
24 cooperated in doing the Environmental Impact Statement,
25 since we all need to use environmental impacts as part of

1 our decision.

2 The environmental impact process for the Private
3 Fuel Storage -- you know, we're from the government, so
4 they're all letters, but I'll try to say it out, started
5 with an application that was submitted to us by Private Fuel
6 Storage to have such a facility in Utah. Under the Atomic
7 Energy Act it is permitted to have such a facility, and so,
8 as an agency, we need to review that and make sure that it
9 meets our safety standards.

10 We published a notice of intent to do that review.
11 We also published a notice that we were going to do an
12 Environmental Impact Statement, and we held scoping meetings
13 in 1998 and 1999, in which we asked people what should we
14 include in the Environmental Impact Statement, and we were
15 in Tooele and in Salt Lake City. Some of you may have
16 attended those meetings.

17 Then we went out to the site. We took the
18 application that we had received, we went through it, and we
19 asked for additional information from the applicant. We
20 prepared and issued the Draft Environmental Impact
21 Statement. A summary of it is on the big tables, as well as
22 copies of the full Environmental Impact Statement.

23 We're now in the public -- the second public
24 comment period. The first public comment period was the
25 scoping meetings. And the comment period closes September

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

1 21st. And all comments that we get, whether they're orally,
2 email, written, all comments will be addressed in the final
3 Environmental Impact Statement, in writing. So it's
4 important if you want to get a copy of that final
5 Environmental Impact Statement, that you make sure that your
6 comments also have your name and address. In the -- in the
7 back table there is a place to sign up to get a copy of
8 that.

9 Once the Environmental Impact Statement is
10 finalized, then each agency, as I said, needs to have a
11 record of their decision in this matter. So your comments
12 now are really very important to us. You can make the
13 public comments.

14 Do we have that slide? Okay.

15 These are all the people that are involved in this
16 from each of the agencies. We have a list of them. What I
17 wanted to make clear is --

18 Do you have the slide where the written comments
19 can be made? No?

20 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Can we have that list
21 of names again?

22 DR. SHANKMAN: Yeah. It's outside on the table.

23 Okay. There's, also, something that looks like
24 this [indicating] out on the table, and it tells you the
25 exact address.

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

1 There you go. Thank you, Melanie.

2 As I said, you can tell us by telephone, by web
3 address, in person at these meetings.

4 We have -- Kerry is our transcriber. And, please,
5 state your name for the record. It's important for us to
6 know, particularly, and leave your address at the back table
7 so we can send you a copy of the final EIS.

8 I wanted to make a note tonight of some of the
9 comments we've heard. I wanted to make it clear that there
10 are two parts to the NRC licensing of this facility. We
11 make an Environmental Impact Statement, which we're going to
12 talk about tonight, but there's, also, something called the
13 Safety Evaluation Report, and in that Safety Evaluation
14 Report we look at some of the things that have been talked
15 about as areas of concern. One is the accident analysis,
16 and that includes earthquakes and the use of the air space.
17 Another area that we look at in the Safety Evaluation
18 Report, although it's touched on in the EIS, the detailed
19 review of it is in the Safety Evaluation Report. And the
20 physical protection, and that would include sabotage,
21 including terrorism, the security. We use the word
22 "safeguards" for terrorism and theft and diversion.

23 Sorry.

24 Another thing is the financial qualifications.

25 I think I'm allergic to something in this room.

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

1 Sorry.

2 Anyway, the financial qualifications of Private
3 Fuel Storage to both operate the facility and decommission
4 it, by that, I mean to clean it up back to what it was when
5 they first went there.

6 So, since I can't talk anymore, what I would ask
7 you to do is Mark Delligatti will call your name. He will
8 call the second name, so that you'll know you're on deck, so
9 to speak. Please make your comments brief, a few minutes,
10 and if you have more to say, please give us a written
11 statement. They'll all go into the record. Okay.

12 Thank you very much.

13 Do you have a question?

14 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Yes. If there are
15 multiple people with a particular group, and there's a
16 spokesman, can we defer our individual time to the
17 spokesman?

18 DR. SHANKMAN: No. For everyone that signed up,
19 we'll give them the same two or three minutes. If we have
20 more time at the end we'll be glad to have you come back and
21 see us again.

22 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'm just saying if we
23 signed up can we defer our time to the spokesman?

24 DR. SHANKMAN: I -- I'd still like to limit it to
25 five minutes, even a group, if that's okay. I'd like to get

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

1 through as many diverse opinions as possible, and then if we
2 have time at the end.

3 I also would offer if people have any factual
4 questions, at the end of the meeting we'll be glad -- the
5 staff is here, there's more staff than myself and Mark and
6 Scott and Greg. We also have other staff with us, experts
7 who did some of the analysis. We'll be glad to answer any
8 questions about the facts we used in the analysis or
9 whatever, because I think -- and let me recommend to some of
10 you, there's a book on the back table. There were some
11 comments here earlier today and in our last meeting about
12 radioactive material and radiation, and I think this book
13 there will give you an idea of what -- we use terms like
14 "rem" and "rad," and if you're not in the business they
15 don't make any sense to you. But this tries to explain what
16 it is that we're measuring and what we believe the effects
17 are in different human effects. So it -- it may be helpful
18 if -- if the language in the Environmental Impact Statement
19 seems like a foreign language, which I think to some people
20 it does, okay?

21 All right. Let's get started.

22 MR. DELLIGATTI: Okay. We have some 50 people
23 signed up that have indicated they would like to speak. As
24 we have done in the other meetings, we begin by a protocol
25 of any elected officials from the national officials, state,

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

1 and tribal officials, local officials. I don't believe I've
2 seen Congressman Cook. He indicated that he might be here
3 tonight.

4 Next on the list would be Chairman Bear, if you --
5 if you wanted to speak, you would be the next one up. It's
6 the Honorable Leon Bear, chairman of the Skull Valley band
7 of Goshute Indians. And he will be followed, if he's
8 present, by Mayor Ted Wilson.

9 CHAIRMAN BEAR: Thank you. My name's Leon Bear.
10 I'm the chairman and chief of the Skull Valley Goshute
11 Indians. The tribe supports the PFS facility that's going
12 to go on out there, and we -- we have studied this facility
13 since 1991.

14 And we -- we do respect the opinions of the
15 public. That's why I'm here, to listen. And we appreciate
16 your extra effort the NRC's making to provide this time for
17 the public to make these comments.

18 And I will submit written comments later.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

21 Mayor Ted Wilson, is he present?

22 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Ted Wilson hasn't been
23 mayor for seven years.

24 MR. DELLIGATTI: Okay. That's how he's marked on
25 my sheet. Thank you for that correction.

1 The next speaker, then, would be Kathleen Gilbert,
2 to be followed by Gary Sandquist.

3 And I -- I would note the folks that -- if you
4 have spoken previously, either this afternoon or at the
5 meetings in July, I'm going to try to defer you to the end
6 of the -- of the comment period so we give everybody a
7 chance to speak at least once. Thank you.

8 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Can I ask a
9 question, a very quick question? Is there a possibility
10 that the business format be a dialogue between people, or is
11 it only the people make the statement?

12 DR. SHANKMAN: Let me answer that. I understand
13 that people would like to discuss the facts of the issue.
14 We'd be happy to do that after the meeting. We have
15 scheduled this time to hear public comments on the Draft
16 Environmental Impact Statement. That is part of the NEPA
17 process, for NRC to take public comments in writing, and
18 that's why we have a transcriber. That's why we want the
19 comments in writing, if you don't get them transcribed
20 tonight, and then they will all be answered in writing.
21 That is a process by which everybody hears the comments or
22 sees the comment and then the answer. If we have a dialogue
23 tonight, it won't be the same record. So for the NEPA
24 process, it is important that we get the comments and then
25 respond to them in writing.

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

1 But if you have questions of fact about how the
2 NRC operates or how we're processing this, we'll be glad to
3 stay after 9:00 and talk to you. I have a roving mike.
4 We'll come down and we'll talk there. Okay.

5 MR. DELLIGATTI: Ms. Gilbert.

6 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you. My name
7 is Kathleen Gilbert, and I'm speaking as an individual
8 resident of Utah today. I'm also a member of the Utah Board
9 of Radiation Control and a licensed attorney in the state of
10 Utah and certified public accountant in Utah, a citizen of
11 Utah, and, most importantly, a mother.

12 Of the alternatives that are presented in the
13 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, which I, as a
14 concerned citizen, have read in its entirety, I would
15 advocate and respectfully ask the NRC to approve the no
16 action alternative, which would mean that the license for a
17 Private Fuel Storage facility would be denied and that the
18 utility companies would continue to store the spent nuclear
19 fuel at the existing reactor sites, in either spent fuel
20 pools or dry casks. This would have minimal economic
21 impact. It would also have the least environmental impact,
22 rather than the Skull Valley proposal.

23 In an effort to be brief, may I say that the Draft
24 Environmental Impact Statement, in my opinion, is flawed and
25 incomplete. First of all, the cost benefit analysis defines

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

1 as the net economic benefit of constructing Skull Valley as
2 a simple difference between the incremental costs of storing
3 the spent fuels at the reactor sites less the cost of
4 constructing and operating the Skull Valley facility. This
5 does not take into consideration the environmental --
6 environmental impact or the incremental risks, nor,
7 moreover, by reaching such a conclusion, the NRC is stating
8 that the paramount determinative issue is the savings to
9 utility companies located elsewhere, regardless of the risks
10 to and environmental impact on the environs of Skull Valley
11 and citizens of the State of Utah.

12 There're key risks that are left out of the
13 environmental impact I would mention briefly: The risk of
14 transporting spent nuclear fuel to the proposed temporary
15 site is significantly greater, due to the fact that the
16 proposal would transport 27 times the amount of spent
17 nuclear fuel that has been moved in the past. It would be
18 moving it twice. Second, the adequacy of the proposed
19 facility to withstand earthquakes is not addresses in the
20 Environmental Impact Statement.

21 The proximity to the site from the military
22 testing range exposes Utahans to danger and threatens
23 national security and the Utah economy. 15,000 United
24 States jobs are put at risk by the proximity and the
25 restriction on testing.

1 Fourth, the Draft EIS does not mention the fact
2 that the PFS is a limited liability company, and it does not
3 address who would pay if there was a catastrophic disaster
4 occurring that exceeds the assets and insurance of PFS and
5 the assets of the utility companies could not be reached.

6 And fifth, and, finally, the PFS' past experience
7 is inaccurate to demonstrate confidence in their ability to
8 manage this site.

9 In conclusion, I would -- I would advocate the no
10 action alternative of the DEIS and remind the --
11 respectfully remind the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that
12 the losers of the proposed Skull Valley facility are the
13 citizens of the United States of America exposed to the
14 radiation along the transportation routes; the losers are
15 the citizens of Utah who may end up permanently storing the
16 spent nuclear fuels that were generated by the citizens of
17 Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, New York, New
18 Jersey, Pennsylvania, Alabama, California, and Georgia. The
19 losers are the citizens of Utah who assume the health risks
20 of being adjacent to the active military test range; the
21 losers are the citizens of Utah whose economy could be
22 adversely affected by the proximity of the military testing
23 if it should be restricted; the losers are the citizens of
24 Utah the who would closest in proximity to the proposed
25 storage facility, and should an accident or or unanticipated

1 occurrence transpire, would suffer the detrimental effects.

2 Instead of so many losses, I respectfully ask the
3 Nuclear Regulatory Commission and other agencies involved to
4 continue status flow, with minimal incremental impact on
5 health or safety, and approve the no action alternative.

6 Thank you for your time.

7 [Applause.]

8 MR. DELLIGATTI: Mr. Sandquist, to be followed by
9 Robert Hoffman. Is Mr. Hoffman here?

10 Then -- then the next speaker would be Ann
11 Swardhansen.

12 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name's Jerry
13 Sandquist. I'm a professor at the University of Utah and
14 director of the nuclear engineering program. In line with
15 our earlier speaker, I'm a certified health physicist. I
16 also have happen to be a senior nuclear reactor operator,
17 which the NRC should be aware of. So I've worked for
18 perhaps 40 years of my life with the Utah operator reactor.

19 For people don't realize that, but we do have a
20 nuclear reactor in the state of Utah. We've had one since
21 1959. It's a small research reactor. It makes radio
22 isotopes for medicine and does many other things.

23 About 20 percent of our electrical power comes
24 from nuclear power, and I know I've heard too many speakers
25 say, "Well, we're very selfish in a sense, we don't have any

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

1 nuclear facilities in Utah. Why should we be concerned
2 about that?" Well, we do use electrical power, and I don't
3 think there's anyone in here who wants to turn out the
4 lights. If you do, we could forego electrical power. But
5 about a fifth of that -- and we receive electrical power
6 generated by nuclear means in Utah. We have a very large
7 grid that comes in to us. So it's a national issue. If
8 we're going to be too narrow minded about it, why aren't we
9 involved in it? Why don't we close down Hill Air Force
10 Base? We're not involve with military action. Why do we
11 want that? We ought to close that down, too. I mean, we
12 don't need to participate in that. Well, electrical power
13 in this country is a national issue. We have the waste. We
14 must address it. We must respond to it. The Congress,
15 which we support, or not, is still part of the American
16 system here, and decided the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and
17 we must take care of this wate.

18 DR. SHANKMAN: I'm sorry. I'm sorry to interrupt
19 you, but the transcriber said he can't hear what you are
20 saying.

21 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Well, I concur. I
22 apologize. I'm an old professor, I want to look at my
23 audience here, but I should be addressing you.

24 Anyway, to -- what I would like to address, then,
25 very briefly, in a sense, let's just look at the economics

1 input the point from the point of view previous speakers
2 said it was negative. This operation is about \$3.2 billion
3 over potential 40-year life time. Now, that's assuming,
4 very optimistically, that it is licenced twice, the first 20
5 years and second 20 years, under federal law. \$100 million
6 would involve site construction. That's money into Utah,
7 because that's at the site, \$100 million. I've already
8 talked to some of the construction companies, and they
9 anticipate that if this comes in, this is going to involve a
10 lot of jobs, and, interestingly, it'll take over about the
11 time when the freeway program shuts down. So \$100 million
12 there.

13 Next item: 4,000 steel cannisters to hold the
14 40,000 metric tons of spent fuel. Those could be fabricated
15 in Utah. They could be fabricated, partially, by Geneva
16 Steel, which has some very significant some economic
17 problems in this country -- or in this state. That's an
18 amount of about \$2 billion. That's a lot of Utah jobs, and
19 others -- concrete and other materials.

20 40-year operating and maintenance cost that's
21 people out out the site operating it, at \$1.2 billion.

22 Then decommissioning at the end of the ten or 20
23 years, depending on it, by about \$70 million, for grand
24 total of about 3.2 billion. Let's just incur that.

25 When Micron announced that it wanted to come into

1 the valley, the state got very excited, the governor got
2 excited. Environmentally, this facility has less impact on
3 the area than will Micron be. It's about the same amount of
4 money, in fact, a little bit more.

5 So let's look at personal data from a selfish
6 point of view, even if we don't care about public relations,
7 solving problems, there's \$3.2 billion that will help with
8 that. In fact, one of the area it's directed at is highway
9 maintenance, and we're hurting anyway with trying to
10 maintain our highways.

11 The environmental impact of it will be small, far
12 smaller than our construction of I-15 which has had a
13 profound impact, and which, incidently, was never developed
14 or brought on line with an invironmental impact statement or
15 even an environment statement. This one is going through
16 full government action.

17 I have confidence in the Nuclear Regulatory
18 Commission, because unfortunately, or fortunately, I have to
19 respond to them on a daily basis to operate my reactor.
20 They are critics. They come in and they're very careful
21 about things that we do. We do not want accidents or other
22 situations involving nuclear power in this country. It is
23 very important to us.

24 If you believe in global warming, and I do, in a
25 sense, nuclear is our primary option for resolving that.

1 Are we going to lose that in the United States? Are we
2 going to continue to burn fossil fuel? Natural gas will not
3 last forever. How are we going to face up to that? Maybe
4 it's just a problem we're going to let our children do it.
5 I can understand administrations would prefer to delay it,
6 but at some point we have to get on with the business and
7 solve this problem. I think it should be started here.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. The next speaker
10 will be Ann Swardhansen, to be followed by Norman Bangerter.

11 DR. SHANKMAN: Okay. What I'd like to announce is
12 we have lot of people who are signing up. I would ask
13 anybody to wants to speak to sign up now, because what I've
14 asked the support staff at the table is after 7:30, to have
15 no further people sign up unless they arrived late. So if
16 you're here and you wanted to speak, please sign up, rather
17 than prolong the evening. I'd like to get everyone who's
18 here on time, within with the first hour and a half, who
19 wants to speak, to sign up, and then at 7:30 we'll close the
20 list, so we'll know how many people want to speak and how
21 much time we have to allot to them.

22 Okay. Thank you.

23 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you, Panel,
24 for allowing us to speak.

25 I'm the executive director of Citizens against

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

1 Radioactive Waste in Utah, and I'm here tonight as proxy for
2 the following people, who are on our honorary board: Former
3 Governor/Mayor Bangerter U.S. Representative Wayne Owens,
4 Bradley H. Parker, Mayor Ted Wilson, Senator Paul Julander,
5 Jill McConkie, U.S. Attorney Brent D. Ward, Mayor Dan Snarr,
6 Representative Ralph Becker, Rocko J. Navarro, Algoro Mason,
7 Judge Andrew Clayton, Senator Scott Howell, Robert Frederick
8 Wanger, Representative David Jones, Mayor Joanne Tahini,
9 Mayor -- or Senator Ted Moss, J. Robert Bradley, Senator
10 Milly Petersen, Mayor Tom Doland, and Senator Jake Garn.

11 We are adamantly aposed to the opening of the
12 nuclear waste storage facility on the Goshute Skull Valley
13 reservation. The -- the facility will bring no benefits or
14 value to the citizens of Utah. And based on the conclusions
15 of the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, the Draft
16 Environmental Impact Statement is flawed and it is
17 unacceptable. We are concerned about the enormous risks to
18 our citizens' health, welfare, and safety.

19 And we respectfully submit the following concerns:
20 The draft EIS never addresses damage perception, issues
21 concerning the business community. The proposed facility
22 and transportation routes would create a negative stigma, a
23 negative perception to the state of Utah, and the business
24 community. This perception could potentially cause
25 devaluation of property, economic losses, especially to our

1 agricultural industry, tourist industry, and other entities,
2 incurring further economic and cultural growth.

3 Can an out-of-state enterprise proclaim that it
4 bears a higher purpose of value than the existing Utah
5 enterprises? Private Fuel Storage's interests do not exceed
6 Utah's enterprises. This proposed facility could
7 potentially damage our future economy, not only because of
8 negative stigma, but the real dangers of transporting the
9 nations nuclear stockpiles through our metropolitan areas,
10 watersheds, and farming communities.

11 The next point: The cost and responsibilities
12 concerning emergency response, training, and technical
13 operations to safeguard Utah citizens in the event of a
14 radioactive leak of transportation accident has not been
15 satisfactorily addressed. What will be the costs? Who will
16 be paying for it, Utah taxpayer, PFS, or the federal
17 agencies?

18 Point: The safety of railways is of great
19 concern. Many of the proposed routes will be shared with
20 Utah's mining industry. These tracks bear constant heavy
21 coal loads. Will there be any studies conducted concerning
22 the condition of the railroad tracks and the risk of
23 derailment? Last year -- last week Utah experienced a major
24 derailment on the weakened condition of tracks.

25 Point: We question the design and manufacturing

1 of the dry casks. There're many conflicting reports
2 concerning the trials and testing of these casks. Are they
3 tested to destruction? Do the manufacturers fabricating the
4 casks use generic cask design, or are they reviewed with
5 site specific criteria? What are the factors of the site
6 specific criteria? For instance, what would a cask design
7 be for a Utah site, knowing there was active seismic
8 activity, the possible UTTR misfired missile, or are the
9 casks a generic design? We have questions regarding the
10 weakening of the NRC certification of cask design, new
11 industry pressure making changes.

12 How would the check and balances concerning safety
13 design compliance managed? Are there any conflicts of
14 interest? How does the NRC handle casks design criteria
15 concerning hydrogen build-up and cracking of the fuel
16 platting and criticality accidents? Documentation is there
17 for the public to review these questions?

18 Point: Also, what kind of NRC documentation is
19 there concerning unloading of the casks? Has a cask in the
20 United States ever been unloaded? If so, the public needs
21 to see this information. Or are we just surmising that the
22 procedure can be done safely?

23 Concerning radioactive leaks, will PFS ever
24 consider building a fuel pool at the facility, or are they
25 taking the policy of sending a damaged, cracked, or leaking

1 cask back to the place of origin? And what if another state
2 resists sending a leaking cask in their jurisdiction? What
3 if the place of origin is decommissioned? Will there --
4 where will it go?

5 What measures will be used for cask monitoring and
6 accessing? Let's say the monitoring Cask Number 4, like
7 Cask Number 4 in Palasades, Michigan, along with the
8 accumulation of the 4,000 casks, how will PFS access whether
9 the respond infrastructure will be in place to handle
10 radioactive waste at potential criticality? Will PFS have a
11 24-hour fire department to handle this or any other accident
12 at the time?

13 Point: Private Fuel Storage and the Nuclear
14 Regulatory Commission failed to disclose financial
15 information that would demonstrate a sound analysis for safe
16 operation, long-term stability and emergency response. If
17 people are expected to live with this facility, we should be
18 privy to this information. We can't tolerate another
19 financial failure, such as the Athlete Superfund project in
20 Moab. We can no longer accept this kind of financial and
21 environmental disaster. We have radioactive materials
22 leaking in the Colorado River as we speak today.

23 Our federal agencies have not demonstrated
24 responsible or safe procedures in the state of Utah. There
25 is a profound history of negligence that has affected our

1 citizens, from uranium workers, millers, and truckers, to
2 the Utah testing downwind victims. Will Utah, once again,
3 be an experimental host, this time the host of an unprecedented
4 high-level storage facility transporting the nation's
5 nuclear stockpile straight through the heart of America, in
6 experimental dual-purpose generic containers?

7 We hearby demand the United States government
8 first clean up the existing radioactive superfund sites,
9 compensate the Navajo miners and workers who are suffering
10 from caner, before licensing a new facility. We demand that
11 the NRC start regulating, protecting our railroad workers
12 who are dealing with current low-level radioactive wastes
13 being transported in Utah today.

14 I'd like to mention the Hill Air Force Base
15 closures, but I think that's already been mentioned.

16 Point: We question the irregularities of the
17 Bureau of Indian Affairs' three-day approval of this
18 facility. We question the BIA's involvement with Goshute
19 tribal disputes and concerns of a purported leadership and
20 their decisions. We demand that the allegations of
21 misconduct and bribery between the purported leadership and
22 the traditional Goshutes be investigated and addressed by
23 either the NRC or the Congressional oversight hearings.

24 Lastly, we -- we request. Wait. I'm sorry. We'd
25 like to have a request of an extension of public comment

1 period for a minimum of six months. This enormous facility
2 plays such consequences to Utah. Respectfully, we request
3 that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission' bureaucratic
4 authority within the licensing process, because of an
5 inherent relationship with the nuclear power industry and
6 the lack of national policy concerning nuclear waste --
7 there may be concerns: Number one, how is the licensing
8 process financed, and does it create a conflict of interest?
9 Because our nation has not developed a national policy
10 concerning the storage of nuclear waste, Utah may receive
11 the operation's nuclear stockpile by default. This lack of
12 policy has betrayed the power plants as well as the
13 potential host of nuclear stockpiles. These are issues,
14 however, that the power plants brought on themselves the day
15 the turnkey was placed in the door.

16 We question the political and corporate
17 maneuvering during the licensing process. It is unjust to
18 target the poverty of Indian reservations, using their
19 sacred sovereignty to benefit corporate interests and to
20 target a state that has no -- that has a lack of political
21 votes. The professional alliance between the NRC and the
22 nuclear power industry should be challenged, just as
23 Eisenhower challenged the military industrial complex
24 program during the onset of the nuclear age. The NRC's
25 authorities who write, regulate, and judge its own laws,

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

1 should be questioned within a congressional debate. Perhaps
2 then this nation will be compelled to deal with this
3 40-year-old issue.

4 A project of this magnitude will affect all of
5 America. The decision should not be left to the NRC alone,
6 but, indeed, to public debate within our democratic
7 congressional debate and process.

8 We respectfully do not find fault with the people
9 of the -- the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, but the
10 bureaucracy itself has been left unchecked by the American
11 people.

12 We respectfully submit these concerns as a basis
13 to deny licensure of this unprecedented facility. We must
14 follow our own conscience to safeguard our families and
15 future generations. Utah will not tolerate becoming the
16 enabler to this this nation's toxic economy. We will
17 challenge any decision concerning the approval of this said
18 facility or any other corporate entity that sees Utah as a
19 radioactive waste dumping ground.

20 The solution lies in keeping the waste where it is
21 is produced, where it has already been licensed, where the
22 necessary monitoring facilities are, and stored in areas
23 that will already be restricted for the future. This is the
24 price that the nuclear energy must pay for doing business.
25 Buyers beware. The DFS, you produced this, you keep it.

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

1 You keep it. This is not Utah's problem.

2 Thank you.

3 [Applause.]

4 MR. DELLIGATTI: The next speaker will be Mac
5 Brubaker, to be followed by Mary Dickson. Mac Brubaker, to
6 be followed by Mary Dickson.

7 DR. SHANKMAN: Mark, many speakers do we have?

8 MR. DELLIGATTI: There are approximately 50
9 speakers left on the list.

10 DR. SHANKMAN: Okay. So if we divide the 50
11 speakers into the time we have left, I think if each speaker
12 takes the 15 minutes that the last speaker took, we will be
13 -- we won't -- won't be able to get everybody in. And I
14 really don't think that's fair to the people that signed up
15 at the end. So if you can limit -- if you have a written
16 statement and you'd like to submit it for the record, that's
17 fine, we'll take the written statement, but I would with
18 respectfully ask that everybody give everybody else who's
19 taken the time to be here, the time to speak their mind,
20 also.

21 Thank you.

22 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Mac
23 Brubaker. I'm the president of the Utah Association of
24 Realtors. I represent directly the 7800 dues paying
25 realtors.

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

1 We feel it's our responsibility and it's our
2 mission to protect the private property rights of the people
3 of the state of Utah. It's also our mission to protect the
4 opportunities to do business in Utah. This gives us a sense
5 of conflict in this situation, because we support business
6 and we support the private property rights of the Goshute
7 Indians, as well as the rest of the Utahans; however, we do
8 not feel it's appropriate for any property owners or any
9 business to operate in a manner that damages other
10 businesses and other people's property rights.

11 We are concerned that there will be a direct
12 impact on property values from the proposed storage
13 facility. In the 1980's Los Alamos needed a place to store
14 some radioactive waste. They created what they called the
15 Waste Isolation Project. In so doing, similar to this
16 proposed project, they had to create a traffic corridor to
17 move the material from one location in New Mexico to another
18 location in New Mexico. A supreme court case before New
19 Mexico came between one of the property owners that had
20 property, partly that was taken, partly that was adjacent to
21 this conduit. That case was called the City of Santa Fe,
22 which happened to be the road building entity, and John
23 Colvis and his wife. That case explored the issue. Not
24 only does damage occur because radioactivity hurts people,
25 but does value be taken from people because there is a

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

1 perception of danger, a perception of loss? That court case
2 involved many serious and detailed studies. It was
3 determined that 71 percent of the public felt like property
4 near the corridor was devalued by the shipping of hazardous
5 waste through it. It was determined that the public felt
6 like that devaluation was in the 11 percent to 30 percent
7 range.

8 The end result of the Supreme Court case was one
9 property owner was awarded \$347,000 of damages. Those were
10 damages not for land taken, not for a cut-off to his other
11 property, that was the damage award purely for drop of value
12 due to perceived risk.

13 So we step outside the battle between the sides.
14 Some would say it's totally safe, some who say it's super
15 dangerous, and we say, as representatives of private
16 property owners in Utah that there will be a loss of value,
17 as evidenced by that study.

18 What will the loss of value be? There's not been
19 a detailed audit or inventory, but we would estimate there
20 is about 750 miles of railroad tracks that this hazardous
21 waste will be brought along to the site from those many
22 states in America.

23 If we look only at the hundred miles along the
24 most populous corridor, the Wasatch Front, and if we
25 restrict our consideration of damage to only a half mile on

1 either side of the tracks, which one of the scientists
2 suggested was a -- could be a danger zone this afternoon,
3 and apply to that the average density of housing, the
4 average value of housing, the loss in property value would
5 be five billion -- that's not million, that's billion
6 dollars. If we apply the 15 percent loss factor in that
7 range 11 to 30 that was found in New Mexico.

8 If the perceived loss of value was not just a half
9 mile, let's say it was even two miles each side of the
10 corridor, that would multiply it by four times, and we'd be
11 talking about a \$20 billion loss, spread among many property
12 owners. That's just along a hundred mile corridor. The
13 agricultural lands lying outside the corridor could also be
14 effected.

15 Well, our message is we must stand up for the
16 rights of property owners, the rights of business owners
17 along our corridors, and we do not think it's fair for the
18 small group of private citizens or for a business enterprise
19 -- a single business enterprise to take, without just
20 compensation, 5- to \$20 billion of property values on the
21 Wasatch corridor, plus destroying agricultural lands' value
22 by perception, beyond that. So we would ask that you would
23 take no action, and, therefore, there being no licensure.

24 Thank you.

25 [Applause.]

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

1 MR. DELLIGATTI: Mary Dickson, to be followed by
2 Elise Lazar.

3 DR. SHANKMAN: One second. When you give those
4 figures, when you're giving your statement, if you have an
5 analysis that you've done to support those figures, we would
6 very much like to see that, because that would help us in
7 our own analysis. So if you quoted a list of numbers,
8 they'll be in the record, but if you have a basis for that,
9 based on your estimated value of houses, that would be very
10 helpful, if you have it.

11 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Well, I would be happy
12 to submit to you, by email, the calculations --

13 DR. SHANKMAN: That would be fine. That's fine.
14 That would be excellent. Thank you.

15 Okay.

16 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you for having
17 us. My name is Mary Dickson, and I'm here as a concerned
18 citizen because I feel very passionately about this issue,
19 and it's because I am a downwinder. All of us, in fact, in
20 Utah, are downwinders. And we have listened to assurances
21 before that all is well, that our safety is being guarded,
22 and those assurances, as we discovered, meant absolutely
23 nothing. I survive thyroid cancer I developed as a result
24 of a nuclear testing during the '50s and '60s. Others have
25 not been so lucky. I have stopped keeping lists and

1 counting the number of friends, neighbors, acquaintances,
2 and relatives who have suffered and lost their lives to
3 cancer and other radiation and fallout related diseases.

4 As Utahans we have lived with that awful, awful
5 legacy of radiation. We continue to live with that legacy
6 because so many effects are long-term and don't show up for
7 years and years after exposure, as I'm sure you know. Now
8 we're being asked to take 40,000 metric tons of the nation's
9 radioactive waste into our back yard, by a consortium of
10 eastern utility companies who created this waste over the
11 last 40 years. When I hear them say that they can safely
12 transport -- transport this amount of high-level radioactive
13 waste across the country and temporarily store it, I am
14 naturally sceptical. I'm not a scientist, but I'm convinced
15 we're the same -- we're at risk in the same way we were 40
16 years ago.

17 I'd love to believe all those assurances of this
18 proposal -- proposed -- proposed site poses no health risks,
19 but everything I read only further alarms me. Once again,
20 we're being targetted as a national sacrifice zone. During
21 the years of nuclear testing there were documents that have
22 come forth that said we were dismissed basically as, quote,
23 "a low-level use of the population." Well, we will not so
24 easily be dismissed again.

25 [Applause.]

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

1 The whole idea that this temporary storage
2 facility is -- the storage facility is temporary is a farce.
3 It's very clear that our nation has stumbled very badly in
4 creating a permanent storage site for the nation's nuclear
5 waste. The Environmental Impact Statement fails to identify
6 a permanent solution, and without a permanent solution in
7 place, that which is temporary stands a very good chance of
8 becoming permanent.

9 Another point: This waste is lethally radioactive
10 for thousands of years. It's going to reach far beyond our
11 lifetimes, into the lifetimes of future generations. What
12 we are deciding now does not just affect our communities, it
13 affects those to come for thousands of years. I want to
14 impress that on people.

15 The National Research Council recently reported
16 the contaminated sites cannot be adequately cleaned up for
17 future use. That means we're going to left to deal with a
18 problem that has no solution. Each and every train coming
19 into Utah the would contain more than 250 times the long
20 lasting harmful radiation of the atomic bomb that was
21 dropped on Hiroshima.

22 Even when contained, development of new casks for
23 shipment of fuel rods will emit radiation. What will be the
24 cumulative effects of thousands of shipments of these casks
25 passing in close proximity to population centers day after

1 day? No one can tell us what those long-term effects will
2 be. Most of the tests that have been done on the storage in
3 transportation casks have been done by computer modeling,
4 and they're not being done by actual tests. Anything is
5 just a guess.

6 Locating a high-level storage facility in close
7 proximity to the very active Wendover Gunning and Bombing
8 Range is sheer madness, not to mention potentially harmful
9 to the nation's defense preparedness. In recent years air-
10 -- cruise missiles have destroyed university research
11 facilities in the west desert. More than a dozen F-16's
12 from Hill Air Force Base have crashed in the military test
13 area during in the last decade. I can hardly think this
14 means it will be safely stored in Skull Valley.

15 The very nature of the financial arrangement
16 between members of the Goshute tribe and the Private Fuel
17 Storage consortium is currently under investigation,
18 producing serious concerns about financial improprieties.
19 Representative Jim Hansen of Utah has called for a
20 congressional investigation of the PFS dealings, as well as
21 an investigation of the federal agencies for failing to
22 provide adequate oversight of this process.

23 The General Accounting Office report says there is
24 enough on-site storage at reactor sites. This completely
25 eliminates the need for a facility in Skull Valley. Any

1 reasonable person looking at the current situation must
2 conclude that the storage of spent nuclear fuel rods at this
3 site of the nuclear power stations that created them is much
4 safer than shipping them cross country to Utah. If they can
5 be stored safely in Utah, as the PFS claims, then they can
6 be stored safely in the states that produced the waste in
7 the first place, and there are no additional hazards.

8 [Applause.]

9 DR. SHANKMAN: Can I ask you if you can wrap up,
10 please.

11 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: This has future
12 implications not just for Utah but for the communities along
13 the transportation corridor. The public comment period ends
14 September 21st. As citizens as we demand and deserve more
15 time to get the word out. We want more hearings. We want a
16 six-month extension. As citizens in a democracy, we must be
17 involved in this process. It is not inevitable. We can
18 fight that. We will. There can be no compromise for our
19 community's sake, our children's sake, the nation's sake,
20 and the sake of generations to come.

21 [Applause.]

22 MR. DELLIGATTI: Elise Lazar, to be followed by
23 Gerald Lazar.

24 DR. SHANKMAN: And, again I'm going to interrupt
25 you after about a minute and a half, because then we can get

1 everybody in.

2 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Oh my, that's a
3 challenge.

4 I want to -- I want to say I didn't come with any
5 prepared speech, I have no statistics, no scientific
6 evidence, but I come with great passion, with great
7 conviction. And although my name is Elise Lazar, I -- I
8 speak to you as Jane Doe, because I don't just represent
9 myself as an individual, I represent thousands of people who
10 are not here today who I know feel similarly as I do.

11 I moved here 14 years ago. I moved from the east
12 coast, and I moved here because the east coast sort of
13 pushed me out. It was -- there was a lot of crime. I
14 thought there was better place to raise children. I thought
15 Utah was a place for me.

16 We came here, I asked all the right questions, I
17 thought, in terms of safety issues and crime and so forth.
18 But who knew to ask about -- about whether there was storage
19 of chemical weapons out in Tooele, you know, and that the
20 incineration process would start shortly after I arrived?
21 Who thought to ask that this -- did we have the largest
22 contamination in -- in the United States in MagCorp? Who
23 thought -- and this is really the Darth Vader, I -- my
24 understanding is of all of this. Who knew that we had a
25 proving grounds for -- for biological weapons? And now

1 this. Now, this. How safe can we feel?

2 And it's not just a question of perception, I
3 mean, it is really real. We know that the incineration
4 process was stopped because there was leakage. There -- it
5 -- it just -- we -- we know that things in nature happen.
6 Who ever thought there would be a tornado in downtown Salt
7 Lake City? You know, you're saying, "Well, you know, maybe
8 there won't be, you know, even though there's a fault and
9 there's seismic probability, we won't have an earthquake,"
10 but those things happen.

11 So I want to say that I applaud all those who have
12 spoken. I -- I -- the Salt Lake Tribune has come out
13 against this. The Deseret News, just -- not this past
14 Monday, but the Sunday before, had an editorial. I applaud
15 them. I applaud Rocky Anderson for coming out, and all the
16 people in the committee that this -- that the one woman that
17 spoke earlier represented. But what about our senators? I
18 haven't heard from Orrin Hatch, I haven't heard from Senator
19 Bennett, and -- and I say shame. Shame to those who are not
20 speaking up against this.

21 You know, you -- you look at these -- you look at
22 the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Shame on them for railroading
23 this through. Same on the officials, the county officials
24 for Tooele, who have been railroading this and bought out.
25 Shame on those 25 or 30 Goshute Indians who really do not

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

1 represent the rest of their tribe in -- in -- in accepting
2 what-- what seems to me an enormous bribe. There a lot of
3 people to blame here.

4 I say we oppose this, as citizens -- citizens of
5 Utah we oppose this. We do not want to be yet another
6 dumping site for something that's going to be very harmful
7 to our children and generations to come.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

10 [Applause.]

11 Gerald Lazar, to be followed by Bern Haggerty.

12 DR. SHANKMAN: Again, if you can limit your
13 comments. I know it seems unfair to the individual, but
14 it's fair to the group. We want to get everybody who signed
15 up tonight a chance to speak. This is ten hours so far
16 we've been listening to people.

17 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Yes. Thank you for
18 being here to listen to our comments. And ten hours is a
19 small number, but we appreciate your time.

20 My name's Dr. Gerald Lazar. I'm a psychiatrist.
21 As my wife was just saying, I moved here 14 years ago from
22 Baltimore for the reasons that she cited. And,
23 interestingly enough, recently we had a family living with
24 us from the Ukraine, physicians who had been involved
25 directly in the Chernobyl event. One of the physicians of

1 that couple had actually been there for six weeks right
2 after the place blew up. And he and his family decided to
3 leave the Ukraine to come to the United States for a better
4 opportunity and for a safer life. And I have thought, as
5 I'm sure other people in this room have thought, you know,
6 maybe it's time to leave Utah. With all the facilities, how
7 could this place possibly be considered safe any longer?

8 The question is where do you go? There are very
9 few places, if any, left in the entire world that are safe.
10 When something like Chernobyl blows or Three-Mile River, it
11 involves the entire world. We are a very small world.

12 The problem and the solution that people have been
13 stating, the problem, namely, being the possibility of
14 nuclear contamination here in Utah, is not really the
15 problem, it's a world problem. And the problem, really, is
16 nuclear reactors and nuclear contamination. And as long as
17 companies are allowed to produce these spent nuclear rods,
18 or the -- without the liability of even having to take any
19 responsibility for shipping them across the country, and
20 that's not figured in their costs, then our costs will look
21 great, that they'll be able to sell nuclear energy at a much
22 lower rate.

23 The problem lies in the policy of the United
24 States of America allowing the continued use of nuclear
25 energy. That's what we have to stop.

1 [Applause.]

2 The automobile industry could do away with
3 contaminating automobiles, and the nuclear energy business
4 could much be better spent in terms of their money and
5 income and finances on alternative fuels. I would much
6 rather be talking about -- SNF to me means Skilled Nursing
7 Facilities, but I did feel it necessary to come here
8 tonight. And I actually started to read this book, but I'm
9 much better listener, being a psychiatrist than I am a
10 speaker. But I did feel it very important to come here
11 tonight, just to say we would very much like you to vote for
12 no action rather than the current site.

13 Thank you.

14 DR. SHANKMAN: Bern Haggerty, to be followed by
15 Ken Holmstead.

16 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Hi. My name is Bern
17 Hagerty. I'm a resident of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, and I
18 just moved here two weeks ago to attend school. I -- as a
19 resident of Wyoming, I -- I'd like to ask you to adopt the
20 no action alternative. For myself, I like to see a nuclear
21 waste dump in neither Wyoming nor Utah. And I'd like to
22 also makes an appeal to the Goshute people and their
23 leadership, who really are here to listen, I'll somebody
24 happy to get on my knees and beg you to change your minds
25 because I think that would put an end to this whole thing.

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

1 [Applause.]

2 And I'd also like to say that I -- I think you've
3 been subjected to what any ordinary transaction would be
4 called "unfair trade practices." The office of nuclear
5 Waste negotiator is a modern day equivalent of a snake oil
6 salesman, and I don't think we should have such a thing in
7 America.

8 Then, in addition to my introductory remarks, I'd
9 like to ask the commission, and, in particular, the Surface
10 Transportation Board and the Department of Transportation to
11 respond to a couple specific issues in the Final
12 Environmental Impact Statement.

13 Now, I've reviewed the -- the materials out front
14 about what's going to be included in the Safety Evaluation
15 Report, and it looks to me like we're not going to be
16 allowed to submit public comments on the Safety Evaluation
17 Report itself, so I want to say some things about that right
18 now.

19 DR. SHANKMAN: Excuse me. If you want a copy of
20 the Safety Evaluation Report, anybody in the room there's a
21 list in the back. We'll be sure that you get it. It's
22 going to be published on September 30th. And if you want to
23 send in written comments for the safety evaluation, of
24 course, that would be fine. Tonight we have to focus on the
25 Environmental Impact Statement.

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

1 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay. Let me ask you
2 to respond to a couple transportation related issues in the
3 Environmental Impact Statement. First, it seems like the
4 PFS environmental report and Safety Analysis Report rely
5 exclusively on the 1986 Yucca Mountain environmental
6 assessment of the transportation related risks of this
7 proposal. A lot has changed since 1986 or 1982, when the
8 data were proposed for that. For example, the Interstate
9 Commerce Commission was eliminated, which was one more
10 entity that would guarantee public input and interstate
11 railroad routing the decision to be made.

12 Second, for example, in the American west the
13 railroad industry has become a monopoly. And you'll
14 remember when that happened a couple of years ago, there was
15 a a huge backlog of abandoned freight cars. What's going to
16 happen when we have more consolidation in the railroad
17 industry? What if there's a deconsolidation? These are
18 specific things I'd like to see addressed in the final
19 Environmental Impact Statement.

20 Second, I'd like to ask especially the Department
21 of Transportation to address the question of regulatory
22 lapse. First, I question the effectiveness of D.O.T. safety
23 regulations. From what I've observed as a frequent commuter
24 on the interstate, there's no real enforcement of D.O.T.'s
25 radioactive waste transportation safety rules, and, in fact,

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

1 all of my complaints about safety violations I've witnessed
2 have gone unanswered. I'd like the D.O.T. to read the
3 Environmental Impact Statement in this proceeding more -- or
4 several proceedings to evaluate the need for some citizen
5 oversight board perhaps, for the D.O.T.'s radioactive waste
6 transportation safety program or perhaps the remedy of
7 citizen watches to enforce the -- the regulations, if the
8 D.O.T. refuses to enforce them.

9 A second category of regulatory items I'm
10 concerned about, I'd like to see specifically address
11 specifically in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, is
12 last year congress eliminated funding for the Department of
13 Transportation's radioactive waste transportation safety
14 program. This is a disastrous -- this could have disastrous
15 consequences at a facility like the Goshute facility. As
16 far as I know, if congress were to eliminate funding for
17 D.O.T.'s Transportation Safety Program, the railroads would
18 shipping the stuff in brown paper bags, literally. So I
19 want that addressed. That's more likely than an earthquake,
20 and probably more disastrous.

21 Those are the specific things I'd like to see
22 addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. A
23 couple of complaints I have: One is about public input.
24 Since I'm a resident of Laramie, Wyoming I don't recall
25 seeing public notice in my newspaper, even though it's a

1 primary transportation route, to the Goshute facility. I
2 think that the Department of Energy -- [applause] -- set, if
3 not the right example, a better example than it did with
4 limitation EIS, and they at least put public notice in all
5 the major newspapers along the transportation route. I mean,
6 the nearest hearing to where I lived was in Denver, which is
7 150 miles away, but at least they notified us of where those
8 hearings would be.

9 So that -- second, I'd like to complain about the
10 unavailability of the documents. I got the Draft
11 Environmental Impact Statement for the first time today. I
12 had to review the environmental report and the safety
13 analysis, and found that the University of Utah Library, the
14 largest public library in the state, to my knowledge, didn't
15 have a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. There's a good
16 reason right there for a six-month extension.

17 [Applause.]

18 Finally, I'd like to praise you for the statement
19 -- the bold statement in the Draft Environmental Impact
20 Statement, and I hope it appears again in the final
21 statement, that there would be no truck transport of
22 materials if this facility is opened, and that there will be
23 a separate NEPA proceeding if you decide to adopt a truck
24 transportatio option.

25 So the things I specifically want a response to in

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

1 the Final Environmental Impact Statement are the changes in
2 the transportation industry between 1986 and 2000, and the
3 possibility of regulatory lapse.

4 Thank you.

5 [Applause.]

6 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

7 DR. SHANKMAN: On the back table in the back room
8 are an issues paper that NRC put to out, and there are
9 public comments on that issues paper until the end of
10 September. Why I'm calling it to your attention is both the
11 U.S. Department of Transportation and the NRC are beginning
12 the process to change the standards for transportation of
13 radioactive material. Since that's going on in --
14 concurrently with this process, I wanted to make sure that
15 everybody here is aware that that is going on. And if you
16 have concerns about transportation standards, as this
17 gentlemen did, with the U.S. Department of Transportation,
18 or for the NRC, I would ask you to pick that up. It tells
19 you where to make comments. We're not going to talk about
20 it tonight, but I want you to know that that's going on
21 concurrently, and it's all in the issues paper that's out
22 there on the back table.

23 MR. DELLIGATTI: Okay. Ken Holmstead, to be
24 followed by Congressman Cook.

25 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Ken Holmstead. In the

1 interests of time I'll defer my comments to email, other
2 than just support a negative no action on that.

3 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

4 The next speaker, then, if you're ready, would be
5 Congressman Merrill Cook.

6 Congressman Cook.

7 [Applause.]

8 CONGRESSMAN COOK: Thank you very much. I'm
9 pleased to be here this evening, and I think that all of us
10 can agree that with this turn-out tonight, it only
11 emphasizes how much the citizens I think of this valley are
12 really concerned, how much they are concerned about the
13 proposed nuclear waste storage site in Skull Valley.
14 Despite tremendous public outcry against this proposed site,
15 there, unfortunately, a real possibility. Current plans for
16 construction of a nuclear storage site remain. In fact,
17 many things, in spite of all of the work that Governor
18 Leavitt has done and those in the congressional delegation
19 that oppose this, but it almost has an air of an
20 inevitability about it. And I'm very concerned about that.

21 Throughout my political life I've always supported
22 measures that provided not only good economics but also good
23 science. My fellow Utahans, this nuclear waste site
24 provides neither. Currently, Tooele County officials are
25 really, still, even at this late stage, the only ones who

1 have endorsed this plan. And this was after numerous
2 behind-the-scenes meetings with Private Fuel Storage
3 representatives.

4 All of us are aware of the negative aspects the
5 proposed plan possesses, but I'd like to reiterate some of
6 the more alarming ones. First, the proposed storage
7 facility leaves our state government with no power to
8 regulate the storage of this deadly waste for at least 20
9 years.

10 Secondly, Private Fuel Storage repeatedly
11 maintains it will only utilize this facility until the Yucca
12 Mountain storage site is constructed in Nevada. My friends,
13 just as we are concerned about these hazards entering our
14 state boundaries, so are the people of Nevada. And I can
15 tell you that construction of the Yucca Mountain storage
16 facility -- facility is years and years away. And I'm
17 painfully aware of that after each of the four years that
18 I've been in congress have gone by, and we've taken
19 testimony from not only the Department of Energy but the
20 Department of Transportation and many others that have been
21 working on this, and many from the administration in
22 Washington.

23 And, finally, the current plan to rail this waste
24 from all parts of the country through Salt Lake City and
25 Salt Lake County opens up the possibility for disaster that

1 we could really never recover from.

2 Ladies and gentlemen, we're blessed to live in
3 such a beautiful and picturesque area of the country, but to
4 throw all that away over greed, without thinking about about
5 other factors that could be impacted, is poor management of
6 our natural resources. This is why so many of other Utah
7 government officials have joined me in speaking out against
8 this proposed nuclear storage site.

9 Ladies and gentlemen, let's not play Russian
10 roulette. With all we take for granted in our state, to
11 advertise to the rest of the country that for a price Utah
12 will accept a hazard that no other community seems willing
13 to accept.

14 I'll continue to do everything I can in the few
15 months I have remaining I have in office, to stop this
16 nuclear waste site from being developed in our state, and I
17 look forward to more dialogue on this subject before we make
18 any decision.

19 Thank you very much for your time.

20 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you, Senator.

21 [Applause.]

22 MR. DELLIGATTI: Dr. M.T. Welles, to be followed
23 by Kyle -- it might be Wells, as well. I'm not sure --

24 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Willie.

25 MR. DELLIGATTI: Willie. Thank you.

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

1 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you for the
2 opportunity to be heard. My name is Marylyn T. Welles.

3 My comments will be brief, because I don't want to
4 deliberate what's already been said in these hearings. I
5 support the no action alternative. I urge you to choose
6 that alternative. I also urge you to extend the comment
7 period for six months, to give us a chance to see what's
8 behind some of the smoke and mirrors.

9 A point I want to make is that many of us who've
10 been attempting, in good faith, to follow the arguments of
11 this matter have unable to verify the credentials of some of
12 the speakers in favor of this proposal. I hold a doctor of
13 engineering, but not in nuclear engineering. It is
14 customary, when examining for experts outside of one's own
15 field, to check into the qualifications of those parties, in
16 order to determine whether or not to believe what they say.

17 Many of the pro-arguments that have been made seem
18 to be simplistic, kind of at the level of what you get in
19 the back of an airline seat. I have attempted to find out
20 something about the backgrounds and credentials of the
21 speakers, and have been unable to verify the claims they
22 made about their qualifications. Some are members of an
23 organization called Scientists for Secure Waste Storage.
24 That organization has an impressive website but no
25 information about the background of its members. There's no

1 email address or inquiries. The only email address provided
2 is that of a webmaster and a list of the website
3 technicalities. I emailed the webmaster with inquiries
4 about where further information could be obtained about that
5 organization or about the background of the specific
6 members. I got no answer.

7 I also asked the Salt Lake City Tribune, by email,
8 what attempts it had made to verify the credentials of the
9 authors of pro-opinion pieces published in that newspaper.
10 I got no answer.

11 A check of the University of Utah website turned
12 up some of the proponents, but did not list them in the
13 capacity they claimed in published materials. In one case
14 an administrator was kind enough to check departmental files
15 and could ask longstanding faculty members about a specific
16 name. She reported that no one had ever heard of this
17 person, not as a faculty member, not as an adjunct, not as a
18 post-staff, nor as a researcher.

19 I will say, as an aside, as a credentialed person
20 myself -- generally, people with credentials have a regular
21 face. They don't hide. Their curriculum vitae is
22 practically written on their cocktail napkins. Why are
23 these people hiding?

24 [Applause.]

25 Scientists for Secure Waste Storage may be mature

1 enough, but to my nose it has the odor of all the technical
2 organizations that were cheerleading for Microsoft,
3 supposedly on an objective basis, until all of the -- the
4 Oracle Corporation hired a private detective, they traced
5 all of their funding back to Microsoft. Those of us opposed
6 to the Goshute Reservation proposal are not going to spend
7 money on a private detective. We are saving our monies to
8 fund a lawsuit, but every one of those as will be after
9 these proceedings.

10 [Applause.]

11 I just wanted to go on record with an initial
12 lawsuit in mind, saying that I'm suspicious of the
13 credentials and motivations of the experts who've testified
14 in favor of it. Money corrupts, and almost everything is
15 for sale in contemporary America.

16 In the meantime, I urge everyone to look at this
17 website, the Scientists for Secure Waste Storage. Part of
18 the risk analysis shown there deals with a very small
19 likelihood that a meteorite will land on the Goshutes'
20 storage site. A prudent person might well say, "Never mind
21 meteorites, what about the risk of the crash of aircraft and
22 missiles at the Hill Air Force Base? What are those
23 calculations?" Murphy's law has not yet been repealed.

24 I will close by including in its entirety -- well,
25 I took some of it out, for time. Item 14 in the points made

1 on the Scientists for Secure Waste Storage website. Item
2 14: "The PFS facility will be attractive target for
3 sabotage." Their response: "It is hard to see that
4 sabotage with anything less than an atomic bomb will have
5 any effect on the public health and environment outside the
6 Skull Valley reservation," yadda, yadda, yadda. I say this
7 is a naive response. Look, instead, to the rules of war,
8 and especially to what history teaches us about the behavior
9 of subjugated populations in the face of a conflict invader.
10 The probability that there was one or more incidences of
11 destruction of railway facilities is very close between
12 Goshute Valley and eastern sources of this spent fuel has
13 not been addressed. If the objective is to not have this
14 stuff shipped here, one way to accomplish that objective is
15 take out a few railway stations and other key network nodes
16 before the nuclear fuel is loaded. I certainly am not
17 advocating such a course of action, I'm simply observing
18 that this is the kind of sabotage that subjugated
19 populations under siege take against invading armies.

20 Many will view the NRC and the fly-by-night PFS,
21 that limited liability corporation, as an invading army. As
22 an investor, I'm sure to not let anything stop the railroads
23 that will be shipping this stuff. If I were to have stopped
24 them, I would dump it immediately. Terrorists are often
25 produced by governments who don't act in the best interests

1 of their citizens, thus leaving those citizens feeling they
2 have no alternative but terrorism.

3 Thank you for your time.

4 MR. DELLIGATTI: Kyle Willie to be followed by
5 Emil Knudson.

6 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Kyle Willie, taxpaying
7 citizen of Utah. And this time, just this time, I would
8 flatly ask you to keep your stinking garbage out of my yard.

9 [Applause.]

10 MR. DELLIGATTI: Emil Knudsen, to be followed by
11 Justin Webb.

12 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'm a realtor in Orem,
13 Utah. I'm a real estate broker down there. I have true
14 concerns about real estate values and properties. If you'll
15 go -- if any of you have an opportunity to follow those
16 railroad track trails all the way up Spanish Fork Canyon,
17 Utah County you will see that we have people living within
18 20 or 40 feet of those railway tracks. It scares me
19 tremendously.

20 My mother was on a -- on a train in Amsterdam that
21 was hijacked by terrorists for 45 days. I have in my mind
22 very deeply engrained the ability of what terrorists can do
23 and the stress and the strain and that damage that they do
24 to people.

25 I didn't come much with anything to say, just to

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

1 hear what was here, and also propose that I support the no
2 action alternative, as over 200 people that I have also had
3 signed petitions for this at this point in time.

4 I'd like to you all to just think there's been so
5 much technical given us, so prolific I'm not -- I don't hold
6 a college degree, I'm very simple in my ways, but please
7 think of me, in the evenings, lying in my bed with my seven
8 beautiful children, two grandchildren, two of which are
9 Native Americans, adopted. And I listen those trains as
10 they drive through, and I think, and even see today in -- in
11 -- the 16 people that died in train derailment accidents. I
12 can't sleep peacefully. Please help me and others sleep.

13 [Applause.]

14 MR. DELLIGATTI: Justin Webb, to be followed by
15 Sharon Ellsworth.

16 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Justin Webb, speaking
17 for myself. I'm also a real estate agent.

18 I think that something that's been rather obvious
19 this evening is there are many emotions about it, and I
20 respect those of you on your panels and with titles and so
21 forth, those who spoke for and those who've spoken against.
22 I also am uneducated as to all the truths and science behind
23 this, yet we've seen throughout history when man has acted
24 without true knowledge, consequences -- consequences have
25 been negative.

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

1 We can see here, by the emotions of these people
2 and those who have spoken previously, that there is nothing
3 but negativity being wrought by the proposed facility.

4 As for the environment, what's more important than
5 any of the potential and physical environmental
6 consequences, is the loss of love, the loss of faith in our
7 government and in one another. Let's not bring that on.
8 Don't do it.

9 [Applause.]

10 MR. DELLIGATTI: Sharon Ellsworth, to be followed
11 by Shannon Vogt.

12 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Hi. My name is
13 Sharon Ellsworth. I'm a resident of Grantsville City in
14 Tooele County, one mile to the east of the proposed Goshute
15 reservation nuclear waste site.

16 I've listened to both sides of the discussion on
17 this topic, attended several of your public hearings, and
18 read countless pamphlets and articles. My family, including
19 my four children, whom I brought with me tonight, so they
20 can hear the debate on this issue that so profoundly affects
21 their future, are becoming increasingly concerned, as we see
22 that the arguments of those in favor of storing at the
23 Goshute site are shortsighted and downplay our very real
24 worries at living 20 miles from what could be the world's
25 largest facility of its kind.

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

1 We are told that the technology of storage is well
2 understood. My question is how can the long-term impact of
3 weather, earthquakes, environmental factors, etc. be known
4 in the industry in nuclear storage labs for only a few
5 years? Who can predict the far distant future, since these
6 materials will still be sitting here after hundreds of
7 thousands of years?

8 Scientists in favor of nuclear energy tell us that
9 we're all exposed to small amounts of atmospheric radiation
10 all the time anyway. Why should we in Tooele County mind
11 being next to the storage site? Is it fair to compare the
12 minimal radiation we are exposed to in in airplanes or in an
13 x-ray with a facility that would house millions of times
14 more radiation than was released in the bombing of Japan at
15 the end of World War II? These assurances by your agency
16 and the BLM and those scientists who say storage is safe,
17 temporary, and poses no threat to surrounding populace,
18 sounds suspiciously familiar. Those are the same assurances
19 were given to the downwinders in Nevada and southern Utah
20 during the era of open air nuclear testing.

21 [Applause.]

22 In all this controversy I'm trying to find the
23 truth, and to not be turned away by fear or speculation, but
24 my common sense constantly asks the question, if the spent
25 nuclear rods are so safe, why can't they remain in storage

1 where they are?

2 [Applause.]

3 Why are the communities back east, where electric
4 is provided by the nuclear industry, so adamant that these
5 spent rods be sent somewhere out west, if storage is so
6 safe? If the industry is so certain that the hazardous
7 radioactive rods pose no threat when properly stored, then
8 why is the NRC and the BLM begging and bribing Native
9 Americans, sovereign nations outside the U.S. jurisdiction,
10 to take their waste on their tribal grounds? They aren't
11 treated fair, because spent nuclear rods are dangerous and
12 potentially hazardous to life.

13 A Salt Lake newspaper, the Deseret News, quoted
14 the National Academy of Science -- this is in hard form,
15 I'll get descriptions of this -- "At many sites,
16 radiological and non-radiological, hazardous wastes will
17 remain posing risks to humans and the environment for tens
18 or even hundreds of thousands of years. Complete
19 elimination of unacceptable risks to humans and the
20 environment will not decrease now or in the foreseeable
21 future."

22 As a result of my small research, I must say I do
23 not believe you when you say that storage of 4,000 casks of
24 spent nuclear rods 20 miles from my home will not pose any
25 threat to the health and safety of my family and my

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

1 community. The NRC and the BLM could make your decisions,
2 choose the rods to Utah, then go home to our homes in other
3 parts of the country, where you and your family do not have
4 to be affected by the radiation when something goes wrong.
5 The lack of responsibility shown by you, the BLM, and
6 Private Fuel Storage and the eastern utilities it
7 represents, and the communities in the east who don't want
8 your waste in their back yards, is appalling.

9 This nuclear waste should not come to Tooele
10 County. We are already overburdened by too many
11 environmental and hazardous waste companies and agencies.
12 We have more than enough concerns to demand accountability.
13 And as for what we do for spent rods, well, this dilemma and
14 the surrounding controversy is the natural byproduct of
15 choosing to produce nuclear energy. If that is what your
16 community chooses, then your community should take
17 responsibility for the waste generated. That, again, is
18 just common sense.

19 Thank you.

20 [Applause.]

21 MR. DELLIGATTI: Shannon Vogt, to be followed by
22 Todd Roberts.

23 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Jackson Rose?

24 MR. DELLIGATTI: I'm sorry, Mr. Rose. Why don't
25 you go after Ms. Vogt.

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

1 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I am Shannon Vogt.
2 I'm a citizen of Salt Lake City, Utah, and I support the no
3 action alternative, because this only reeks of corruption
4 and greed, and there's no beauty in it whatsoever. It's
5 going to detrimentally effect the whole nation. I think the
6 nation should be definitely -- you should have more public
7 -- it should show in the newspapers or publicity about it
8 before this action takes place, the decision. So I would
9 strongly suggest and request that you have a longer
10 extension period before this is -- this decision comes
11 about.

12 And that's it. Thank you.

13 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

14 [Applause.]

15 Jeri Roos, to be followed by Todd Roberts.

16 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Did you say Jeri
17 Roos?

18 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Jackson
19 Rose.

20 MR. DELLIGATTI: I'm terribly sorry. I -- I was
21 overlooking -- I overlooked Jeri Roos. I thought that was
22 -- that was who you were saying. I thought you realized you
23 were up.

24 Ms. Roos, if you would.

25 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you. I also

1 support the no action alternative. I've been looking at you
2 tonight, and, quite frankly, you're a very intelligent
3 looking group. The fact that you are here presiding over
4 this hearing seems to attest to the fact that you are above
5 average in your intelligence. So that being the case, I
6 have to ask you, what is the reasoning behind moving
7 dangerous radioactive waste from one temporary site to
8 another temporary site, for as the -- as the Environmental
9 Impact Statement states, just seven years when the General
10 Accounting Office has assured us that there is ample on-site
11 storage already in existence at the reactor, and that that
12 on-site storage could be expanded, if necessary. That just
13 doesn't make sense, regardless of how intelligent you are.

14 There has to be more to this proposal than Private
15 Fuel Storage is telling us. Could it be the states where
16 the energy is used have passed laws prohibiting power
17 companies from expanding their storage, even though space is
18 available, because they are not sure of the safety of the
19 waste?

20 Then the question arises, why are the companies
21 that make up the consortium that assures us that it's
22 perfectly safe, not willing to take the responsibility for
23 possible accidents? They are not sure that it is safe,
24 either. So they fail to step forward to take responsibility
25 that is theirs, and hide behind an umbrella company with no

1 assets. Instead, they to a desperate group of people and
2 tell half truths. This is dishonest and immoral.

3 I'm supposed to submit to you that one of the
4 untruths is that it will only be there for seven years,
5 because there is no plan that is approved or near approval
6 for moving the waste out of here. Thus, Utah will believe
7 the permanent site by default.

8 Ms. Allison, you represent the Bureau of Indian
9 Affairs, I understand. As I understand it, it is your
10 responsibility to protect and guide the Indians. Under
11 these circumstances I assume it would be impossible for you
12 to endorse this proposal, since it is designed to take
13 advantage of the very group of people you are paid to
14 shepherd. It is your responsibility to explain to them a
15 little bit about -- a little bit about corporate America,
16 that this -- this company or these companies are looking out
17 for themselves, their stockholders, and not for the welfare
18 of the tribe. They need to understand that many other
19 groups have been approached by the consortium, and that all
20 of the others recognized this this is not a safe proposal,
21 that these companies are looking out for the stockholders in
22 the companies and not the Indians. They need to understand
23 that unless the states are willing to allow them to expand
24 -- unless the states are willing to allow the companies to
25 expand their on-site storage or to move the storage to the

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

1 Indian reservation, they will have to close down and follow
2 the example of Germany, which is not exactly a third-world
3 country -- country. Germany is closing down because they
4 have recognized the danger of nuclear power.

5 There needs to be a lot more research into making
6 those radioactive spent rods safe before nuclear energy is
7 really a viable choice. The Indians need to understand that
8 this consortium is attempting to make their reservation a
9 sacrifice zone.

10 Mr. Allison, you have a responsibility to explain
11 to the Indians that in a report commissioned by the
12 Department of Energy the National Academy of Science has
13 said, just a week ago, quote, "To assume that engineered
14 barriers like concrete and steel would eventually fail and
15 that most of the interest known about the behavior in
16 contaminants in air, soil, and water might eventually be
17 proven wrong, the department needs a long-term program that
18 acts -- actually seeks out and applies," end of quote. Now,
19 this is written for the military, but it is undoubtedly safe
20 to assume that the nuclear energy is in its infancy, and we
21 don't know what it is going to do. You must make them
22 understand that to allow this consortium to move nuclear
23 waste on the reservation is to sacrifice the west
24 desert. They need to understand it isn't just about them,
25 but there are millions of people who would be at risk while

1 waste is in transit, and they don't have a right to
2 jeopardize all those people.

3 Please did not let the white man again take
4 advantage of the Indians. You have the power to prevent our
5 grandchildren, our great, great grandchildren, and others
6 from ever having to read in history book again about the
7 white man taking advantage of the Indians. You have the
8 right, you have the authority to prevent another trail of
9 tears because of the selfishness of the white man. You have
10 the power to prevent this travesty of justice.

11 Ms. Stephenson, you represent the BLM, I believe.
12 It says in your mission statement that you are to sustain
13 the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands
14 for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.
15 That cannot be accomplished if you allow PFS to make this a
16 sacrifice zone, and that is what they are planning to do,
17 since the impact settlement -- statement says the waste will
18 be there, will be moved in seven years, and we know that is
19 not possible because there is not an approved place to move
20 it.

21 If you allow this, you rob us and other future
22 generations of enjoying this land, and there are many who do
23 enjoy the west desert. You have been entrusted with an
24 awesome responsibility to protect that land. That desert is
25 virgin land out there. This consortium does not have the

1 right to destroy it. Utah is not a garbage dump for the
2 rest of the nation. How could any -- anyone in good
3 conscience locate a facility in this seismically active area
4 when a big earthquake is long, long overdue? Your
5 responsibility is to do the moral and honest thing, and not
6 to allow this to happen.

7 And, Mr. Gardiner, I don't want you to go away
8 feeling left out.

9 Laughter]

10 Yours is the agency responsible for allowing the
11 transportation of this waste. This waste will be going
12 through some of Utah's populated areas and along our
13 important watershed. And, yes, I know you hope it will be
14 safe and you hope that they will do everything they can to
15 make it safe, but let me point out to you, if you don't
16 already know, as has already been mentioned today, there was
17 a train accident just last week in the area that will be
18 used to transport some of the waste. Luckily, they were
19 able to keep the contaminants from reaching the reservoir.
20 We are lucky it was not caused by -- we -- we were lucky
21 that time. It was not caused by human error, it was a rail
22 defect. How do you guard against that?

23 There some things that are out of human control,
24 also. Do you want that responsibility? And if an accident
25 did occur, after the clean-up there would, undoubtedly, be

1 numerous lawsuits. Here again, the taxpayers would be the
2 ones to foot the bill. It would not be the consortium nor
3 the Goshutes, you can guarantee that.

4 The waste is safe where it is until a permanent
5 solution is found. Leave it safe.

6 Sometimes it's the -- the things we do that go
7 unrecognized that are the defining elements of our
8 character. Each of you has -- is very powerful. Each of
9 you has the power to prevent this travesty of justice. Does
10 one, two, or three of you have the strength of character,
11 the courage, or the honesty to step forward and put a stop
12 to this proposal? This could be your finest moment.

13 Thank you.

14 [Applause.]

15 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. Todd Roberts, to be
16 followed by Steve Rush.

17 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Good evening. My
18 name's Todd Roberts. I've been a citizen in Utah and
19 resident for the last seven years. I moved here from North
20 Dakota, where we don't have as many beautiful things to look
21 at, so I'm very grateful to live in such a beautiful state.

22 I -- I spent yesterday afternoon on the top of
23 Wolverine Peak, and at that moment I made a new commitment
24 to myself to defend this beautiful state. So I want to --
25 want to say that when I moved to Utah I realized that I was

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

1 coming into a state that had a long, long tradition of
2 federal persecution. The original founders of this state
3 were driven away from Missouri by Governor Bogg's execution
4 order against the Mormons. And their decendents in southern
5 Utah, a few generations later, were faced with dealing with
6 the nuclear fallout of the above-ground tests in Nevada. I
7 thought that was all ancient history. I thought, "Oh, we
8 don't have to worry about that now, I -- I don't have
9 anything to worry about," but evidently we do. We're
10 continuing to be at risk of this exposure.

11 What I find really ironic is that the defenders of
12 this plan continue to cite nuclear fuel as necessary in
13 order to cut down on global warming, something that big
14 business has already imposed on us. I'd like to suggest
15 that, you know, our tax dollars start being reinvested into
16 maybe some solar technology. Is that like entirely
17 infeasable? I -- I know it's not going to happen because
18 there's no way to sell the sunlight to consumers. That's a
19 pretty radical concept for the government to deal with.

20 But I don't have too many things to say about
21 environmental issues. I didn't realize this was only going
22 to be a hearing based on that. As far as I understood, this
23 was the only other hearing we were getting, so I'm -- you're
24 going to have to listen to me talk about some safety issues
25 anyway. The whole thing about -- the whole thing about --

1 DR. SHANKMAN: You can talk about those at the end
2 of the meeting, please, so we can hear the people.

3 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You know, I really
4 didn't appreciate the condescending -- you know, everyone
5 limit their speech to two or three minutes. We don't have
6 enough hearings. You're just going to get more and more
7 people upset.

8 [Applause.]

9 You -- you talk to us like we need to have respect
10 for you and --

11 DR. SHANKMAN: I -- yes, I believe that you should
12 have respect for everyone in the room, [multiple voices] and
13 I --

14 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: -- and the truth of
15 the matter is you should give us all a chance to speak in
16 the matter.

17 So I'm going to talk about accidents: the fault
18 lines, the bombs, I mean, the -- the -- the Dugway Proving
19 Grounds being so close there, these, I mean, rail car
20 accidents. How can you assure us that there is not going to
21 be an accident? All of this hedges on the fact that, "Oh,
22 if there are no accidents." You can't.

23 So I want to -- I want to like really make a deal
24 with that fact, and then I wanted to address this
25 reassurance that they give us about how, oh, we normally get

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

1 about a normal, you know, 20 millirels of exposure of
2 radiation from x-rays. Well, when was the last time the
3 doctor actually sat in the room when you -- when you took
4 the x-ray? Everyone we saw in that room was wearing like a
5 lead bib. Is everyone going to be provided with lead bibs
6 when those like rail cars are going by? Is the NRC prepared
7 to do that?

8 I mean, this isn't, obviously, a risk we're going
9 to be taking every day.

10 Finally, I just want to say that like the
11 patronizing, insulting tone that you take with the citizens,
12 this bureaucratic maneuvering, where you give us two weeks
13 notice for another hearing, this is just absurd. This is so
14 condescending and insulting. Everyone here is behind me on
15 this. We need more hearings and we need more notice, so
16 please give us an extension to our -- our public comment
17 period.

18 Thank you very much.

19 [Applause.]

20 MR. DELLIGATTI: Steve Rush, to be followed by
21 Darin Benchley.

22 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: All right. My name is
23 Steve Rush, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you
24 tonight. I'm here representing -- can you hear me okay on
25 that? I'm here representing the Utah Defense Alliance.

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

1 It's a group that deals with military issues and coordinates
2 the state of Utah. I'm also a member of the Southwest
3 Defense Alliance, which is a broad five-state coalition
4 dealing with military ranges and large issues like that.

5 We are opposed to the storage of nuclear waste at
6 Skull Valley. I just wanted to start with that, in case
7 there's not enough time at the end.

8 We've had an opportunity to be briefed by the air
9 force many times. The entity which manages the range, the
10 chief staff of the air force, the air combat command
11 commander, as well as Secretary Peters, who is the secretary
12 of the air force, we feel like we have a pretty good
13 understanding of what the issues out there are, and we like
14 to put into perspective, from the military viewpoint, to
15 what this nuclear storage can do to their mission.

16 Skull Valley is the low-level approach to Utah
17 Test and Training Range. The air space for the site of it's
18 owned by the FAA, says this is the approach. The valley is
19 bordered by two mountains, so it's very narrow. It is the
20 low-level approach. It's the only one we have there. This
21 is important because the majority of that mission, all the
22 training, the testing and evaluation, new weapons and
23 everything takes place out there. It's incredibly vital to
24 Hill Air Force Base and it's vital to the tests.

25 From the base standpoint, Hill Air Force Base is

1 the largest employer in the state of Utah, about 23,000
2 employees. The impact of the -- of the base on the state
3 has been estimated by the governor's office and the
4 University of Utah as \$2.6 billion per year, so from an
5 economical standpoint it certainly vital. The range is one
6 very incredible piece of land. It's been identified through
7 base closure and other processes as being very, very
8 necessary.

9 When the military does trainings out there, they
10 -- they train on the edge. That's what they do. They're
11 out there, they're pulling high G's, they're doing live
12 weapons, they're testing cruise missiles, they're using the
13 new send-off weapons that they're lobbed 30, 40, 50 miles
14 away. And the reality of that is in the last year or two a
15 cruise missile took out that a trailer on site, as sometimes
16 things go awry. It is not an exact science, especially
17 during the test and evaluation stage.

18 The issue the air force has and our group has, is
19 by placing that nuclear waste storage in a very constricted
20 area where they fly through, this could -- all it takes is
21 one accident, one near miss. It doesn't have to hit. I
22 know in the report it talks about 10 to the minus six
23 probability. The reality is if anything happens here there
24 is a 100 percent probability that mission will change, and
25 it will dramatically affect the air force's mission. So

1 from their standpoint, I wanted to come back to this point,
2 that the way they train, it goes right through there. It's
3 a very narrow check point. They've got to have it. It
4 affects the entire range, not just that one piece.

5 The other part comprised in this is the economic
6 impact should something happen to the utility of that range.
7 It is a key area. Ten percent of all training missions of
8 the air force takes place at the Utah Test and Training
9 Range, and the viability of Hill Air Force Base is very much
10 tied to that range. It receives 2.6 billion, 23,000 jobs.

11 Thank you very much.

12 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

13 [Applause.]

14 Darin Benchley, to be followed by -- I believe the
15 last name is Carthey or Cathey? I can't make out the first
16 name. I'm sorry. It looks like it might be Randee.

17 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Randee Cathey.

18 MR. DELLIGATTI: Oh, I'm sorry.

19 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Darin Benchley. I'm
20 from Provo, and a father of two. I'm speaking just as a
21 citizen.

22 I wish was addressing the Solar Energy Regulatory
23 Commission. Then we'd be discussing what to do with all
24 those -- those solar cells and how to recycle them to into
25 bark benches. But I'm glad to be here anyway.

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

1 I just moved from Puerto Rico, and not in small
2 part because they were testing live ordinances with diseased
3 marineland, and I didn't want to leave down wind of a radium
4 oxide pile exploding all over my otherwise tropical
5 paradise. So I moved to Utah thinking this was the holy
6 land, as it were, and I moved here and found out this was
7 the toilet bowl in the industries of war and filth.

8 [Applause.]

9 I can't see how to separate the safety issues and
10 the environmental ones, as there is a strain there. If
11 there is a leak, the watershed gets polluted and we all die,
12 and we all die of radiation poisoning. I think that's an
13 environmental and a safety issue, in transport.

14 [Applause.]

15 I think the assurances that we get from experts
16 are not objective, they're they're tainted, they're
17 fraudulent. I think the experts of Amtrack didn't expect
18 the derailment that happened in South Carolina. The experts
19 that work the railroads here in Utah didn't expect the
20 Schofield derailment a week ago. I'm sure the experts at
21 the Russina navy didn't expect a nuclear sub to be sitting
22 on the bottom of the Atlantic. So I question some of these
23 assurances that we get. I think Utah's had its share. We
24 have our incenerators, we have the above-ground nuclear
25 testing, we have the weapons, the chemical weapons, the

1 biological weapons. I think we've -- we've born our share,
2 anyway.

3 We didn't generate this waste, we don't want it.
4 I think, also, straight up, we need more time, we need more
5 public hearings. This is a democracy, after all. To give
6 us two weeks and -- and two hearings is just -- is not
7 adequate. We need more extension. I think that the
8 deadline of the 21st of September is not enough, more
9 meetings. I want to know more about this PFS and its
10 non-liability in the event of something. And I'm for the no
11 action alternative.

12 Thank you.

13 [Applause.]

14 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

15 DR. SHANKMAN: The speaker after you will be Jon
16 Jensen.

17 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Randee
18 Cathey, and I am here as a citizen of Utah. And I think I
19 just want to take my time to -- to ask everybody to really
20 think about the -- the irony and the shame of using Native
21 American reservations, Native Indian reservations to store
22 nuclear waste. And that the Native People need to even
23 consider that as an option, really troubles me.

24 [Applause.]

25 But I also want to say that I believe in our

1 community, and I think that if we all come together, the
2 Goshutes and the people of this community come together,
3 that we can try and find an alternative to this proposal
4 that will benefit all of us, so rather than only speak in
5 this direction [indicating], that we speak in this direction
6 [indicating], and really try and work on something where the
7 Goshutes don't have to give up what they are looking for,
8 and that all of us, then, don't have to give up what we all
9 need.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

12 [Applause.]

13 Jon Jensen, to be followed by Evan, I believe it's
14 Beckstead.

15 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you. First of
16 all, I want to advocate adoption by the NRC of the no action
17 alternative, the reasonable nature of which seems to be
18 verified in the DEIS itself. In the Utah -- under the no
19 action alternative section of the alternatives to the
20 proposed action, the DEIS states that the environmental
21 impact of spent nuclear fuel storage at reactor sites were
22 addressed in an environmental assessment and its
23 accompanying finding of no significant impact. For all
24 eight independent spent fuel storage installations an
25 environmental assessment was completed, and the finding of

1 no significant impact was reached. So there is, right in
2 the DEIS itself, a finding of no significant impact of
3 reactor storage. So what's the issue here? Adopt the no
4 action alternative, please.

5 [Applause.]

6 Another point: I call into question the entire
7 cost benefit analysis in the DEIS. It predicts a positive
8 net economic impact of this proposal, based on the insidious
9 fact that this cost benefit analysis is based on a report
10 generated by PFS's contractor, Energy Resources
11 International. Of course, PFS's contractor finds a positive
12 effect impact. The conflict of the interest makes the
13 economic analysis a sham. I demand that the -- the final
14 EIS -- [applause] -- include an unbiased, objective
15 third-party cost benefit analysis that takes into account
16 all short and long-term, direct and indirect net economic
17 effects of this proposal.

18 @@ Another point: I think it's almost -- should be
19 mandatory that public hearings be held in every single
20 community along the transport route, from Michigan to
21 Minnesota, Illinois, New York, California, everywhere.

22 [Applause.] They're all going to be affected by
23 this issue. And whether that takes six months or another
24 few years, it doesn't matter. We need them in every --
25 every single community.

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

1 Finally, I have just want to state that the issue
2 here is that the nuclear industry wants to externalize its
3 true costs onto the people of Utah, to keep its power costs
4 artificially -- and power prices artifically low. I'm here
5 to say I don't want to be the nuclear industry's
6 externality.

7 Thank you.

8 [Applause.]

9 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. Evan Beckstead, to be
10 followed by Jeanne Kirkpatrick.

11 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: There are three points
12 that I would like to make. First, I say amen to that which
13 has been addressed and proposed by the representative
14 majority of the speakers who preceded me.

15 Second, for protection of people, property values,
16 and environment, the only thing that makes sense is for
17 states producing nuclear waste to -- to manage that waste
18 within their states. That way, there is a chance that
19 responsibility and risk will be made with the appropriate
20 benefiting revenue-producing private corporations.

21 [Applause.]

22 It makes no sense to me whatsoever to be shipping
23 nuclear waste all around this country and calling it a
24 temporary effort.

25 Third, I support a no action vote to Private Fuel

1 Storage proposal.

2 [Applause.]

3 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. Jeanne Kirkpatrick,
4 to be followed by Heidi Sorenson.

5 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Along with many
6 other concerned Utahans, I recently attended two U.S.
7 Nuclear Regulatory Commission sponsored commentating
8 sessions in Salt Lake City, Utah on the proposed transport
9 via railway and/or truck of high-level spent nuclear waste
10 consisting of more than 40 metric tons of spent fuel rods,
11 by a consortium of nuclear power plants, mostly in the
12 midwest, to so-called temporary, i.e., at least 40-year
13 storage, on the reservation of the Skull Valley and Goshute
14 Indians, the small, impoverished sovereign Indian
15 reservation which is about 75 miles southwst of even Salt
16 Lake City, that the NRC has persuaded the tribal leadership
17 to accept.

18 The private nuclear power facilities, which
19 supposedly have run out of room in their respective states
20 in which to store their nuclear wastes, has formed a limited
21 liability corporation called PFS to transport and store the
22 spent fuel on the Goshute tribal land in Utah.

23 As a limited liability corporation, Private Fuel
24 Storage claims no assets of it's parent private utility
25 companies, and, thus, is indemnified against the legal and

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

1 financial responsibility for an accidents or leaks that may
2 occur while casks containing the spent fuel rods are
3 transported and stored above ground and on concrete pads on
4 the Goshute reservation.

5 If all goes as planned, and NRC grants PFS,
6 Private Fuel Storage's permit to store the long-lived waste,
7 PFS will begin construction of the desert storage in the
8 western desert. As Utahans should be well aware, the
9 corridor to the proposed storage site is already home to a
10 veritable witches brew of other facilities that are used to
11 store a host of other lethal and toxic agents, that are test
12 sites for the development and deployment, as, for example,
13 the chemical weapons incinerator in nearby Tooele, and the
14 Dugway Proving Grounds, which develops and tests biological
15 and chemical weapons, the long time employer of the power
16 plant that has the most waste to get out of their back yard
17 and into ours, acting as a representative of Private Fuel
18 Storage. It was very troubling to observe the
19 communications as well as the overt convenants and
20 conferences between members of the federal panel and private
21 nuclear power industry and those members of the Skull Valley
22 tribe of Goshute Indians who have signed on to the stage
23 across their land, that this reservation was selected as the
24 -- selected in the first because of the sovereign status of
25 Indian land and, therefore, not nearly likely to cause a

1 public protest, as it certainly would if the facility were
2 proposed on state or federal land, is, technically, a
3 violation of NEPA.

4 [Applause.]

5 I felt very saddened, as well as mad, and to
6 listen to these scrapping Native Indian Americans openly
7 admit to being wine and dined by folks at Private Fuel
8 Storage by being taken on lots of foreign junkets to nuclear
9 storage facilities on on-site storage facilities in Japan,
10 France, Italy, and Germany, which has since started moving
11 their nuclear plants out, in an obvious attempt to get them
12 to sign on to the scheme of allowing the toxic -- toxic
13 storage on their land, and worse, but not before creating a
14 poignant and painful division the members of the small
15 tribe, whereby those courageous members who strongly opposed
16 to being bought out are paying a very high price for
17 listening to their conscience and honoring their heritage
18 and assuring their legacy. Besides being ostracized by
19 their fellow tribal members, they have suffered harassment,
20 intimidation, and even withholding of some monetary benefits
21 to which they were entitled. This added contemporary insult
22 to historic injury in the 19th century treaty, where the
23 Native Americans were induced to sign, that was then
24 shamefully fabricated by the federal government in order to
25 confiscate their land.

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

1 [Applause.]

2 It has often been said that an accident would
3 happen, in which a railway car would derail or a truck would
4 jackknife and overturn, or there would be an earthquake in
5 Tooele or a tornado or a wildfire at the storage site.
6 These tragedies have been described to always be acts of
7 God, or of the Devil, whichever you want to believe. I hope
8 that if the good people of Utah know what these private
9 agencies and private nuclear power companies and other
10 agencies transporting this thousands of miles of the
11 railroad tracks and public highways, including through the
12 state of Utah to be dumped probably permanently, at
13 construction on Nevada's Yucca Mountain permanent repository
14 site is halted for various reasons, on the desert around us,
15 basically, the only thing the Goshute Indians possess, that
16 right-minded people will see is it's clearly not right, that
17 this travesty is it about to be visited upon a sovereign
18 people and along the proposed transportation routes in the
19 state of Utah.

20 I respectfully request a moritorium on the
21 transportation and storage of this nuclear waste, that
22 involves such catastrophic consequences.

23 Thank you.

24 [Applause.]

25 MR. DELLIGATTI: Heidi Sorenson, to be followed by

1 Tully Cathey.

2 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Good evening. My
3 name is Heidi Sorenson. I'm speaking for myself. As a
4 native born Utahan, as a business owner, as a search and
5 emergency team leader I'm well aware of the -- of the
6 potential of earthquakes and what it can do to all of the
7 surrounding landforms and the -- the disruption of these
8 storage facilities.

9 I'm also, most importantly, a mother of four. I
10 seek for a own children -- in fact it is my oldest
11 daughter's birthday today, and I think that this is the most
12 important place I can be right now, rather than with my
13 family.

14 [Applause.]

15 And, by the way, as a single parent I don't take
16 much time off for these things anymore, because I have too
17 much responsibility. But I'm here because I speak from my
18 heart. This is where I need to be, to speak for my children
19 and all the children that -- whose parents are not able to
20 be here.

21 The talk of the temporary storage facility, no, I
22 don't think so, and because no one wants it, and who's going
23 to want it in the future? I don't think that's going to
24 change any time soon. It's better not to produce it at all.

25 By the way, on Mother's Day a few years ago, I was

1 down at the Nevada test site also protesting the testing
2 down there, which I think we shouldn't be doing. We
3 shouldn't be doing anything with nuclear fuel. It's too
4 deadly for all of us. Utahans wisely do not generate
5 nuclear waste, so why should we have it here, especially
6 when the radioactive waste remains lethally radioactive for
7 10,000 years? I mean, you know, it just doesn't make sense.
8 I'm not an expert, so -- but we all have the intelligence to
9 know that that is not a wise thing. Would you want it in
10 your back yard? I don't think so.

11 I'm most concerned about the health and safety
12 issues about transportation because I don't live really
13 close, but give me a break. Look how close we all live. We
14 know what nuclear accidents and the bombs at Hiroshima can
15 do. And so I'm empathetic with those who do live closer
16 than I, the many that have spoken so wisely tonight.

17 I'm also sensitive with the Native Americans who
18 wish a better quality of life. I admonish them to remember
19 and hold true to the wisdom of their ancestors, who wisely
20 knew that they shouldn't make any decision which harms seven
21 generations following. So what I suggest that we, instead,
22 invest in training, education, jobs, and businesses for the
23 Goshutes, spend our money more wisely.

24 [Applause.]

25 Soon Utah will be welcoming people from all over

1 the world. We also hold the welcome mat out for people. We
2 have -- we have the heritage of being friendly to people.
3 But we will not hold the welcome mat out for others' nuclear
4 waste. I love this state. It is not only one of the most
5 beautiful states, it is the most beautiful state. I've
6 lived here most of my life. I cherish it, and we all
7 cherish it. I'm sure everybody in this room agrees. If you
8 haven't seen it, you ought to go see it. It's incredible.

9 Keep your waste out of here. We don't want it.
10 Money does not buy everything. Especially, it does not buy
11 safety and peace of mind.

12 For the record, I am for the no action
13 alternative. Thank you.

14 [Applause.]

15 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

16 MS. SHANKMAN: Tully Cathey, to be followed by
17 Michael Pavich.

18 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Tully
19 Cathey, and I'm an adjunct professor of music at the
20 University of Utah, and citizen of Utah. And my family
21 moved here back in 1962, and my parents still live here.

22 I love this state a great deal, and I have no
23 desire to leave, but if this spent nuclear fuel does end up
24 here, I will strongly consider leaving, even though it may
25 break my heart.

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

1 I live in downtown Salt Lake City, and, as I
2 understand it, the railway tracks will be carrying this
3 material in my view, and so I'm concerned about my safety
4 and the safety of my wife and the safety of my parents, the
5 safety of my sister, all of whom live here.

6 I'm opposed to the -- to the -- to this idea, and
7 I would suggest that it not be adopted. Thank you for
8 providing us with the opportunity to have more hearings. I
9 really appreciate that, and I would urge you to consider the
10 six-month extension that has been asked for tonight. Thank
11 you very much.

12 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

13 [Applause.]

14 Michael Pavich, to be followed by Tim Peterson,
15 Jr.

16 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Michael
17 Pavich. I'm a retired major general of the United States
18 Air Force. I have a Master's degree in aeronautical
19 engineering, special premier weapons. I understand the way
20 airplanes work, I understand the way weapons work. I've
21 been in part of a lot of bureaucratic processes, a lot of
22 times sitting in your place up there, so I know what you're
23 going through. I'm part of the Utah Defense Alliance.

24 We've just been counseled on our position, that it
25 may turn around and bite us. I consider that a threat, but

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

1 that's all right. There is an important issue here. In
2 1995 when the national base closure process was taking
3 place, we were told by the commander of the air force
4 material command, who operates Hill Air Force Base, that
5 they were going to close Hill Air Force Base. The rationale
6 was that it was the easiest base to close of the five air
7 logistics centers. We put together a group to fight against
8 that issue. The major point that allowed us to be
9 successful was the criteria that the Department of Defense
10 used in base closure, and they said, that Hill Air Base, as
11 an air logistics center -- and I used to command an air
12 logistics center in Sacramento, so I know what I'm talking
13 about -- had the highest military value of any air logistics
14 center of the air force, and that was predominantly the
15 reason that it was not closed.

16 The Utah Test and Training Range is a major factor
17 in the military value of Hill Air Force Base. The
18 Environmental Impact Statement -- the Draft Environmental
19 Impact Statement has taken no position on the potential
20 economic impact to the State of Utah of the closure of Hill
21 Air Force Base. The way the air force will react to nuclear
22 storage in the vicinity of the Utah Test and Training Range
23 will be to completely eliminate any flying over, near, or
24 around that nuclear storage, because regardless of how
25 infinitesimal the potential somebody may say in a study may

1 be, the air force cannot afford some sort of act that they
2 could be blamed for that would result in nuclear waste being
3 opened to the public.

4 Consequently, it's not an overflight issue,
5 typically, of the Goshute reservation, it is the issue of
6 all of the military activity going on in that range and the
7 potential for something spilling out and hitting the nuclear
8 storage site, which will be the largest concentration of
9 nuclear storage anywhere in the United States, several times
10 over from what currently exists: 4,000 metric tons, 4,000
11 casks. You know, you have for 40 or 50 in the 360 or so
12 sites that you have today. This is concentrating it all in
13 one big pile and saying, "Mr. Air force, have at it, do
14 whatever you want."

15 Let me gave you an analogy. If you were the owner
16 of a professional football team, and you built a huge
17 stadium in which this professional football team was going
18 to operate, and you said, "Here's your field, you run up and
19 down the field and you become as good as you can, so that
20 you can take care of me as the owner of this team"; somebody
21 comes up to you and says, "Here is priceless crystal" --
22 it's your wife's or your husband's, however the case may be.
23 "It's priceless crystal, and we're going to put it on the 50
24 yard line. Now, you can run up and down the field and you
25 can play football, and you can throw the ball and you can

1 tackle, but if anybody hits that priceless crystal you're
2 all fired," okay, right away you've got a football team
3 that's going to use from the 20 yard line to the end zone,
4 and 20 yard line to the end zone, and it isn't going to go
5 anywhere near that priceless crystal. That's exactly the
6 way the air force will retract to storing this stuff in the
7 vicinity of its football stadium. This is a one of a kind
8 football stadium for the air force, and impacts
9 significantly the viability of the continued use of Hill Air
10 Force Base. And if the EIS statement does not address that,
11 which it does not, it does not address the impact of using
12 -- losing over \$2 billion to the economy of Utah, not
13 anywhere is it addressed, it is flawed and cannot possibly
14 be accepted.

15 Now, your job, as I understand it, is to take
16 public comments on whether or not this Draft EIS statement
17 is adequate. It is not adequate. It is seriously flawed,
18 not just the overflight issue of the Goshute reservation,
19 but the whole potential for limiting the viability of the
20 air force's unique Test and Flying Training Facility, which
21 is absolutely needed, absolutely needed, and is essential to
22 the economy of the whole state, not just the Goshutes.

23 So we're against going forward with this proposal,
24 and we think that the Draft EIS is seriously flawed.

25 Thank you.

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

1 [Applause.]

2 MR. DELLIGATTI: Tim Peterson, to be followed by
3 Vickie McCall.

4 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Hi. My name is Tim
5 Peterson. I'm speaking tonight as a citizen of Utah. I
6 thank you for the opportunity to be heard. I'll be brief.
7 Most of the points that I had on my mind were addressed at
8 great length by far more eloquent people than myself.

9 The -- the risk is far too great. The idea of
10 transporting nuclear waste from site of production to a
11 temporary storage site, to a national site, it just doesn't
12 make any sense. Why move it more than it needs to be moved?
13 The waste should be stored on-site until we have a more
14 permanent solution for it. I -- I fully support the no
15 action alternative, and I ask that the public comment period
16 be extended.

17 Thank you.

18 [Applause.]

19 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. Vickie McCall, to be
20 followed by Paul McConkie.

21 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Good evening. My
22 name is Vickie McCall. I chair the Utah Defense Alliance,
23 but I also wear another hat, in that I am an advisor to the
24 four star general of air combat comand. I was a previous
25 chair. I have also served as the chair of Hill DDO, which

1 is a group that was put together several years ago when we
2 tried to fight the preservation of Hill Air Force Base, and
3 we had the last base realignment and closure process.

4 I am not going to be redundant and -- and restate
5 the remarks of Mike Pavich and Steve Rush. I just want to
6 tell you that we have energized our group again. We expect
7 that there'll be another round of base closures probably in
8 2002, 2003. There are organizations all over the country,
9 communities all over the country, that have put strong
10 groups together to fight for the -- for their -- for their
11 bases. We are going to fight for our lives. And I do not
12 -- I do not want to understate that. Anything that you do
13 now will impact us in 2002 and 2003, in preserving Hill Air
14 Force Base.

15 It's not done -- I mean, even innuendoes that you
16 may impact our flight -- that you impact that military
17 operating space, will have severe consequences to us right
18 now. We strongly encourage you to -- to look at this and
19 consider Hill Air Force Base in the future.

20 [Applause.]

21 MR. DELLIGATTI: Paul McConkie, to be followed by
22 Penny Archibald-Stone, I believe it is.

23 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Paul
24 McConkie. I'm here as a concerned citizen of Utah. I'm
25 also an attorney in Salt Lake City, who has an area of

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

1 emphasis in environmental litigation. I appreciate you
2 being here tonight and coming down for further hearings. I
3 know it's been a long time for you, and I'll try to be
4 brief.

5 We're not here to debate the merits of nuclear
6 power, this really isn't a time for that. What we are
7 talking about is the wisdom of moving up to 40,000 tons of
8 high-level nuclear waste cross country to be stored 45 miles
9 from a population center of nearly 2,000,000 people.

10 What PFS's has done is really quite astute. PFS
11 knew that it could circumvent the political process which
12 governs virtually all other aspects of society if it could
13 find an Indian tribe willing to have this nuclear waste put
14 on the reservation, which is a sovereign land, not subject
15 to the state zoning laws or state regulators. What PFS has
16 done is effectively taken this issue away from the people
17 who have elected representatives to look out for their best
18 interests. With its elected representatives helplessly
19 looking on, the voice of the people goes largely unheard,
20 except out at a few sparsely attended hearings such as this,
21 attended by those few who actually have an inkling of what's
22 at stake.

23 And I want to inform the NRC to take seriously its
24 mission, which is to protect the public health and safety,
25 the environment, and the -- the common defense and security.

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

1 As we approach our state and national elections
2 and celebrate the democratic process in this nation, one
3 wouldn't think that could happen in America, but it is. I'm
4 sure in the minds of the industry its ends justify the
5 means. The proposers are willing to spend tens of millions
6 of dollars to move this nuclear waste out of their back
7 yard, and are asking the NRC to approve this plan, with
8 really no idea whether or when a permanent repository is
9 going to be available down the road. It's really absurd.

10 Even the most zealous industry advocates have to
11 admit that we are in uncharted waters, because nowhere near
12 this volume of nuclear waste has ever been transported and
13 stored in -- and stored in one location. Nobody can
14 guarantee that this nuclear waste can be safely transported
15 and stored because it's never been done. For every model
16 that says it can be done safely, there's a counter model
17 that says we're flirting with disaster. My question is why
18 take the chance, when the consequences can be catastrophic
19 to so many people?

20 I've spoken of the 2,000,000 Utahans who are going
21 to be affected. I haven't even mentioned the millions of
22 the people who live along the transportation corridors who
23 are being affected without even the benefit of the hearings
24 we are having tonight.

25 It's not like there's not a safe and a reasonable

1 alternative. The NRC itself has determined that the
2 utilities could continue to store the spent nuclear fuel at
3 their reactor sites with no significant incremental effect
4 on the quality of the human environment. I would also
5 advocate the no action alternative, and move for an
6 extension of 180 days to allow for more hearings, not only
7 in this state but all along the transportation corridors.

8 With the voice of the people and their elected
9 representatives being taken out of the equation, I would
10 employ -- I would implore the NRC to take very seriously
11 the added responsibility that that places upon your
12 shoulders to protect the safety of the people.

13 PFS says that the more we ever learn about this
14 the more comfortable we'll become with the idea, but the
15 more I learn about this the more scared I get.

16 Thank you.

17 [Applause.]

18 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

19 Penny Archibald-Stone, to be followed by Karla
20 Reading.

21 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Penny
22 Archibald-Stone. I'm a member of two organizations whose
23 members strongly oppose this idea, the Sustainable Salt Lake
24 and the State Party of Utah. And I'm also a school teacher,
25 and for two decades I've been teaching sixth-graders.

1 And I have five brief points I want to make, and
2 they remind me of what I've been teaching my sixth-graders
3 for 20 years.

4 The first one -- and I also hope that they learn
5 it a little better than some of the people that currently
6 hold government positions and are currently members of our
7 corporations that are part of this problem. First of all,
8 what effects all should be decided by all. Now, I've taught
9 my students where we get our democratic principles from, and
10 that was by a famous Roman statesman. This is a democratic
11 nation, so let's practice it as we try to solve this
12 problem.

13 Number two: Those who make messes and who
14 generate waste waste of any kind should be responsible for
15 cleaning up and disposing of such waste, within their
16 classroom or within their bedroom or within their region, in
17 this case.

18 [Applause.]

19 The more we move around toxic waste the more
20 resources you waste transporting it, and the more
21 opportunity there are for accidents.

22 Number 3: We should not continue producing such a
23 dangerous product if we don't know how to diffuse it. I
24 just don't understand the rationale, why we keep producing
25 all of this stuff.

1 [Applause.]

2 Number 4: Nuclear energy and fossil fuels are not
3 the only source of energy. If the money that has been spent
4 trying to solve this nuclear waste problem had, instead,
5 been spent developing safe, clean renewable alternative
6 sources of energy, we wouldn't be in this fix.

7 [Applause.]

8 And the last point: In our school I don't want my
9 classroom to be the dumping grounds for the whole school,
10 and I don't want my state to be the dumping ground for the
11 entire country.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

14

15 [Applause.]

16 Karla Reading, to be followed by Mary Dickson.

17 MS. SHANKMAN: She's already spoken.

18 MR. DELLIGATTI: Oh, okay. Thank you.

19 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Karla
20 Reading. I'm a social worker and a member of two
21 organizations that strongly oppose this proposal: FAIR,
22 which is Families Against Incinerator Risk, and Sustainable
23 Salt Lake.

24 There are a lot of things that bother me about
25 this absurd proposal, so I won't stand up here and go

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

1 through my entire list, although I do share many of the
2 concerns that we have heard here tonight. I just want to
3 tell you what bothers me the most about this. What bothers
4 me the most is the arrogance of a handful of people making a
5 decision that may very well affect the lives of millions of
6 people. Eight nuclear companies and less than that number
7 of people from the Goshute nation think they have the right
8 to make a decision that will affect the State of Utah and
9 all the states along the transportation corridor for
10 generations to come.

11 It bothers me a lot that the Nuclear Regulatory
12 Commission, far from regulating the nuclear industry, has a
13 well established record of an hand-in-glove enabling
14 relationship with it.

15 [Applause.]

16 It bothers me a lot that the DEIS discussion of
17 the proposed rail spur ignores requirements of the current
18 BLM Resource Management Plan that says, quote, "Public lands
19 will not be made available for inappropriate uses, such as
20 storage or use of hazardous materials."

21 It bothers me that there's no provision in the
22 DEIS for accident cleanup, and that there -- if there is a
23 leakage or contamination, the plan is to ship the faulty
24 cask back to the reactor and then back to Skull Valley.
25 That makes a whole lot of sense.

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

1 What really bothers me is that PSF is a limited
2 liability corporation that could walk away from an accident
3 that would cost taxpayers billions of dollars to clean up,
4 in addition to the damage to the health and safety of the
5 emergency workers and to citizens in any affected
6 communities, and the fact that there is no plan before an
7 accident and what -- an overall plan of who is responsible.
8 There's none of that in the DEIS. It sounds to me like a
9 bad case of corporate welfare.

10 [Applause.]

11 I realize that the nuclear industry got off the
12 ground before we had a very clear idea of sustainability and
13 the needs and limits of our biosphere. I realize that the
14 eastern states are dependent on nuclear energy for 17
15 percent of their electricity. I realize that the nuclear
16 industry has a serious public relations problem, as well as
17 the long-term problem to what to do with nuclear waste.
18 What I don't see, no matter how hard I try, is why Utah
19 should bear great risks so that people on the east coast
20 continue to use a rate of electricity at low cost without
21 ever having to think about the consequences, and so that the
22 nuclear industry shareholders won't lose a single night's
23 sleep wondering what is going to happen to their
24 investments, especially when there's plenty of room right
25 now to store it on site at the reactors.

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

1 The only reason that that isn't being seen as a
2 long-term solution is because many of the same towns and
3 cities that use nuclear energy have passed laws against
4 permanent storage in their communities. Maybe it's time
5 they had a wake-up call. Nuclear waste storage isn't good
6 for any community, and I know it isn't good for mine.

7 I need to go on record as being strongly for the
8 no action alternative, and to demand an extension of the
9 public comment period to 180 days to allow for more hearings
10 along the transportation corridors and in all the
11 communities in Utah that will be affected.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

14 [Applause.]

15 Dau Kearn, to be followed by Cynthia Rosco.

16 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Good afternoon. I
17 haven't read the DEIS statement, but I did read your
18 brochure fact sheet here, and I thought it was great that
19 the NRC's mission is to protect public health and safety.
20 Another gentleman mentioned this already, but I think it's
21 pretty good to stress that's what the mission of this
22 regulatory commission is about, and it's not to -- it --
23 it's to protect public health and safety, and not to assure
24 public health and safety, and the difference there is the
25 burden of proof is much stronger. And I think that the very

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

1 least we can ask is that the -- this -- this period of
2 public comment be extended, and I go on the record for
3 supporting the no action motion.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. Cynthia Rosco, to be
6 followed by Joseph Gordon.

7 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Cynthia
8 Rosco, and I am a citizen of Salt Lake. I am an individual
9 member of the Utah Progressive Network and I'm here
10 supporting the Families Against Incinerator Risk.

11 I am going on the record as taking -- advocating
12 the position of no action and demanding a 180-day extension
13 for more public comments, and all along the corridor and
14 here in Utah.

15 This is not my issue. I am -- I've not been
16 involved in nuclear protesting, but what I've heard here
17 today shows to me that this is a no-brainer. This is a
18 dangerous, dangerous thing that we're trying to do here, and
19 it also smacks of corporate money mongerers dividing and
20 conquering the people who have to live with the problems.
21 What is happening is the people of Utah are being pitted
22 against the Goshute tribe. And I want to beg the Goshute
23 tribe to please say no to this.

24 [Applause.]

25 The only people who are going to -- in the years

1 that follow, the 40 to 60 to 80 to 100 years that follow,
2 profit from it are the people who have their money invested
3 in these corporations. I would request that the
4 organizations that are -- are operating to prevent this from
5 happening, work with the Goshute tribe to find a viable
6 solution to their economic needs, which are very real, and
7 every single person in this room should dedicate themselves,
8 if they're opposing this, to helping the Goshute tribe
9 overcome their financial problems.

10 [Applause.]

11 Please, this is not the answer.

12 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. Joseph Gordon, to be
13 followed by Dean Larsen.

14 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you for the
15 opportunity to speak. I speak -- my name's Joseph Gordon.
16 I speak on behalf of U.S. Public Interest Research Group.
17 We currently have approximately 300,000 members across the
18 country. We all, as an organization, advocate the no action
19 alternative, and have always worked against mobile Chernobyl
20 or any plans to move nuclear waste in containers across the
21 country under current scientific technology. So the
22 original institute of technology -- nuclear technology,
23 nuclear energy assumed a gamble, and that gamble was -- and
24 there's a reason that there's almost very little on-site
25 storage, frankly, for waste as it stands. That gamble was

1 that there would either become a permanent, safe storage
2 site somewhere in the country, or that there would be --
3 there would be a discovery of a way to reuse nuclear spent
4 fuel, so that we wouldn't continue to create nuclear waste.
5 There' no plan for for permanently storing more and more
6 nuclear waste. So we've lost the gamble, and all of us have
7 lost in that gamble.

8 Science includes basic study, and there are some
9 facts I want just to point out in some of the scientific
10 standpoints that have been put together today that is not --
11 that are not being disputed. One is that nuclear waste is
12 destructive and deadly. It's one of the more deadly
13 substances on Earth. The second is that there's currently
14 no safe, permanent 1 storage site in the world for nuclear
15 waste. The third is that there's no -- there's still -- and
16 I mean that over the course of a thousand years. There is
17 still no way to reuse spent nuclear fuel.

18 There's -- and then, fourth, some nuclear waste is
19 dangerous for thousands of years, and no scientific tests
20 exists for the effect of nuclear waste for thousands of
21 years. I'd like to see a study on that. I haven't seen it.

22 And the last, fifth, is if we stop production,
23 currently store waste in the facility that now exists -- so
24 the problem is we continue to produce it. Where do we put
25 it? We would say quit producing it.

1 If this proposal was a solution, it would be a
2 stronger argument, but it's only temporary and includes an
3 incredible risk. Take the most deadly substance in the
4 world -- this is how the process seems to me: Take the most
5 deadly substance in the world, transport it through
6 population centers of the west, the largest population
7 centers in the west, on old train tracks, and store it near
8 an air force base and the nation's stockpile of chemical
9 weapons, and near a fault line. It seems like that can't be
10 conceivably the safest option or the best environmental
11 option.

12 [Applause.]

13 So there was a point, and it was good one: What
14 do we do in terms of energy, because we need energy? Where
15 is the research on alternative energy -- energy solutions?
16 If you want to include an economic assessment, and in terms
17 of environmental damages, first off, turn to assess the
18 damage of someone getting cancer. I would hate to put a
19 number on that.

20 In your economic assessment you should accept the
21 basic fundamental principles of supply and demand. If we
22 reduce the supply of energy, which we would do if we reduced
23 nuclear facilities, prices would go up, but people wouldn't
24 stop living. We would definitely not be able to keep our
25 lights on at 3:00 in the morning, but we think that's -- in

1 that case people would be smart because they'd have to pay
2 those bills, which is not simple, but if you use -- and only
3 use safe technology, we'll -- we'll figure out some
4 solution. And I have faith in the human ability to create
5 solutions rather than create more problems.

6 [Applause.]

7 When you're drowning, which you might say in terms
8 of global warming, you don't start smoking.

9 In terms of the -- I would argue you for an 3
10 extension, not just in Utah, but across the country, the
11 places and communities that are affected, which would be you
12 in NEPA, by the environmental -- of the environmental public
13 comments capable of public comments senior and all
14 communities that are being affected by this movement.

15 And I guess, lastly, I think that we ought to look
16 at the ultimate question, which is what is the solution?
17 How do we continue to provide power? And until they find a
18 way to recycle and reuse nuclear technology, this is the
19 worst option, and this only gives an opportunity to create
20 more of the waste that we're already realizing the ultimate
21 problems of.

22 I appreciate your time.

23 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. Dean Larsen, to be
24 followed by Jackson Rose.

25 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: What was the name?

1 MR. DELLIGATTI: The name was Dean Larsen.

2 Okay. Mr. Rose, to be followed by Allison Jones.

3 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'm proud to be an
4 American in the United States of America. I'm proud to be a
5 veteran for the United States of 4 America. I'm proud to be
6 a citizen in the state of Utah. I'm proud to be a graduate
7 from the University of Utah, a USA Utah U.

8 I have a problem: I went to the community care
9 center, and I had a physical, and the doctors told me that
10 there is a ultraviolate rays in this high altitude that is
11 causing skin cancer. And the rate is higher. That means
12 your atmosphere has something wrong with it, contaminants.

13 We're down wind from Tooele, from chemical plants,
14 from refineries, and from the Goshute reservation. I'm
15 currently going to the Veteran's Hospital to check and see
16 if I have skin cancer. I've only been up here five years,
17 and I'm not healing. And it's only occurred since I've been
18 up here, I believe. The doctor told me that my eyes are
19 trying to protect myself, so now I have to use U.B.-blocking
20 sunglasses for A and B rays.

21 I'm for the no action alternative. I would like
22 to see an extension.

23 My grandfather was a Navajo Indian. I believe if
24 you can go and get an education, you can learn something,
25 and receive employment by alternate means.

1 Thank you. 5

2 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

3 [Applause.]

4 Allison Jones, to be followed by Lynn Van Dam.

5 Allison Jones? Lynn Van Dam? Teri Jerman?

6 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Jerman.

7 MR. DELLIGATTI: To be followed by Teri Jerman --

8 Jerman.

9 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Hello. My name is
10 Lynn Van Dam, and I am a citizen of Utah and Salt Lake City,
11 and I'm speaking for myself and all my friends.

12 I want to echo what many people have said, and I'm
13 not going to try to repeat those things. I appreciate your
14 time, and I know you're tired, but I want you to hear what I
15 have to say, okay?

16 I grew up in Farmington, New Mexico across the
17 river from the Navajo reservation. We were promised in
18 those dates that the uranium was safe. Such a pretty stone.
19 I played with that stone a lot. So did a lot of Navajos. A
20 lot of the Navajo Indians ended up with -- with children the
21 were deformed. We've had problems. We were told that
22 uranium was safe in those days. It isn't safe. And I know
23 that now. We all know that now, right?

24 I -- I traveled all the way to Utah. I used to
25 come to school up here. I traveled to 6 California, I

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

1 traveled through. And now I have this scar on my neck. I
2 don't know if you can see this nice pretty scar I have from
3 my thyroid. I have no thyroid glands. I have approximate a
4 third of my thyroid gland. No one knows for sure if it was
5 caused by breathing the air from the downwinders or
6 breathing -- playing with the uranium, whatever.
7 Nevertheless, that wasn't safe, and I was told it was safe.
8 We were told it was safe.

9 You are telling us this is safe. Well, I've got
10 to tell you, I don't believe you. I've got to tell you that
11 I don't trust you, because I don't think it's safe. And I
12 don't want to take a chance. It seems like to me that if I
13 were building -- if I were building a whole development with
14 houses, and I didn't plan for any toilets in my houses, I'd
15 be run out of the country. Well, why didn't that nuclear
16 energy company -- why didn't these companies plan for this
17 waste? Because they kept telling us it's safe. Well, it's
18 not safe, and it's not going -- we don't want it here.
19 These people who voted, who had a chance to vote and say
20 they didn't want to have it in their state, well, we haven't
21 had a chance to vote. We haven't had a chance to vote here,
22 to say we don't want it in this state.

23 [Applause.]

24 I want to recommend -- I -- I know that the
25 Goshutes have had a lot of troubles. Don't take the

1 short-end money. Don't take the short-end money. The
2 Navajos paid -- paid prices they can never get back for the
3 short-end money. It ain't worth it, babe, it ain't worth
4 it. And we don't want it. I'm asking for no -- for it to
5 not come here. I'm not saying it very well, but please
6 don't bring it here. I'm begging the Goshutes, please don't
7 bring it here.

8 And, look, 4,000 cannisters there're 4,000 people
9 back east. Let's let them take turns putting it in their
10 back yard. They can have one apiece. Let them take turns
11 putting those things in their back yards, because we don't
12 want it, and we don't use that stuff so we don't need it.

13 Thank you very much.

14 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

15 Teri Jerman, to be followed by Scott Fife.

16 DR. SHANKMAN: It's Jerman?

17 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Yes.

18 DR. SHANKMAN: Thank you.

19 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'm Teri Jerman.
20 I'm the immediate past president of the Utah County
21 Association of Realtors. We have approximately 1,035
22 members in Utah County. 8

23 I want to let you know that we agree with the Utah
24 Association of Realtor's position and what they had told you
25 earlier on their position, so please remember that. And

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

1 then I'd like to make a couple of personal comments, also.

2 I know that, just from recognizing some people in
3 this room that there are a number of people who came here
4 who've only known about this issue for a few days. I've
5 only known about this issue for a few days. I don't know
6 why I've own only about this issue for a few days. It seems
7 kind of odd to me, because it seems so magnificent of an
8 issue, you know, that it seems like everyone in Utah would
9 know. But for some reason we don't. But the fact that
10 there is a large representation here of people who have just
11 known for a few days, I think should be enough evidence to
12 you to say that we need more time. More people need to
13 know. And I'm here only knowing this much about the issues.
14 And I'd really like to study it out and know more, so I
15 could give you some good solid rationale for not bringing
16 the waste here. But I need more time to do that, and so do
17 the rest of the people here.

18 Now, as you see a number of realtors here realize,
19 okay, I'm here representing a large number of real estate
20 agents. Each of those agents, in consort, 9 represents the
21 public that they sell to, worry being about the economic
22 viability of their homes, which is a big issue. Just the
23 perception of the danger of the nuclear waste makes a huge
24 difference in how people value their real estate.

25 In our city we dealt with an environmental issue,

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

1 and we had people in masses coming out saying how this was
2 going to ruin their property values. And in real estate
3 perception is reality. If people view it as a danger, then
4 it does effect their values, whether it's a danger or not.

5 So I think that you need to hear from these people
6 who have a concern about the value of their real estate
7 throughout Utah.

8 I'd also like that thank all of you for being
9 here. I know that you've been here a long time.

10 Usually I feel like a pretty self-reliant person,
11 but right at this minute I feel very, very dependent,
12 because you are making a decision that's going to effect my
13 life and the life of so many people that I know.

14 I appreciate the fact that as you're sitting there
15 you're looking at each of us; you know, you really seeming
16 to listening to what we're saying, which means a lot to me.
17 I was a member on a city counsel in my city, and I know that
18 we dealt with an issue where I sat with the planning
19 commission and watched each of them just turn off what the
20 public was saying. They had a preconceived idea of what
21 they felt was right, and they were not listening to the
22 public. And so I wanted to tell you that I really
23 appreciate the fact that you are sitting there making eye
24 contact and listening. So thank you very much for that.

25 [Applause.]

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

1 I want you to also think about the fact that Utah
2 is one of the smaller states population-wise, but we are
3 growing like crazy. There are a lot of people coming here
4 because this is such a wonderful place to live. Give us
5 another 10, 20, 50 years, and we're going to be a large
6 populace, because this is such a great place to live. So
7 think about that large populace as you're making the
8 decision, not just the smaller percentage of citizens of the
9 United States that live here now.

10 And then the -- the one other thing that is really
11 mind-boggling thing to me, and maybe it isn't to anybody
12 here, maybe it's because I don't know all the facts, but
13 we've got representatives here of the Indians and looking
14 out for their best interests, and I've heard that they're
15 going to be paid \$1.4 million to have this on their
16 reservation. I want to know who their agent is. You know,
17 we've got ball players here that are playing ball for a few
18 years are making millions and millions and millions of
19 dollars. You know, I think they could get 100 million
20 dollars for keeping it on their reservation. So something
21 seems out of whack, that these people don't know what they
22 ought to know.

23 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you very much.

24 [Applause.]

25 Scott Fife, to be followed by Elizabeth Niederman.

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

1 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Hi. I'm Scott Fife.
2 I'm with the Green Party of Utah and Sustainable Salt Lake.
3 And I didn't think I'd be in alliance with the military and
4 the realtors of Utah, [laughter] but politics makes strange
5 bedfellows.

6 One thing I think is really sad is that we've have
7 got this limited liability corporation that's really calling
8 the shots here, and it sounds like the Nuclear Regulatory
9 Commission is basically a lapdog for the organization, for
10 this corporation, and this worries me.

11 You know, I -- I climbed the Stansbury Mountain.
12 It's a beautiful mountain. I've looked down on it to the
13 Goshute Valley many times, and Skull Valley to the
14 reservation, and I just -- it sickened me when I saw the
15 future of -- you look down there and see this facility. I
16 will never climb that thing again.

17 I really worry about how close it is to this size
18 of population. I think the whole history of the -- of the
19 nuclear industry has been one of deception, one of, you
20 know, lies, and I - really worry about that.

21 And other concept that the professor talked about
22 is privatizing the cost and -- and -- and then the people
23 have to -- oh, I'm trying to think of this term, but just
24 privatize the cost and the public has to -- the public as to
25 eat the cost, but we privatize the profits. And I think

1 that's what's happening in this case.

2 And that these -- this corporation won't be
3 around, but this stuff's going to be around for 10,000
4 years, really worries me.

5 I had a mother who died of thyroid cancer. It was
6 spread to the rest of her body. And I totally believe that
7 she was a downwinder. I mean, she was affected by -- by
8 both Washington and the testing in Nevada.

9 And I just want to say that I'm for the no action
10 alternative, and I think we need a 180-day waiting period
11 extended. We need to get every Utahan out here and
12 everybody along the corridor.

13 We saw -- and I have just reading today's paper
14 back there. They had 250 acres burned in the Stansbury
15 Valley, plus the -- you know, the -- the fault line, the
16 military jets crashing all the time, and the -- and the
17 Dugway, you know, and all the other things out there. This
18 is just -- you just need common sense. Where's the common
19 sense?

20 Thank you.

21 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Elizabeth Neiderman.

22 [There was a discussion held off the record while
23 the court reporter changed paper.]

24 MR. DELLIGATTI: Okay. My name's Elizabeth
25 Niederman, and I am a resident here in Salt Lake City. I'm

1 a homeowner and a student.

2 This is the first hearing that I've come to on
3 this issue. I only found out about it because a friend told
4 me about it. And I'm really just blown away by everything
5 that I'm hearing here. And I'm not an expert on these
6 issues, and it just makes no sense to me that we would want
7 to transport this waste across the country to where I live.
8 We don't have nuclear facilities here. We don't have a
9 power plant here, that is.

10 I'm appalled that I just heard about this, that
11 there's been hearings in the past that I wasn't able to
12 attend. I can't believe that this is going to travel across
13 the country and that those people who live near where this
14 dangerous material is going to be transported have not had a
15 chance to speak about how they felt about this.

16 I am definitely for the no action alternative. I
17 would urge you to have hearings, not just here in Utah, but
18 across the country. People everywhere are going to be
19 affected by this.

20 Thank you.

21 [Applause.]

22 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. Mark Nelson, to be
23 followed by Ms. Stats.

24 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you for this
25 opportunity to speak. My name is Mark Nelson, and I'm a

1 citizen of Utah. I reside in Salt Lake City.

2 It has long been recognized that everywhere people
3 are free, that there are times and circumstances which
4 demand the people, if they wish to remain in touch with
5 their common sense, their sense of justice, their human
6 dignity, and their very grip on freedom itself, yes, the
7 people must ignore the laws of men and act out of duty and
8 faith in a higher law. So the Sons of Liberty cast tea into
9 Boston Harbor. Henry David Thoreau refused to support an
10 unjust war with his taxes and found himself in civil
11 disobedience contentedly in jail. Harriett Tubman and
12 Frederick -- Frederick Douglas refused silence and broke the
13 laws of safety. Hundreds went to jail to win the vote for
14 women. Eugene Detts, Emma Goldman, and A. Phillip Randolph
15 were a few jailed in freedom's cause, as they spoke out
16 against the evils of World War I. And, of course, we all
17 have heard of Rosa Parks and Dr. King. And we know, too,
18 there were thousands of others who refused to submit to the
19 poisonous laws and the toxic racism of the Jim Crow south.
20 And many of us in the room tonight resisted the placement of
21 MX in our state, and we know maybe more who have crossed the
22 line at the Nevada test site to bring an end to nuclear
23 testing.

24 So, what might a consequence of placing high-level
25 nuclear waste on the Goshute reservation be? Well, perhaps

1 tens or hundreds or even thousands of Utah's citizens will
2 fill the jails as we block highways and railways to stop the
3 shipment of this potential waste of our homes and our lives.

4 [Applause.]

5 We may do this, as hundreds around the country
6 have before us. Here is an example of such citizen action
7 from Wendell Barry, and I quote,

8 "On June 3rd, 1979 I took part in an
9 act of non-violent civil disobedience
10 at the site of a nuclear power plant
11 being built at Marble Hill near
12 Madison, Indiana. At about noon that
13 day 89 of us crossed the wire fence
14 onto the power company's land. We
15 were arrested and duly charged with
16 criminal trespass. Few of us I think
17 found it easy to decide to break the
18 law of the land. Why did I do it?
19 Like the majority of people I am
20 unable to deal competently with the
21 technical aspects of nuclear power and
22 its dangers. My worries are based on
23 several facts available to any reader
24 of the newspaper. Nuclear power and
25 nuclear waste facilities are extremely

1 dangerous, for this, the elaborate
2 safety devices and backup systems of
3 the plants themselves are evidence
4 enough. Radioactive waste, moreover,
5 remains dangerous for many of
6 thousands of years, and there is
7 apparently no foreseeable safe way to
8 dispose of them. Dangerous accidents
9 do happen. Officials and experts
10 claim that accidents can be foreseen
11 and prevented, but accidents are
12 surprises, by definition. If they are
13 foreseen they do not happen. Nuclear
14 experts at plant and waste facilities
15 and employees do not always ack
16 competently in dealing with these
17 accidents. Nuclear power requires
18 people to act with perfect competence
19 if this is to be used safely. But
20 people in nuclear facilities are just
21 as likely to blunder or panic or
22 miscalculate as people anywhere else.
23 Public officials do not always act
24 responsibly. Sometimes they
25 deliberately falsify, distort, or

1 withhold information essential to the
2 public's health and safety. If I had
3 doubts about any of this, they were
4 removed forever by the accident at
5 Three Mile Island, and if I had any
6 lingering faith that the government
7 would prove a trustworthy guardian of
8 public safety, that was removed by
9 hearings on the atomic bomb tests of
10 the 1950's, which have revealed that
11 the government assured the people
12 living near the explosions that there
13 would be no danger from radiation,
14 when, in fact, it knew that the danger
15 would be great.

16 And so when I climbed the fence at
17 Marble Hill, I considered that I was
18 casting a vote that I had been given
19 no better opportunity to cast. I was
20 voting no, and I was voting no
21 confidence. Marble Hill is only
22 approximate 20 miles upwind from my
23 house. As a father, a neighbor and a
24 citizen I had begun to look at the
25 risk of going to jail as trivial in

1 comparison to the risk of living so
2 near a nuclear power plant" -- and I might add a
3 nuclear high-level nuclear waste facility.

4 And so [applause] consider if these hearings fail
5 and if all the proper political channels fail and if the
6 governor and other public officials cannot turn aside the
7 tied of those poisons from our lands, if the feds tell us we
8 have to accept these wastes of all that lives, let us pledge
9 to resist. Let us pledge to fill the jails.

10 I am for the no action alternative and for
11 extending the public hearing period.

12 Thank you.

13 [Applause.] Kathleen Stats, to be followed by
14 Michael Brehm.

15 DR. SHANKMAN: Let me tell you we've counted the
16 number of people who have signed up. Mark, how many, again?

17 MR. DELLIGATTI: There are -- including the Stats,
18 there are one, two, three, and I understand two more, so
19 five who have not spoken at all at all, either today or
20 previously. And I'll have to go over it again -- 11 who
21 spoke earlier at our other July hearings.

22 DR. SHANKMAN: Okay. So I've asked the court
23 reporter and the other staff that we have and the other
24 agencies. We could go for about another hour and a half,
25 and I think that would accommodate everybody, but we'll have

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

1 to take a break after you, to give the reporter court
2 reporter a chance to take a break and change his tape and
3 take a walk around, whatever he has to do. So we'll a take
4 a ten-minute break at that point, come back, and then I'd
5 ask everybody to be prepared to be brief.

6 Again, I appreciate that everybody has limited
7 their comments and not repeated comments. We want to get
8 everything on the record. I want to assure you that this
9 will be forwarded to the senior officials of NRC and the
10 other agencies, the transcript from tonight, so your
11 comments are well taken and they will be heard by the people
12 in the agency who have made all the decisions to this point,
13 okay?

14 Thank you.

15 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you for
16 hearing us. My name is Kathleen Stats. I live upwind from
17 Tooele Valley and the Goshute -- where they are on the
18 reservation in Centerville, Utah. I am a private citizen.

19 This morning my 12-year-old -- 12-year-old son
20 approached me with a question of "If lightening strikes the
21 nuclear waste, will it be like the atomic bomb?" I told him
22 no -- sorry -- but I did not tell him that an accident can
23 -- can spread contamination and be devastating. It saddens
24 me and it angers me that this is a concern of my beautiful
25 12-year-old son, and it should be a concern of all of Utah's

1 children, for the rest of their lives and for generations to
2 come.

3 Recently and currently there are environmental
4 fighting against having the Legacy Highway put in because of
5 the environmental impact, and yet the BLM is willing to
6 approve nuclear waste shipments along the same corridor?
7 What happens to the environmental value, let alone the human
8 value here in Utah? What about Horseshoe Springs that will
9 be ruined? The BL- -- BLM designated them as, quote, "an
10 area of critical environmental concern."

11 Their fire suppression is flawed. We are the --
12 one of the driest states in the country. Just two weeks ago
13 you could not look out your window and see the mountains
14 here in Utah because of smoke from the fires.

15 I'm concerned about the poison that we'll be
16 breathing if this nuclear waste is stored here. From the --
17 that we'll be breathing when the smoke is settled in and
18 doesn't leave the valley. The leakage from that waste, no
19 matter how small you say it is, it concerns me.

20 It also concerns me about how is the likelihood of
21 a fire at this nuclear waste storage -- how are we going to
22 fight it? This year and now our firefighters are exhausted,
23 and what part of Utah is going to be jeopardized with fires
24 so that the manpower can be moved over to fight that near
25 the nuclear storage? We who are concerned about the Earth

1 and the environment know that this poison should not be
2 disposed of here. It should not be passing our schools, it
3 should not be passing our homes, it should not be passing or
4 churches, and it should not be licensed anywhere in our
5 state. This poison wasn't created here and it shouldn't be
6 placed here. Anyone that's concerned about our environment,
7 children, and families, knows that this is wrong. I know
8 the reality that this poison exists, but it should not be
9 deposited where it was not created.

10 As the NRC concedes in your no action alternative,
11 it is safe to keep it where it is. If the class wants to
12 create the waste, or if they don't want to -- and if they
13 don't want to store their waste, then it should be stopped
14 having power made by this dangerous method. Utah is not the
15 place for the nuclear waste dumping. We don't want nuclear
16 -- new nuclear waste jobs. We want to keep the jobs that we
17 currently have.

18 More hearings are needed and a six-month extension
19 for public comments. The timing of hearings coincides with
20 vacations, back to school, and an election year. How
21 convenient. It's too important to be cut short.

22 Would the NRC -- NRC turn down, probably for the
23 first time in its history, a proposal, this one which is
24 controversial? You could gain a lot of respect by putting
25 citizens first and following the no action alternative.

1 Thank you.

2 [Applause.]

3 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

4 DR. SHANKMAN: Okay. We'll take a ten-minute
5 break to give Kerry a chance -- and we will start exactly --
6 according to my watch, it's five after 9:00. We'll start
7 exactly at 9:15.

8 [There was a short break taken.]

9 MR. DELLIGATTI: Shall we wait for the rest of the
10 panel?

11 DR. SHANKMAN: No. They're coming. They're in
12 the room. Go ahead.

13 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'm Michael Brehm.
14 I'm a member of the state of Utah's Counsel on Science and
15 Technology, but tonight I'm here just as a husband, father
16 of two, a small business owner, and a licensed professional
17 engineer with credentials you can check out, and a taxpayer.

18 I came here tonight just expecting to sort of
19 passively listen, much like yourself, perhaps, and I -- I've
20 been moved by something that I've watched happen, and,
21 hopefully, you have been too, but unless you're from Utah,
22 you may not have picked up on it. We're a very diverse
23 community here, despite popular belief. And tonight I hope
24 you saw that people from both ends of the political
25 spectrum, economic spectrum, and vocational spectrum, people

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

1 of all walks are aligning on this issue and have told you
2 tonight they're interested in -- in the no action
3 alternative. So -- so please don't dissect the comments one
4 by one and take them just at their face value, as -- as
5 strong as that is. Collectively -- when you're out of town,
6 we're busy fighting on other issues and we're going at each
7 other's throats okay; like the gentlemen indicated earlier,
8 he can't believe he's working next to realtors. I can't
9 underscore that enough. The community is aligning, and I
10 think your statistics on the comments tonight will -- will
11 show you that, but I hope you see that otherwise.

12 Let me end with a quote. Excuse me. Thomas
13 Jefferson, another easterner with vision, once said, "If we
14 can avoid wasting the people's money under the pretext of
15 serving them, then we may be happy."

16 That's all I have. Thank you.

17 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. Deborah -- I believe
18 it's Wrathell; I'm sorry, I couldn't quite read the name --
19 to be followed by Judy Lord.

20 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Hello. My name is
21 Deborah Wrathell. Thank you all for being here tonight.
22 Thank you. As a citizen of Salt Lake City and Utah I must
23 speak.

24 In the morning when I dismount the bus in the
25 foothills where I work I stop and look over the valley which

1 has been called "Zion." I smile and breathe deeply and I
2 recognize my affection for this place. This is my home and
3 the homes of my closest loved ones.

4 Mine is an emotional appeal. This the home of my
5 ancestors, a safe haven, "Zion" to my ancestors. My great
6 grandfather ran sheep on the land where the nuclear waste is
7 supposed to end up.

8 This is the home of my predecessors. My affection
9 is strong and alive. My affection is strong and alive, and
10 I'm tied to this place.

11 I request that the waiting period be extended for
12 180 days, and I request that the hearings be extended to all
13 citizens along the supposed nuclear transport corridor. Our
14 Zion and our beloved home does not include nuclear waste.

15 Thank you.

16 [Applause.]

17 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

18 Judy Lord, to be followed by Jason Grunwald.

19 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Judy
20 Lord. I'm a member of the Utah Peace Test, which is an
21 anti-nuclear group. However, I am here to speak for myself
22 as a citizen of Utah for the last 58 years, and I hope it
23 will be a little longer.

24 I have a Master's degree, and I don't say that to
25 brag about my education, but to say that I can read and I

1 can read well, and I'm used to heavy-duty reading, and, my
2 gosh, you didn't know how long it took me to read just the
3 executive summary, because just about every two pages my
4 eyes would close. But it was a struggle, but it was worth
5 it.

6 What I found as I read this was that I had more
7 questions than answers. Now, somebody mentioned, in the
8 last hearing that I came to, that, "Wow, this is good, that
9 -- that nuclear power is the power of choice in Japan, and
10 they have all these people and it must be wonderful," and so
11 on. Well, you know, why I've been to Japan and I know why
12 they have chosen nuclear power. They have no fossil fuel.
13 They have no place to put windmills and things like that in,
14 you know, without maybe tearing down the whole forest and
15 put, say, solar panels all along the mountains or something.
16 They have felt that that's the only thing they can do. And
17 the result is, according to an article I read last summer,
18 when they had their nuclear accident at a reprocessing
19 plant, was that they have more nuclear accidents than
20 anybody else in the world.

21 Now, I don't know what it does to their
22 environment. I know it kills their people now and again. I
23 don't know what it does to their environment, but I know it
24 will be bad for ours.

25 As I went through this, I thought about air

1 pollution. Now, the only air pollution that's talked about
2 in this great, huge volume is dust that will be raised,
3 clouds of dust being raised during construction. Well,
4 that's fairly normal, especially in a desert. What about
5 the traffic? Now, the only mention of traffic is that that
6 maybe there'll be traffic jams sometimes. What about the
7 tons of rubber that goes into the air when there's a lot of
8 traffic? What about the tons of SO2 and other emissions
9 that are in the air when there's a lot of traffic? None of
10 that's mentioned.

11 Water. Now that air pollution may be minor in all
12 of the things that we could look at. Water. Now, this is
13 the second driest state in the nation. According to this
14 book, 89 to 90 percent of the water we get out of Skull
15 Valley is lost to evaporation. And they're saying, "That's
16 all right, we'll dig wells, and I'm sure there is water
17 under the ground." Well, first they have to dig some test
18 wells. When is that going to be done? At what point is
19 that going to be done?

20 And if they find the water not adequate, or if
21 they find, more likely, that it affects other people's
22 wells, then what? Well, they said, "We'll bring in water in
23 tanker trucks." Will I spent the last week, because I put
24 it off 'til now, trying to find out who in the state of Utah
25 provides tanker trucks full of water in great enough

1 quantities for this kind of construction? I could not find
2 out. Nobody that I asked could give me a clue where these
3 tanker trucks full of water was to going to come from. And
4 so that -- that is a real concern for me.

5 Then, of course, there's radiation. And radiation
6 can affect the environment, but I thought it was really
7 interesting that I read over and over again phrases like
8 "within acceptable levels" and "small fraction of a normal
9 background radiation from the United States," which I assume
10 must be some kind of an average, and "minimal radiological
11 impacts." And then they're -- I read that the reason they
12 don't -- the main reason they don't want to consider
13 alternative three, where they don't go by railway but put it
14 on trucks, is so that they can avoid, quote, "additional
15 doses that would be incurred by the workers making the
16 transfer." Well, wait a minute. I thought there wasn't any
17 dose big enough to worry about. All the things I read up
18 until then said, "Oh, no problem, no problem, little teeny
19 bit." Then they say, "but we can expose the other workers
20 to this." So I -- I'm wondering -- this seems like a
21 contradiction to me.

22 Now, I went through just -- I used to be a school
23 teacher. I'm a little bit insulted about things like this.
24 I made my own little tally sheet, and I went through this on
25 your little -- I can't think what it's called, but where you

1 compare side-by-side on the chart what will happen here and
2 here and here and here, with the only alternative you're
3 considering, and the others. And I said, okay, the one that
4 has the least impact, I'll give that two points. The one
5 that says the next best thing I'll give one point, and, boy,
6 the one with the high score ought to win. And you know
7 what? I came up with something really interesting.
8 Alternative Number 3 got three points, Alternative Number 1,
9 the only one being considered, got five points. The Wyoming
10 alternative got 11 points, and no action scored 41 points.

11 [Applause.]

12 Now, in that case, why is Number 1 the only one
13 being considered? Well, I -- I think a lot of people have
14 kind of come to the right conclusion on that. I think it's
15 money. Well, okay, whose money? Who's going to get money?
16 Well, they keep mentioning one of the benefits of this is
17 going to be all the tax money that the county and state are
18 going to get. What tax money? This is reservation lands.
19 They can't take tax money from things that go on on
20 reservation land. In fact, I have a little article right
21 here signed "Deal for End Waste," and it says since it's on
22 the reservation it's not required to pay county taxes.
23 Instead, it offered the county some money and events.
24 Uh-huh.

25 Okay. Well, that takes care of the tax money, so

1 it can't be that. Okay. The Goshutes? Well, sure, some
2 Goshutes are going to benefit, not all Goshutes. Some
3 Goshutes are going to benefit and some are benefitting
4 already. It's quite obvious if you drive out there.

5 Okay. Who does this leave? The power companies
6 and PFS, Private Fuel Storage. And this is -- isn't it
7 amazing? What do you read over and over and over again in
8 this thing? Well, those poor power companies are running
9 out of room. You read that phrase I don't know how many
10 times, you're "running out of room," "running out of room,"
11 over and over. And then you get down to the nitty-gritty;
12 it's cheaper here. It's cheaper to bring that stuff across
13 the country, have somebody build a facility for it to keep
14 it in, pay those people -- building the rail spur to the
15 facility, pay those people to run the facility, than it is
16 to keep it where it is. And, besides, they're running out
17 of room.

18 Well, they could -- if it's cheaper to do that,
19 they can take more money, but they pay the Tooele County
20 Commissioners, they pay the Goshutes, they can build the
21 facility, and they can still make more money for their --
22 for their stockholders and charge less to their rate payers.
23 Well, that's just wonderful for them, I suppose.

24 One little thing, in addition. At -- at the
25 beginning it says, "Well, this license is for 20 years and

1 it's renewable." Then later on they start saying things
2 like "the 40-year life of the facility." Obviously nobody's
3 really planning, really assuming that it's going to be 20
4 years if they keep saying "the 40-year life of the
5 facility."

6 So what's the bottom line? Doing the right thing
7 will not make any money for PFS. Doing the right thing will
8 not make any money for the power company and the
9 stockholders. The right thing is to educate the American
10 public about using less power. And this is not an easy
11 thing, but I would think it would be a whole lot cheaper
12 than this and less dangerous.

13 And I'm not saying we're not guilty. People just
14 say, "Well, we don't have any nuclear power plants." Well,
15 I understand we're on a grid. The whole company is on a
16 grid. It doesn't matter where the power is made, we all get
17 to use some of it when it's our turn. And I know whenever I
18 turn on the light switch that power light has come from the
19 nuclear power plant. So I'm not saying that I'm not guilty
20 for having produced some of this problem, but we know now.
21 We know better than to make this garbage that we have no
22 place for.

23 And Congress got us into this mess a telling those
24 companies, "You just keep on making garbage and we'll find a
25 place for it." And so, of course, I guess most of us --

1 well, I don't know, some people get elected so many times
2 that they're not all gone out of congress. I was going to
3 say maybe they were, but maybe they're not. Nevertheless,
4 what we've got to do is not use it. If you could make solar
5 energy and wind energy, wind power, things like that, if
6 they could make as many million dollars for companies as
7 nuclear power makes, by golly, we'd have those things now.
8 So it's -- that comes back, again, to money.

9 So it's our fault it's our Congress's fault.
10 We've just got to stop, because you open up a nuclear
11 facility here threatening our environment, our air, our
12 water, and as someone else said earlier, it doesn't matter
13 how little the leak is, I don't want any little leaks in my
14 environment. If we create a new storage that just puts off
15 the day when we have to decide what else to do. We cannot
16 go on forever saying, well, we'll move it here and then
17 we'll move it here and that makes more room here. The
18 longer we do that the longer we go without something to make
19 a real decision about what really must be done. In the
20 meantime, keep it where it is.

21 [Applause.]

22 MR. DELLIGATTI: Jason Grunwald, to be followed by
23 Rosemary Holtz.

24 Mr. Greenwald.

25 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Hi. My name is Jason

1 Grunwald. I have a lot to say. I just want to make sure
2 that I have an opportunity to say it.

3 You know, I would like to thank you for having
4 another hearing here in Salt Lake City. I think everyone in
5 this room would agree it would have been nice to have a
6 little bit than two weeks notice more about the hearing.
7 Also, maybe it would have been nice to have it on a night
8 other than Monday night; you know, it's the family home
9 evening here in our community, as well. But that's all
10 right. So in the future I'm going to look forward to
11 working you in ways we might hold more hearings and involve
12 more members of our community in this decision-making
13 process.

14 I think you'll agree that much has happened since
15 the last time that we met in July. We had a fire out in
16 Skull Valley, and maybe it's a good thing that we got that
17 out of the way because I'm sure that won't happen in again
18 in the next 10,000 years.

19 [Laughter]

20 There was also an interesting report that came out
21 by the National Research Counsel which said that facilities
22 across the country that contain or process nuclear energy or
23 dealt with nuclear waste are not able to be adequately
24 cleaned out to the point where they would be returned for
25 public use. Obviously, that has a pretty significant impact

1 on what we're talking about here today.

2 I think the other thing that's happened that's
3 pretty significant is communication of our community
4 together expressing concerns about this proposal and the
5 process in which the decision is being made.

6 I know one of the things as I continue to kind of
7 go back over the Draft EIS and think about this proposal,
8 one of the things that just continues to amuse me is the
9 idea that this is facility is a temporary site. You know,
10 it still jumps out that Private Fuel Storage claims it takes
11 20 years to bring the 4,000 casks here into the State of
12 Utah, which coincides with the time that their license
13 expires. One gentlemen mentioned that, "Well, we're
14 immediately going to be moving it down to Yucca Mountain, so
15 you know, there's really nothing to worry about." Well, if
16 that's the case, then why aren't we looking at the general
17 accounting office report which talks about the ability to
18 continue to store this waste at the reactor sites for years
19 to come? I mean, if they're surely going to move to in 20
20 years, it makes absolutely no sense to bring it here, only
21 then to move it again to Yucca Mountain.

22 Well, maybe -- maybe the reason it doesn't make
23 sense is because it isn't a temporary site. And I think
24 some of the language in the Draft EIS only reinforces that,
25 by saying you're not going to require Private Fuel Storage

1 to address the issue of removing this waste until five years
2 before their license expires. And yet there's really no
3 discussion of the risks involved with removing this waste
4 from our community, as well.

5 I'm also amuzed that we are looking at this site
6 in isolation; you know, there's no discussion about the
7 impact that we have at this -- in the west desert and Tooele
8 County that are already on the ground. I find it
9 interesting that we're not talking about the Envirocare
10 proposal, where they submitted an application to the state
11 of Utah to accept all kinds of radioactive waste at their
12 landfill. What happened is they put those two proposals
13 together and then combine the risk of that to -- we still
14 come up with the same result. Well, maybe -- it may prove a
15 little bit tough for the scientists to crunch the numbers;
16 I'm sure they can figure it out, but it's one thing that we
17 need to consider.

18 I'm also amuzed by the statements that if we
19 oppose the storage of nuclear waste that we then must be
20 supporting global warming. And, you know, to me it's like
21 saying, "Well, I'm opposed to being skinned and dumped in
22 the middle of the ocean; therefore, I must be willing to,
23 you know, be pushed off a cliff on to sheer shard rocks."

24 I think the real problem here is language in the
25 Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the literature

1 that's being handed out regarding the actions of Private
2 Fuel Storage and the National Research Counsel. Well, when
3 I was growing up my dad taught me that, you know, actions
4 speak louder than words, and you need to be responsible for
5 your actions. And I guess if Private Fuel Storage is
6 serious about removing this waste, then they need to step up
7 to the plate and prove it. You know, let's have them put up
8 a bond for the cost of removing this waste after any type of
9 accident and have it held in the interest of people here of
10 Utah. I think it's time for them to put their name on the
11 dotted line, rather than hiding behind a limited liability
12 corporation.

13 [Applause.]

14 We have a decent turnout tonight, but I also know
15 that there are several hundred people who could not make it
16 here, and part of that was because they couldn't clear their
17 schedules in such short order. So one of the things that we
18 did in the process of getting the word out about this
19 hearing is we contacted various organizations to see if they
20 would be able to contact their members and notify them that
21 here tonight, on the 21st, we would have probably one of the
22 last chances to comment on this proposal. And what
23 continually came back was the impossibility of getting the
24 word out in that short order. So what we did is we put
25 together a list here of the organizations that are joining

1 in requesting more time to comment on this decision-making
2 process. We would like at least a 180 day extension to the
3 public comment period. We'd like there to be more hearings,
4 not only in Utah, but elsewhere across the transportation
5 routes.

6 I'll just kind of read this so you have it: The
7 American Association of University Women, Citizens Against
8 Radioactive Waste in Utah, the Downwinders, the
9 Environmental Justice Foundation, Families Against
10 Incinerator Risk, Hawkwatch International, JEDI Women, the
11 League of Women Voters, Lupus Foundation of America -
12 Utah/Idaho Chapter, the National Council of Jewish Women --
13 and I'm going to have a tough time with the pronunciation --
14 the Ohngo Gaudadeh Dezia, Save Our Canyons, Sierra Club -
15 Utah Chapter, Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, U.S.
16 Public Interest Research Group, Utah Progressive Network,
17 Utah Peace Test, Wasatch Clean Air Coalition, West Desert
18 Healthy Environmental Alliance, Wild Utah Forest Campaign,
19 Women Concerned/Utahns United, and Women's Actions for New
20 Directions. And that was just in two weeks.

21 [Applause.]

22 You know, we found other organizations here
23 tonight that we haven't made contact with before and are
24 also interested in signing on to this letter.

25 So I think what you need to recognize is the

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

1 desire of our community to be -- to have have more of an
2 engagement with the agencies permitting the licensing
3 facility.

4 We'd like to talk with Private Fuel Storage about
5 both sides of the Goshute reservation and get input from
6 that. We are in the process of setting up those hearings.
7 We'll be sending out an invitation for you to join. I hope
8 you'll stake us up on that offer. We really need to have an
9 opportunity to dialogue, to get answers to the questions
10 that individuals have, especially those questions that fall
11 outside of this narrow little box in the Draft Environmental
12 Impact Statement.

13 So I will go ahead and leave you with a copy of
14 this, and, for the record, I, as well, support the no action
15 alternative.

16 Thank you. [Applause.]

17 MR. DELLIGATTI: Rosemary Holtz, to be followed by
18 Chip Ward. Jason, wow.

19 My name is Rosemary Holtz. I am a member of Women
20 Concerned/Utahns United. We are adamantly opposed to the
21 storage of spent nuclear fuel rods on the Goshute
22 reservation. Now, more than ever, the information that has
23 been given to the citizens of Utah on this issue is woefully
24 inadequate. We believe the NRC is responsible to require
25 the Private Fuel Storage and any other agencies involved

1 with this consortium to provide factual, forthright, quality
2 information to all stake holders who will be impacted by the
3 nuclear storage proposal. We do not believe the cost risk
4 benefit documentation has been shared with the Goshutes nor
5 the citizens of Utah, nor has information been shared with
6 those states or cities whose path will be crossed during the
7 transportation of high-level radioactive waste. Stake
8 holders must have truthful information before they're able
9 to give their, quote, "informed consent" to allowed
10 transportation of the storage of nuclear waste in their
11 communities.

12 I would like to show you some questionable quality
13 information that has been disseminated by PFS. I ask the
14 NRC panel if you would call this "worthwhile information."
15 I don't know if you've seen this brochure, it's put out by
16 PSF. There's a picture here for you in the audience, as
17 well as you folks up here. Well, a highway, almost looks
18 like the Yellow Brick Road, with an arrow that goes to
19 Tooele County. But just let me just mention some of the
20 things that -- information that's been given: "More jobs,
21 more money, a better future for your children are coming to
22 Tooele County." "Temporary" is mentioned through here six
23 times. Never "permanent," always "temporary." "Wise use
24 of Goshute land." "Protect the land, desiring to preserve
25 it for future generations." Listen to this: "Not one shred

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

1 of scientific evidence that an above ground spent fuel
2 storage facility would jeopardize the health, safety, or
3 future livelihood of their families or those of neighboring
4 communities." Quality information? I think I would
5 question that.

6 "Hundreds of jobs." "Economic security." Again,
7 "temporary," "temporary," "temporary." "A tremendous
8 economic boom." "The growth of dozens of existing
9 businesses." "Millions of dollars in educational and
10 community funding to pave the way for an even better future
11 for all families of Tooele County."

12 They've also commissioned you or identified that
13 "The NRC will listen to public input and conduct a thorough
14 review." So they've also made promises for you.

15 This brochure reminds me of something that the
16 tobacco industry might publish.

17 [Applause.]

18 We are requesting that the NRC delay and extend
19 for at least the six months, 180 days, the next steps in the
20 process of licensing PFS to store nuclear waste in Utah.
21 During that time we would ask that the Draft Environmental
22 Impact Statement be made available in a summary form to the
23 public, not the big book that some people of toting around
24 this evening. It is very difficult for the average person.
25 This one woman that said she's a great reader, well I

1 commend her for sharing what she did with us. But it is
2 difficult for the average personal to feel confident enough
3 to comprehend the volume of a complete DEIS.

4 During this time we should ask -- we would ask
5 that PFS be required to print a brochure that is an
6 information document with objective risk benefit issues, not
7 the type of thing that I just read to you.

8 After the time extension we would request that
9 public question-answer sessions be made available. The
10 public has not allowed to ask any questions on this issue,
11 and even the state has been overpowered by the strict rules
12 as to what the NRC would allow them to discuss on this
13 issue. For instance, is the NRC going to waive their own
14 earthquake regulations and make an exception on the Goshute
15 reservation? If so, why? Will the NRC require a resident
16 inspector at the Goshute site? What sort of law enforcement
17 will be provided on the Goshute side, and by whom? What
18 happens if PFS, a few years in the future, sells out to
19 another utility consortium, and the Goshutes and Utahans end
20 up with a huge bankrutcy, such as we are now, in this state,
21 witnessing with SafetyClean?

22 [Applause.]

23 These are but a few of our concerns, and we would
24 appreciate it if you would prove to our citizens -- prove to
25 our citizens and to the nation that the NRC is not just

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

1 another entrenched bureaucratic entity. Perhaps you could
2 refute the rumor that the decision has already been made by
3 the NRC, and that these public comment periods are strictly
4 tocanism.

5 We here in Utah have long been burdened by the
6 nuclear testing downwind issues, and now we may be forced to
7 endure that we could begin to call the upwind issues of
8 nuclear waste storage. Downwind, upwind.

9 We're asking the NRC to choose the no action
10 alternative, to deny a license to PFS. Do not leave Utah
11 hanging in the wind again.

12 [Applause.]

13 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

14 Chip Ward, to be followed by William Peterson.

15 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Chip Ward,
16 and I'm here speaking as a private citizen. I do want you
17 to know, though, that I am on the board of Families Against
18 Incinerator Risk. I'm on the board of Southern Utah
19 Wilderness Alliance, and I've recently published a book on
20 the environmental history of the west desert on the rim.

21 I think that most of what I had to cover has been
22 covered, so I have cut my remarks considerably. I do want
23 to talk about the NRC's role here, though. I think that the
24 context for this project is obvious. It's the collapse of
25 our national policy on spent nuclear fuel. If we had a

1 national policy that was even hopeful, it would preclude the
2 project that is in front of you. It's because our policy is
3 in shambles that PFS member utilities went looking for a
4 backup plan. You know this. For you to act as if you do
5 know this, or that it is not so, and accept a Draft EIS with
6 a temporary site at face value and ignore the more stringent
7 requirements that could come with a permanent facility,
8 which is obviously what Skull Valley is likely to become, is
9 irresponsible and it would be dishonest.

10 In today's world science operates with everyone's
11 proxy, whether it's given or not. We have a right to expect
12 you to act with integrity and credibility. I think some of
13 the distain that you have seen tonight for the NRC is not a
14 function of our lack of reason or lack of knowledge or our
15 lack of expertise, it follows a well established history of
16 bias and self-interested decisions masquerading as objective
17 science.

18 [Applause.]

19 Our contempt for this decision making process,
20 which fall far short of a full civic dialogue that we need,
21 I think is a response equal to the condescension, arrogance,
22 and cynacism that this process expressses. The NRC damages
23 both science and democracy when you engage in this. The
24 time has come for you to stop doing that.

25 [Applause.]

1 I am particularly pleased tonight that people here
2 in Utah are finally getting the picture. This is not about
3 saving the nation's energy grid, this is not about global
4 warming, this is not about saving people back east from
5 risk, it's about money. It's about PFS member utilities
6 saving storage costs, keeping profits up, and avoiding a
7 rate increase to the customers who benefitted from that fuel
8 in the first place. Those are venal mundane modus
9 masquerading as the national interests and objective logic.

10 [Applause.]

11 And it has only taken us a month to see through
12 that.

13 The message I hope you take away from here tonight
14 is that we're learning fast, we're on our feet. You are in
15 for a fight.

16 [Applause.]

17 We are not going to sit down.

18 MR. DELLIGATTI: William Peterson, to be followed
19 by Robin Jenkins.

20 DR. SHANKMAN: He already went.

21 MR. DELLIGATTI: We're on that now.

22 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you. I, again,
23 want to express my appreciation for -- for the NRC coming
24 out and doing this. This is a -- a peculiar circumstance.
25 Our country, our political leaders have set out a policy for

1 making power. In this case it's with regards to nuclear
2 power as being an alternative today, an alternative for the
3 future. And as part of making this alternative they set up
4 a way that - for the power companies to -- to do this, which
5 requires disposal of this spent fuel. And the federal
6 government has not been able to -- to make this disposal
7 system happen, over a long period of time. They put
8 together the office of nuclear waste negotiator under the
9 president to -- to do this thing. And under that office
10 David LeRoy and Richard Stallings, there was two offers made
11 for -- for storage group, and they -- those two offers came
12 out of Utah. I realize that people here are -- are saying,
13 "We're -- we're opposed to that," but this process has been
14 in operation for a long time, and there was only two
15 alternatives that were put forth, and that -- it was put
16 forth out to the whole country. And there are also reasons
17 why it should be here.

18 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: What?

19 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: And it's -- somebody
20 said "What?" Number one, it's a -- it's a ideal climate.
21 It's the best climate for the -- for the nation, due to --
22 concrete endurance is one reason. The location. It is a
23 good location because it's close to the -- to the best
24 activity and the best source for reprocessing was developed
25 at INEL in Idaho. We're most close to that. There was a

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

1 repositing facility built back in South Carolina, and there
2 was intentions by the industry to reprocess then. First,
3 President Ford, and then President Carter defeated those,
4 and required, by executive orders, that we would bury the
5 spent fuel.

6 That was -- they came out in the west and looked
7 at that alternative, and that was tried for at Davis Canyon
8 down in southern Utah. They wound up at Yucca Mountain as
9 the second alternative.

10 President Reagan has lifted that ban, I understand
11 and we can reprocess, but we've got a power industry that
12 was badly hurt by spending about three and a half billion
13 dollars, I believe, to rebuild the reprocessing plant. We
14 were reluctant to proceed again to do it again.

15 The power industry has been told they can't
16 produce more power with coal burning because of the problems
17 having -- with the greenhouse effect and the -- and the
18 pollution that they're causing there.

19 Coal contains uranium. We are exposing all of us
20 to uranium by burning coal-making power. If we will go to
21 atomic energy and just get our power that way, we will reduce
22 our exposure to one five millionths of what we're receiving
23 now from that. These are -- this is a figure from navy
24 studies.

25 We -- we worry about the exposure from spent fuel,

1 but this stuff does not get airborne like an atomic blast.
2 It does not get out and float around. There's been
3 extensive studies made by the federal government on the
4 transportation issue. They've done 1500 crash tests, and
5 these are full -- these were done with full-sized vessels
6 and and equivalent railroad trains, trucks, concrete walls,
7 all sorts of things. The government has tried very, very
8 hard with this issue. And it's a very hard and trying
9 issue. It is so political. It is a scary issue because of
10 its atomic nature.

11 I'm a downwinder myself. A lot of us have been
12 scared with the atomic bombs that's been created and the
13 weaponry that's been created, the fear -- the whole world
14 fear of atomic war. We've generated a horrendous amount of
15 atomic weapons. It's known now that it only takes three
16 pounds of plutonium to make a bomb. Now we're taking this
17 out of bombs. We have over 40 pounds of plutonium that
18 needs to be burned up. The only way we can get rid of this
19 plutonium and the only way we can participate with Russia to
20 get rid of their plutonium is burn it up in a reactor. The
21 only way we can do that is to process that into fuel pellets
22 and burn it up in a reactor. And to do that we need to do
23 that along with spent fuel and make what's called a "mix
24 oxide fuel." We make this fuel, put it in fuel rods, burn
25 it up, then we get rid of our plutonium.

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

1 We also get rid of our spent fuel. There's ways
2 now that we can take and reprocess or we can burn up all of
3 the material in spent fuel. The scientists are working very
4 hard at this thing. The politicians are about wore out with
5 it. They don't know what way to turn. It's a tar baby
6 issue. It hurts them whenever they bring it up.

7 It's a hard issue for -- for the NRC. They get
8 slapped in the face all the time for it. And I've got to
9 give them a hand for their continuing to sit here and talk
10 to us. I've got to give a big hand to Leon Bear. I mean,
11 he's a gone out against what all you people are thinking,
12 what -- what his other colleagues and other tribes, what
13 their feelings are. He's -- he's not thinking -- thinking
14 in the future, the future of our country. I mean, we really
15 have got to do something to save our -- our power industry.
16 We're at a point we have no new power plants on the drawing
17 boards. We have a -- a power industry that will not build
18 new power plants, will not even look at building more power
19 plants until we solve this issue.

20 [Applause.]

21 And this issue is storage of spent fuel, and this
22 issue, by law, had to be taken -- spent fuel had to be taken
23 by the federal government, and they cannot figure out a way
24 to do it but, by law they are supposed to have taken this --
25 taken care of this problem. We've got a few utilities now

1 who've taken it on their own to build a spent fuel storage
2 facility, and set out on their own to try and rectify this
3 whole matter. It's a very difficult, very critical issue,
4 and we can't just sit here and say, "Not in my back yard."
5 It is something we've got to cooperate with and something
6 we've got to work together with. And we have a world issue
7 -- we have three world issues that's at stake here, and
8 they've got to be solved. We don't have another ten years
9 to start over again. These two facilities we've worked on
10 for ten years, and we don't have another ten years to start
11 again, because we've got power needs that are not going to
12 be met unless we get this issue solved -- solved.

13 And I compliment you people for coming out and
14 hearing this. I compliment you people for coming out and
15 talking about it and addressing it, but, please, see the
16 whole issue. We are at the center piece of a whole-world
17 issue.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

20 William Peterson, to be followed by Robin Jenkins.

21 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Excuse me. Yeah,
22 that's my name. I'm William Peterson, Bill Peterson. I'm a
23 mechanical engineer, Master's degree. I've been working in
24 the nuclear industry for a long time. I move the uranium
25 tailings. Everything that goes up at the INAL goes through

1 equipment I designed and my lab built. I've been really
2 involved in it. I've been involved with energy all my life.
3 I've -- I've been involved in coal, I've been involved in
4 oil, I've been involved in research to make oil out of coal.
5 And it's hard and it's expensive. I've looked at all kinds
6 of alternatives, and believe me, the best alternative we
7 have today is nuclear power.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. DELLIGATTI: Robin Jenkins, to be followed by
10 Steven Barrowes.

11 DR. SHANKMAN: It's now 10:00, and the court
12 reporter can stay until 10:30, so we have how many more
13 people?

14 MR. DELLIGATTI: We have about eight more.

15 DR. SHANKMAN: Okay. So I would ask you to please
16 limit your time. Otherwise, at 10:30 we'll go off the
17 record, and although you can talk with the persons that will
18 stay, you will have to make your comments in writing. So if
19 you limit your comments so we can get through the half hour,
20 I'd really appreciate it.

21 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: And I've got a short
22 one, because I knew this was coming.

23 I think we, with 98 percent opposition expressed
24 here tonight, don't know why nuclear power is -- is -- is so
25 wonderful, why it's a savior. It's -- it's supreme waste.

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

1 The life of a rod at the facility of a nuclear power plant
2 is only 18 to 24 months. But, you know, I don't think I'll
3 ever recycle another aluminum can. It's just sickening.

4 Anyway, on the with the DEIS. I am a geologist,
5 25 years experience. I read reports such as the DEIS by the
6 hundreds every year. It's based -- I'm sorry. Thank you.
7 The DEIS is based on faulty data, and it ignores obvious
8 data that is available to the public. If this DEIS is
9 accepted and this proposal is licensed, it's corruption and
10 it's fraud.

11 I would like to focus on one appendix in this
12 DEIS, and that is Appendix F. Now, every report has -- they
13 have appendices. These appendices are a supporting
14 documentation. They provide the raw data on which a
15 contention is truthfully based, on which this proposal I was
16 expecting to be truthfully based. In Appendix F -- I looked
17 through all 38 exhibits that contained the initial screening
18 form. And it -- it -- none of the day that was quantified,
19 and so as -- as one of the speakers earlier did, I created
20 my own tally sheet. Well, 86 percent "unknown," as an
21 answer to a criterion on that form is not acceptable. It's
22 not acceptable as a foundation for anything.

23 This -- so then I get to Exhibit F.3, the Goshute
24 initial screening form, which contains the following false
25 information: That proposed location is greater than two

1 miles, is greater than five miles from a capable fault, and
2 it is not now, I know that because I -- I get public
3 information just like the -- the data that should have been
4 in this DEIS is -- is missing, because the -- because then
5 the supporting documentation for the distance to a capable
6 fault is in the Safety Analysis Report. It's in the all --
7 own data, and we're putting it together is extremely
8 difficult, but that's what was resolved, was that -- that
9 the truth comes out that the proposed location has not only
10 on-site faults but is half a mile from on capable fault and
11 1.2 miles from another capable fault. And, as I showed you
12 earlier, epicenters don't happen out of thin air, you know,
13 they happen around capable faults. This is a modern
14 epicenter five miles from this proposed facility, and there
15 are five other modern epicenters in Skull Valley alone.

16 DR. SHANKMAN: Are you going to submit that?

17 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I -- I -- no. It's
18 public information. Your technical people can get it.

19 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Maybe you'd better.

20 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It would be nice if
21 you could.

22 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Oh, yeah, I can give
23 you the -- it's the EIS in Arcin, so one of our techies got
24 it for me. This is from BLM information. I also have
25 topography showing that it's ten percent --

1 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Just give it to
2 them.

3 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Offer to sell it to
4 them.

5 [Laughter]

6 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay. Okay. I
7 don't know what to do. I spent -- I work, you know, 40, 50
8 hours weeks every week and I do this on my spare time. I'm
9 a little testy about parting with my information, that
10 should have been obtained responsibly by anyone in the world
11 because of the Internet.

12 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Give them your
13 yellow copy.

14 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: All right. All
15 right. The --

16 [Applause.]

17 DR. SHANKMAN: Give us the reference; we'll get
18 it.

19 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I have it on a
20 paper.

21 DR. SHANKMAN: Just give us the reference.

22 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It takes a long time
23 to print out and --

24 DR. SHANKMAN: That's fine. That's fine.

25 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay. One other --

1 oh, please don't roll your eyes at me, Dr. Shankman.

2 DR. SHANKMAN: I didn't.

3 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Yes, you really did.

4 Anyway, there's one more criteria on this initial
5 screen form, it's called, that cannot possibly support the
6 -- this proposal in any sound, scientific way, and that is
7 public acceptance. It -- on the form it says, "Is the area
8 free of anti -- free of proactive antinuclear referendum,"
9 and it says, "Yes, we're free of antinuclear referendums"
10 despite 20 years of the downwinders actively lobbying for
11 citizens in -- in Utah alone, and longer than that elsewhere
12 in the United States, and Nevada.

13 And -- and then, also, I was curious, I guess we
14 can all make up or select a definition of a term that has
15 multiple definitions, but the definition of a referenda is a
16 note sent by a diplomatic agent to his or her own government
17 requesting information. Now, Governor Leavitt didn't do
18 that with -- with the Department of Environmental Quality,
19 but -- excuse me -- restructuring our department -- that's
20 where I work, but I'm here as a private citizen, to create a
21 -- another division to analyze this proposal, then this -
22 then the -- this information is false, not to mention the
23 fact that -- the presence of downwinders.

24 So I -- when I read a report with -- with an
25 appendix, Appendix F, I expect to find supporting

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

1 documentation for a sound proposal, and I don't find it.

2 And, finally, I was also curious about reducing
3 the data on those forms, these 38 exhibits, and I know that
4 they were answered "unknown" on every single criterion; you
5 know, everyone knows that's not correct.

6 But what was particularly alarming to me as a
7 geologist and knowing what I thought about seismicity in that
8 valley, that the reason why one of the Muscolaro reservation
9 sites in Mexico scrapped and it's called "reason for
10 rejection," was the presence of a capable fault.

11 So I just don't understand how we can be accepting
12 false information from a public document, and that -- that
13 alone is not a reason for rejection, when it was the reason
14 for rejection at another site.

15 Thank you very much for your time.

16 [Applause.]

17 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

18 Mr. Barrowes, to be followed by Robynne
19 Kirkpatrick.

20 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Steve
21 Barrowes. I wrote a couple of editorials that have been
22 published in the Tribune. You can find one at the back of
23 the hall there on the table. And I'm the alleged person
24 whose credentials cannot be traced. So I would like to tell
25 you that I got my Ph.D. at the University of Utah in 1971,

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

1 and my five years at Louisiana State University physics
2 department, and three years in Mississippi State University
3 physics department, then three years at Illinois State
4 University physics department. And I took a few years off
5 while I wrote a book -- a book writing project in the
6 1990's. In early 1990 I joined a research effort at the
7 University of Utah, which continued for about six years,
8 funding off and on. And during that time I taught a few
9 classes at the University of Utah.

10 So this will help in tracing those credentials for
11 that lady who left. I didn't get a chance to talk to her.

12 I would like to challenge, publically, one of the
13 experts from the anti-nuclear people to debate with me any
14 of the things in this editorial, or the earlier one. I
15 don't think they're going to be able to disprove anything
16 that I have said, and I would like to be able to debate it
17 because there's such a wide disparity between claims that
18 everybody within half a mile of the transportation route or
19 maybe two miles, as one of the realtors mentioned tonight,
20 is going to be impacted with radiation and devalued property.
21 Well, there's nobody along that transportation route that
22 will get so much as a chest x-ray's worth of radiation,
23 because there aren't enough casks in the country to to run
24 past his property. You can lean against the back fence. He
25 needs to do it for 19,000 casks to get one chest x-ray's

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

1 worth of radiation. And I'd like to have one of their
2 experts go through those figures and show me where I'm
3 wrong, because I'm not wrong. I'm ready to debate that on
4 radio shows or whatever he wants to do.

5 The -- the dangers of this transportation have
6 been greatly exaggerated. It's the same for the dangers of
7 the -- of the storage on the -- on the reservation. A
8 person in the Skull Valley village there, four and a half
9 miles away, will get a little bit of radiation, but it'll
10 take him 20 years to get the equivalent of one chest x-ray.
11 Now, that is not what we consider harmful. If you take one
12 airplane flight for four hours, you'll get the the
13 equivalent of a chest x-ray by doing that.

14 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Let's leave it
15 there, then.

16 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Now, the question of
17 whether -- whether it should be left there or whether it
18 should be put here, it doesn't help to greatly exaggerate
19 the dangers of the transportation and the storage. Those
20 dangers should be realistically evaluated and not greatly
21 exaggerated. The factor of 10,000 is really a lot of an
22 exaggeration or a risk factor, and, you know, we should get
23 the dialogue and where you can see and where other people
24 can see that we're both on the same page, as far as the
25 science is concerned. When we -- when we have such wide

1 discrepancies, it's -- it's not possible to come to a
2 reasonable agreement.

3 So, in conclusion, I suppose we're going to have
4 to wait until global warming comes to more of a crisis stage
5 before anybody gets serious. Now, the -- the solar is a
6 good idea, but it's still three times the cost of any of the
7 power that we're used to using. So when we jack the cost up
8 like that, there's going a lot of jobs that are going to be
9 lost because some products are not going to be worth
10 producing at the higher cost. You're going to see a lot of
11 people who can't afford what they're used to having, because
12 the cost is going to go up. And that's -- that's one of
13 those things that we may have to face.

14 Now, the research that I did at the University of
15 Utah from 1990 to about 1995 or -6, in fact, was aimed at
16 finding another energy source that would be clean, non
17 polluting, no global warming, and all that. It's the
18 infamous cold fusion -- cold fusion project, all right? All
19 right. Our job in the physics department, we were not
20 wholeheartedly in support of that. We wanted to find out
21 and evaluate it scientifically, instead of making a
22 political decision on a scientific question. For that we
23 took a lot of heat. On the other hand, well, there were
24 those that thought we were traitors and turncoats to our
25 profession because we asked the question scientifically

1 instead of just politically saying, "Oh, we -- we know the
2 answer. Those guys must be sharp." And as it turns out in
3 our work we were not able to come to a definitive answer as
4 to whether Ponds and Fleishman were right. We couldn't
5 duplicate their heat, but there are plenty of technical
6 reasons why we may not have been adequate to that challenge.
7 It's a very multiple disciplinary field, and I -- you need a
8 time, not just a couple of people, to have the expertise
9 that you need to get the job done.

10 Unfortunately, those who got the best results also
11 ran out of funding and ran out of -- of some of their
12 results. And I still don't know the answer to that. If
13 that comes on line, I won't be totally surprised, but then
14 if it doesn't I won't be totally surprised. I'm a little
15 bit in limbo on that question.

16 The research was aimed at finding a clean energy
17 source that does not cause global warming. It's a wonderful
18 idea. And all the research should go forward that -- that
19 has that kind of a promise, but right now nuclear is the
20 only thing we've got that has available to us now, so I urge
21 that you consider this seriously.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. Robynne Kirkpatrick,
24 to be followed by Cynthia of the Desert.

25 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: For the record, I'd

1 like to say that I'm for the no action alternative.

2 Several people have already talked about looking
3 at this process from a more realistic standpoint, so right
4 now I'd like you to think about corporate proposals from the
5 perspective of how people are affected. Now, we need to
6 look at such practices as uranium mining and storage of
7 high-level lethal nuclear waste from a more global
8 perspective. When we do that, it's obvious that there is a
9 clear pattern of exploitation of poor and minority peoples.
10 For example, Native peoples are currently living at toxic
11 uranium tailings sites, as we all know, that Native people
12 do not profit from leasing their land. You're also, as I
13 understand it, responsible for licensing many of those
14 facilities. Since you're responsible for licensing mining
15 operations for the nuclear industry, you are aware that
16 there are some, say, on the Navajo reservation south of
17 toxic uranium tailings site that have not been cleaned up.
18 And apparently, from what I understand -- what I understand,
19 the EPA has gone in and basically declared that that area is
20 too remote -- I guess too remote to be inhabited. But
21 people live there. That's documented in Ward Churchill's
22 "Struggle for the land."

23 The example I gave is not atypical of how land
24 adjacent to where poor minorities live has loss of value.
25 In this way native peoples have had to fight against their

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

1 land being devalued, since once waste dumps and other
2 operations that are perceived to endanger health and
3 esthetic values are established, both within or adjacent to
4 Native lands, it becomes easier for for corporations to
5 further exploit people and land.

6 To illustrate this, I'm going to take the liberty
7 to quote from one of the members of the Skull Valley band of
8 Goshutes. And this is quoted in Valerie Culet's, "The
9 Painted Desert."

10 "People need to understand that which
11 this whole area has already been
12 deemed a 'waste zone' by the federal
13 government, the State of Utah, and the
14 county. Tooele depot and militariy
15 sites stores 40 percent of the
16 nation's nerve gas and hazardous gas
17 only 40 miles from us. Dugway Proving
18 Grounds an experimental life sciences
19 center, is only 14 miles away and it
20 experiments with viruses like the
21 plague and tuberculosis. Within a
22 40-mile radius there are three
23 hazardous waste dumps, and a, quote,
24 low-level active waste dump," and which, by the
25 way, as we know, everything's -- and spent fuel rods --

1 "from all directions, north, south,
2 east, and west, we're surrounded by
3 the waste of Tooele County and the
4 state of Utah and the U.S. society.
5 Over 30 percent of the tribe totally
6 against and very concerned about all
7 of this. So that's why it's so hard
8 to talk with businesses or anybody
9 else about economic development.
10 They're are all scared to come out
11 here and much less develop things
12 here. But I live here, I like it
13 here, I'm not going to move."

14 I understand that only three members of the
15 Goshute band seem to have legal authority.

16 Okay. With respect to furthering this proposal by
17 Private Fuel Storage, to my shame, authority of tribal
18 councils is exploited by the practice of providing so-called
19 grant money that's well documented and through the office of
20 the nuclear negotiator. It is well documented that monies
21 are provided to tribal council if they agree to consider
22 storing the lethal radioactive waste that will not decay for
23 millions of years.

24 Randall D. Hansen wrote about how more and more
25 grant money is given to supporters of proposals that allow

1 land to be used as nuclear waste dumps, as a process of
2 getting toward reaching this -- reaching the proposal in
3 advance. So they're given more and more money just to sort
4 of keep them going.

5 I'm alarmed at how such proposals smack of
6 systematic exploitation of indigenous peoples. To me it is
7 clear that the environmental assessment's executive order
8 seems to be violated, since it is documented that Native
9 people's land is targetted for dumping.

10 As I'm sure you're aware, in the state of New
11 Mexico they recently held a similar symposium, and I don't
12 have all of the details, but, you know, I understand that
13 the Native peoples are very active, and the people in the
14 state also put pressure on their members of congress to
15 actually stop that influx of money to the office of the
16 nuclear negotiator.

17 Specific to this proposal, the DEI states that
18 population density is supposed to be analyzed within a
19 radius -- radius of about five miles. Then it states that
20 due to minority populations in Utah being relatively low or
21 under represented compared to other states, for some reason
22 it looks to me like you've arbitrarily decided to expand
23 that radius out to 50 miles. It seems clear to me that this
24 has the effect of altering or deleting it so that it
25 conforms to your need to rationalize the proposed travesty.

1 Thus, since within a radius of 50 miles one finds some of
2 the most affluent and some of the most impoverished peoples,
3 it appears to me that you have attempted to try to
4 circumvent the environmental justice executive order.

5 Relatedly, I wonder if you've violated sacred
6 sites -- sacred sites executive order. I'm going to take
7 the liberty to quote from Margene Bear, who is quoted in
8 "Outside Magazine," May 2000. She said about her home,
9 "When you stand up here and look out over the valley, it is
10 so pretty that one can feel the beauty. Some people have to
11 go to church to meditate, but I don't have to go anywhere.
12 I just have to be here."

13 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you. For the record, I
14 think it's Margene Volcreek.

15 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'm sorry. I'm so
16 sorry.

17 MS. SHANKMAN: We have about ten more minutes for
18 the court reporter, and I think we have four more speakers,
19 so --

20 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay. With respect
21 to assessing impact of this proposal on homes and housing,
22 you completely neglected to site that residents of Skull
23 Valley and other communities might feel compelled to move.
24 We've heard from families today that said that they feel
25 compelled to move if this -- if this proposal would go

1 through. Also quoting from "Outside Magazine," Margene
2 Volcreek said that she felt like she would have to move if
3 this proposal did go through.

4 You also stated, of course, we've heard that home
5 prices -- you actually stated that they would go up.
6 Obviously, you know, you're ignoring research there that is
7 -- you know, is well documented that shows that along
8 transportation routes near waste dump sites, okay, that
9 property values go down. Often people move out.

10 Okay. Also, of course, you're going to get even
11 lower tax revenues coming into Tooele County, so it's not
12 going to be increased.

13 Okay. Another thing is -- I believe I've already
14 said. I can go ahead and send this in.

15 One additional thing is that with the wells --
16 drilling of the wells, it doesn't look to me anywhere in the
17 DEIS like you've analyzed whether impacts to groundwater is
18 assessed. You just say you need a -- large amounts of water
19 to construct and operate this facility, and you're going to
20 dig all these wells, and I guess you're just going to dig
21 some more if you don't have enough water, is what it sounds
22 like to me. I think that that could actually have a very
23 serious impact on the desert.

24 So I'm going to send in my comments, but I'd also
25 like to say that, along with many others, I feel like we

1 need to have hearings throughout all of the different states
2 where this waste is going to be traveling. We need to have
3 the public comment period here in Utah extended for at least
4 180 additional days.

5 And I believe that's it.

6 [Applause.]

7 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you very much.

8 Cynthia of the Desert, to to be followed by Dianne
9 Nielson.

10 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Good evening, again.
11 I truly appreciate the chance to speak to you again this
12 evening.

13 Once again, we are all pressed for time, but I
14 want this to be taken in a positive light. People are
15 becoming educated, and you're going to become well aware
16 that there are more responses like this.

17 I'll give you a little background of who I am,
18 first. I'm a founding member of Utah Peace Test. We've
19 been around for 14 years, originally active around the
20 Nevada test site.

21 I've read many of the DEIS an other documents
22 about Yucca Mountain, and that's why I could plow through
23 this one, also.

24 I have joined this current coalition with many
25 Utahans, Citizens Against Radioactive Waste in Utah and also

1 FAIR. We're beginning to stand up to this in our
2 communities because they're beginning to realize that it
3 affects all of us. This has been very difficult to get out
4 into the community until very recently, as you have heard
5 repeatedly tonight, but now the people are beginning to be
6 aware, you're going to get a lot of response. You've --
7 you've had a lot of it in the last month, and it's going to
8 continue, I guarantee it.

9 I, too, along with a lot of the people, am going
10 to edit my remarks because many, many of them have been
11 repeated very eloquently tonight. It will in my written --

12 Once again, I invite you -- actually, I demand
13 that you extend these hearings to as many as there are
14 necessary to people who need to understand this and speak
15 out, not only in Salt Lake, but Tooele -- Tooele, the
16 cancelled hearing. Whatever happened to that one, I don't
17 know. Grantsville, again, Spanish Fork, and all the cities
18 and towns and municipalities along the DEIS-stated -- very
19 vaguely, I might add -- route through the state of the Utah
20 and, indeed, along all the roads throughout, from all the
21 power plants through all the corridor communities, to this
22 proposed facility in Skull Valley.

23 Many of those mayors of those towns and cities are
24 now aware of this situation, but not from your direction.
25 We've done some of your work for you, and you need you to

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

1 understand that.

2 [Applause.]

3 You -- you must respond to the public. Indeed,
4 you have a moral responsibility, even if your legal language
5 says that you really don't have to. And I know that you've
6 heard this before, but I'd like you to hear it again.

7 Remember, you're -- you're here tonight in
8 response to the overwhelming public interest generated two
9 weeks ago, which you didn't expect and were not very well
10 prepared for. Because of this, there really needs to be an
11 extension of hearings and where they're held.

12 Also, again, along with everyone else, I am
13 insisting that you extend the written response deadline for
14 at least six months, to give people a chance to really get
15 familiar with your huge doorstep, and try to understand what
16 it all means and what it means to them.

17 You know, what is this unconscionable rush to
18 decision making, that will affect literally seven
19 generations? This is the least you can do in your
20 regulatory capacity, since in your regulatory capacity,
21 since six months cannot be compared to 10,000 years. Don't
22 rush this.

23 [Applause.]

24 I'm going to just hit a couple of points in the
25 DEIS. Oh, wait. This is even -- even more important. If

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

1 the D.O.T. is the governing agency charged with the
2 responsibility of the routes, why aren't they part of this
3 process? And, again, if the Department of Defense is the
4 military oversight agency, and you've heard many, many
5 concerns about that, why are they not part of this? You've
6 heard strong concerns about the military impact. There are
7 many of us strange bedfellows out here, I'll tell you. This
8 is covering the spectrum in Utah, everyone. I ask for a
9 restructuring of your hearings to include both of those
10 federal parties -- agencies.

11 Okay. In -- in addressing, directly, the DEIS,
12 there are no plans for emergency response regarding fire
13 suppression. Tooele County representative Ron Allen, also
14 the volunteer fire chief, stated two hearings ago that the
15 volunteer fire department would not cover fires at the
16 facility or the wildfires. The wildfires have already been
17 mentioned tonight. The west is on fire. We've had several
18 small ones in Skull Valley. They aren't going to stop.

19 The acquifers, you know, they're not dealt with in
20 the DEIS. There are a few small springs. I've been out
21 there, I've seen them. It's a beautiful, lovely little
22 spot. Not enough to construct this facility, not enough of
23 air, water and fire issues. Where will the water come from?

24 Values are not addressed. They will be affected,
25 even if only through perception. And I've already read into

1 the record two weeks ago what happened in New Mexico on just
2 the perception of -- of decreased property values.

3 DR. SHANKMAN: Okay. The court reporter will --
4 we have three more people. If you can limit your remarks --

5 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I will.

6 DR. SHANKMAN: -- we'll try to get it all on the
7 record, but I really would ask you, since you've already
8 spoken once --

9 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Many people have
10 spoken several times.

11 I, too, interestingly enough, have maps. And the
12 last thing that I want to speak to you about the DEIS -- and
13 these -- this map is from the USGS.

14 DR. SHANKMAN: Could you just give those to us so
15 we can get the other people on the record?

16 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Right in the middle
17 of this map are -- are the fault lines that are going to run
18 right in the middle, right underneath the proposed waste
19 site, waste dump. This has not been addressed adequately.
20 And, of course, in my remarks I'll deal with it a lot more
21 efficiently. I'll also make sure you have copy of this, in
22 case you don't already.

23 DR. SHANKMAN: Thanks.

24 Who's next, Mark?

25 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: There are no

1 acceptable risks. Acceptable to who? Not to Utah.

2 Thank you very much.

3 MR. DELLIGATTI: Thank you.

4 Dr. Nielson, to be followed by Cory Hooplaiang.

5 DR. SHANKMAN: And the last one?

6 MR. DELLIGATTI: And the last one is Mr. Scott
7 Northard.

8 DR. SHANKMAN: Okay. Okay.

9 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

10 I'm Dianne Nielson. I'm here representing
11 Governor Leavitt this evening. And on his behalf and in
12 concert with numerous requests this evening, I would ask
13 that you extend the comment period for written comments;
14 that you provide an opportunity for additional hearings,
15 both within the State of Utah at transportation corridors,
16 particularly in the central and southern part of the state,
17 transportation areas which will be impacted from shipments
18 to PFS from southern California, from shipments back to
19 California, if there's not a permanent repository, or to
20 Yucca Mountain, if that repository is approved; that you
21 extend public comment to citizens along the entire
22 transportation corridor, [applause] many of whom at this
23 point have no idea this proposal is going forward, in the
24 interest of providing a complete and adequate record upon
25 which to evaluate the Draft EIS and the impacts.

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

1 Take the time to get that information. It's worth
2 noting. And I would, in -- in doing that, thank you for the
3 third hearing, which was not part of the original schedule.
4 But it is worth noting that every one of the hearings that
5 you have held here have gone over time, over expectation,
6 and still have required, in the process of doing that, that
7 people shorten their comments. And they've been willing to
8 do that, and I think you -- you would agree, on the whole,
9 that this has been a very respectful group, and we
10 appreciate your commitment to these hearings. But the fact
11 of the matter is that we have heard from only a few people
12 from outside the state, and if there were an opportunity for
13 people on the transportation corridor to know of this
14 proposal, there would not have been sufficient time in any
15 of these hearings to receive their comments. That's just a
16 record that's based on the time we've gone over, even with
17 the existing limitations.

18 So I would urge you to ask the questions, to
19 provide the opportunities for comments, to take the
20 opportunity to hear that information and evaluate it now,
21 because to hear it after the comment period is over, to hear
22 it after the decisions are made, is too late.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. DELLIGATTI: I hope I didn't butcher your name
25 too badly.

1 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: No. That's fine.
2 That's fine.

3 [There was a discussion held off the record while
4 the court reporter changed disks.]

5 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: First off, I would
6 like to thank the NRC for coming, and I -- I sort of -- as
7 I've been sitting there, I think it's a foregone conclusion
8 that you have already made your decision, or at least you
9 know how the citizens of the State of Utah feel about it,
10 you know. I mean, it's obvious that -- and I also feel like
11 many of the people here tonight were very misinformed on the
12 meetings and the impact that us being here could actually
13 make on your decision -- on your decision.

14 I know that I could go out and petition my
15 neighbors and get thousands of people to sign a petition
16 saying, "We don't want to have the state as a dumping ground
17 for the nuclear waste." And everything that's --

18 I met at the governor's office today to find out
19 why he hasn't tried to kill this thing from happening, and
20 -- and they've exhausted all their resources. This has been
21 going on for a period of like ten years. And, well, Leon
22 will back me on that, and he's the one that's trying to get
23 this thing through. So you look like you've been -- it's
24 been going on for a long time. But Governor Leavitt's
25 office, he feels like he's exhausted the resources that are

1 available to him, trying to do everything in his power to
2 prevent this from coming to the state. He's tried to build
3 a mote around the Goshute reservation with state lands so
4 they can't be accessed by PFS to put their nuclear waste in
5 there. And I admire his efforts for doing so.

6 We own land out there in the valley, and we were
7 actually considering building a town site, you know,
8 establishing an industry and putting all of our money that
9 -- we're in manufacturing out in there, to built a town site
10 so that we could curtail that from happening, but the
11 proximity of where it's going to be stored is too far away,
12 and even having a town site out there with, say, 10,000
13 people didn't matter. And I think the idea of having a site
14 there has already been decided.

15 I find it -- I find it amusing that you -- you put
16 down "metric tons," because, you know, I wasn't sure if a
17 metric ton was heavier than a regular ton. I've come to
18 find out it's not 44,000 -- or excuse me, it is 40,000
19 metric tons that you're proposing to put out there, but, in
20 actuality, in my -- in my -- layman terms it's actually
21 44,000 pounds of nuclear waste. And so, to me, it's even on
22 a grander scale than what -- what was announced in the
23 paper.

24 And it -- it put sort of -- what I'd like the NRC
25 to consider is, you know, there's been a lot of controversy

1 on all the money that's going to be spent in transporting
2 this nuclear waste out there. There are some scientists
3 here who are brilliant, and Steve Barrowes for one, he's a
4 brilliant scientist, and there were two others that were
5 here. And Bill said that the INL is a company based out of
6 Idaho who he says reposal --

7 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Reprocess.

8 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Reprocess, excuse me.

9 That they actually have the knowledge and capability to
10 reprocess this radioactive material back into energy to
11 where it is no longer a threat, but he mentioned that it
12 comes as a cost of about 300 billion dollars. Well, from
13 where I come from, I understand that there's about \$60
14 billion in an escrow account that's been formed from all
15 these nuclear facilities that have been putting money into
16 an escrow account to -- to get rid of the radioactive
17 material waste that they are creating. They know they're
18 creating it. So for every amount of energy that they're
19 producing they're having to put a certain amount of money
20 away; is that correct? Okay. And if there's \$60 billion in
21 an escrow account -- and I don't that the amount of
22 interest, but, man, that's a sum, to me. But it would seem
23 plausible to me that if -- if three and a billion dollars to
24 create a plant to --

25 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Recycle.

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

1 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: -- recycle. I'm going
2 to say recycle. I'm sorry. This late I'm starting to melt.
3 I've been here all day. And you guys are starting melt,
4 too, kind of. But it's really a serious issue.

5 But I feel like if there is that much money in an
6 escrow account, why can't they take that money, and instead
7 of spending it in transporting it and trying to build
8 facilities, why can't they build a facility to reconstitute
9 it or recycle this material, close to where it's being
10 manufactured, instead of having it shipped in? I don't
11 understand that.

12 [Applause.]

13 Okay. It's not enough money to have a recycling
14 plant at each one of those facilities, but certainly you
15 could build one close enough to where two or three could be
16 -- okay. I'm sorry my times up. I appreciate the time.

17 I just -- and the wording, when it says that "I am
18 for a no action alternative," I'm for an action alternative.
19 I think it should be "Yes, I'm for an action alternative."
20 It should be just the opposite, to me. I think we need to
21 look for something -- for other ways.

22 And earlier I said why can't they do it in you
23 know, like in Ohio. And I don't want to dump on those
24 people, but something that's a little more centrally
25 located, that they don't have to come across the Rocky

1 Mountains to dump their nuclear waste. If it was something
2 that -- you know, run a rail spur in South Dakota or North
3 Dakota or some place that would be a little more accessible
4 to people on the east coast where -- well, I think it was
5 mentioned that 70 percent of the -- of the nuclear waste was
6 being, you know, produced.

7 But -- and, also, one other thing: As I was
8 sitting there I couldn't help but think that the NRC -- that
9 the decision -- this keeps coming back to me, that the
10 decision's already been made. Am I'm wrong?

11 DR. SHANKMAN: For the record, the decision has
12 not been made.

13 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Well --

14 DR. SHANKMAN: The -- the document that you are
15 quoting from, or other people have voted from, is called a
16 "Draft Environmental Impact Statement," and we are -- we
17 will answer every comment that we get in writing.

18 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: And I -- I wonder who
19 assigned you the position to be here? Is it our congressman
20 or -- I mean, who -- who assigned you to this position to
21 make -- or to, you know, take the information back? Who's
22 going to be analyzing information that you're taking back?
23 I mean, who -- who do we, as citizens of Utah, go to to say
24 -- okay, we -- we send our comments to you, because I would
25 like to be able to write to my congressman or senator or

1 whoever it might be, to let him know that I don't want it to
2 stop with you, I want to go on, because I'm really concerned
3 that is an issue.

4 DR. SHANKMAN: Once again, we are acting from a
5 legislative mandate, which is congressional, so that would
6 be appropriate.

7 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay. And I just
8 wanted to dispell -- somebody was mentioning about the fires
9 -- fires in Skull Valley, because we have property out
10 there. We had one of our members, she set off the fire that
11 was -- I don't know, it was five miles long. We had
12 spotting plans and drop planes. And I don't think fire is
13 an issue, as far as if there is a nuclear site out there, or
14 nuclear waste out there. We've spent \$80,000 this year out
15 there and -- last year, and I don't know how much they spent
16 this year.

17 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: What is your
18 authority?

19 DR SHANKMAN: We have one more speaker, and I'll
20 be glad to answer any of your questions afterwards about
21 what our authority is and where it comes from.

22 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I just want to thank
23 you for your time, and everybody that stayed, and thank you.

24 FEMALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Are you appointed?

25 DR. SHANKMAN: I'll be glad to answer all those

1 questions after the last speaker speaks, okay?

2 MALE AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'm Scott Northard.
3 I'm with Northern States Power Company, and I'm also a
4 project manager for Private Fuel storage.

5 I want to, first of all, thank the NRC for having
6 this additional hearing. I think it's important for the
7 public to express their views. And I've taken a lot of
8 notes today. A lot of people have spoken very passionately
9 about their beliefs and, believe me, we to take those to
10 heart.

11 But I wanted to tell you a little bit about my
12 background. I've been involved in the nuclear industry for
13 23 years, involved specifically with handling storage and
14 transportation of spent fuel. Our company has done all of
15 those and has done those safely, and I know that it can and
16 is done -- can and -- and is done safely regularly. The key
17 is having high-quality standards and a respect for the
18 technology, and -- and to have a conservative attitude about
19 what you do.

20 I primarily came here today to listen. I'm not
21 going to provide a lot of comments and, out of respect for
22 the court reporter, I'll try to limit those quickly here.

23 Just to touch on a couple of issues in the Draft
24 Environmental Impact Statement, first is the issue of need.
25 There is, in fact, a need for this facility. 21 percent of

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

1 our nation's electricity comes from nuclear power. This
2 summer alone there have been 14 energy alerts in California
3 where we've been on the verge of involuntarily interrupting
4 customers. Now, because of -- there have not been large
5 base low power plants built. Northern States Power, the
6 company I work for, has -- has one of the largest wind
7 installations in the country, yet there are days when the
8 wind doesn't blow and we still need the energy, and it turns
9 out in many case those are the warmest days of the area and
10 our loads are the highest.

11 The second issue, with respect to whether this
12 facility will be temporary, yes it will be temporary, and
13 there are a number of reasons for that. One of the biggest,
14 though, is that our nation needs to get on with a permanent
15 solution, and -- for disposal of spent fuel and high-level
16 waste. I think most experts would agree that commercial
17 spent fuel doesn't present a lot of immediate health and
18 safety risks to the public, but there are materials stored
19 that are left over from the weapons production programs up
20 in Washington, Idaho, Savannah River, Rocky Flats, and many
21 other places, that need to have a permanent solution, and I
22 think our nation will move forward and -- and license a
23 facility like Yucca Mountain, in order to store those.

24 Finally, the issue was brought up tonight of
25 LLC's, limited liability companies. And in fact, the

1 Private Fuel Storage is organized under that mechanism. I'd
2 like to point out that even though Private Fuel Storage is
3 licensed as an LLC, the nuclear utility companies themselves
4 will always retain title to the spent fuel until the federal
5 government takes possession of it. That is a provision
6 that's built into our agreement with the tribe and is a
7 consideration in the license.

8 And I'd just like to, again, thank the NRC for
9 having these hearings and just to make a statement for the
10 record on behalf of Private Fuel Storage: If this can't be
11 done safely, it won't be built. And that's -- and that's
12 our -- been our commitment from the very beginning.

13 [Applause.]

14 Thank you. Mr. Northard.

15 DR. SHANKMAN: Okay. I want to thank everybody
16 who stayed, and I want to thank the people of the panel.
17 We're going to go off the record now, Kerry. Thank you.

18 [The hearing was concluded at 11:15 p.m.]
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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 THE P DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT 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