Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Scoping Meeting for the Environmental

Impact Statement for Holtec International's Hi-store Consolidated Interim Storage Facility for Spent Nuclear Fuel Located in Lea County,

New Mexico

Docket Number: N/A

Location: Roswell, New Mexico

Date: April 30, 2018

Work Order No.: NRC-3668 Pages 1-171

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

	_
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL
5	IMPACT STATEMENT FOR HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL'S
6	HI-STORE CONSOLIDATED INTERIM STORAGE FACILITY
7	FOR SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL LOCATED IN
8	LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO
9	+ + + +
10	MONDAY,
11	APRIL 30, 2018
12	+ + + +
13	ROSWELL, NEW MEXICO
14	+ + + +
15	The Public Scoping Meeting was convened in
16	the Commissioners' Hearing Room at the Eastern
17	University of New Mexico-Roswell, Campus Union
18	Building, 48 University Boulevard, at 4:00 p.m., Chip
19	Cameron, facilitating.
20	
21	NRC STAFF PRESENT:
22	CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator
23	BRIAN SMITH, Deputy Director, Division of Fuel Cycle
24	Safety, Safeguards, and Environmental Review,
25	Office of Nuclear Material Safety and

	2
1	Safeguards (NMSS)
2	JILL CAVERLY, Environmental Review Project Manager,
3	Environmental Review Branch, NMSS
4	JOSE CUADRADO, Licensing and Safety Review Project
5	Manager, Spent Fuel Licensing Branch, NMSS
6	JOHN McKIRGAN, Chief, Spent Fuel Licensing Branch,
7	NMSS
8	CINTHYA ROMAN, Chief, Environmental Review Branch,
9	NMSS
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

3:55 p.m.

MS. KNIGHT: My name is Cathy Knight. I live in Roswell, New Mexico. I appreciate that you have been tasked with a difficult decision. Many lives will be affected by your choices. I do not want high-level nuclear waste moved across the United States. In 1982 the U.S. agreed to provide permanent disposal of high level nuclear waste. During the last 36 years, our knowledge concerning nuclear waste has evolved. It is no longer a prudent choice to move high level nuclear waste to a large storage site. The dangers of transport should not be underestimated. Environmental contamination, illness and death of U.S. citizens will occur.

A better option is to leave the high level nuclear waste where it is. Store it according to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Guidelines of five years in spent fuel pools and then transfer to dry cask storage. Have a robust system in place to assure compliance. Monies collected from nuclear electricity producers and placed in the Nuclear Waste Fund totals approximately \$40 billion. It can be returned to those energy producers on a set schedule so they have the resources needed to follow the National Regulatory

Commission's storage guidelines. I do not consent to bringing high level nuclear waste to New Mexico.

(Pause)

MR. GROGAN: I just want to speak out in favor of the storage site. We have some 90,000 metric tons of nuclear waste. I feel like that is the best place that I could think of to put it -- for future generations our nation needs to have somebody to dispose of it, or do it in a safe manner. That's about it.

(Pause)

MR. CAMERON: Good evening, everyone. I am Chip Cameron and I am going to be facilitating the public meeting tonight. We have a poster session scheduled from 4:00-7:00, and then we are going to have comments from everybody. Some NRC presentations and then comments from all of you that we're putting on the record with our court reporter. The reason I asked you all to come in is that we have the mayor of Roswell here, Dennis Kintigh. And Dennis has a conflict later on at 7:00. And so I wanted to give him the opportunity to just say a few words to all of you before he has to leave. And thank you for all coming in.

MR. KINTIGH: Thank you. All right, full

disclosure, my wife went to Texas on Thursday to visit
grandkids. She is on her way home tonight. So, I am
sorry, I am going to go see my wife who I have not
seen in four days. Nothing personal. Don't mean to
diminish the importance, but family does come first.
I want to thank everybody from Roswell for coming out
tonight. I want to thank you folks from the NRC for
participating and putting this forward. This is an
opportunity for a respectful dialogue. And I know
that the folks from Roswell here are that kind of
people. So I look forward to a honest, respectful,
informative dialogue. Share of concerns, state your
opinions, listen for each other and have a great
evening. And I encourage everybody here who is not
from Roswell to check out some of our sites while you
are here. We have a couple of great art museums. I
encourage you to go visit. And check out our we
have some wonderful restaurants. And it's a
fascinating town. So, without further ado and I
do apologize, I have another meeting now actually,
I have two meetings now, but I will have to move on.
So, thank you very much. Thank you very much. Have
a great evening.

24 (Pause)

MS. BROOKS STEPHENS: I have toured the

website. Prior to the accident. I've been to Los
Alamos multiple times. This is all an accident
waiting to happen. I was witness to a pickup truck
almost plowing into a WIPP truck that was taking waste
to Carlsbad. And they were within inches it was
a drunk driver. They were within inches and it was
just during the trial period before they really
started shipping. And I know that accidents happen.
Again, I know multiple people that are dying or have
died from working at Los Alamos. And I know that this
waste leaks. Even though they tell us it doesn't, it
does. And it's going to be leaking on our roads.
It's going to be leaking on our railroad track. You
have tracks running by schools. Dexter, New Mexico,
you're within feet of the of two of the schools,
the junior high and the high school or, mid-school
and high school. And there this is far too
dangerous for us to have in our state. Let them keep
it where they created it. This will be going across
the entire United States and they may very well bring
it in internationally. And I am fed up with the whole
discussion. They need to stop it. We don't want it.
I have over I counted them up last night over
60 relatives in the Roswell area alone. I don't want
my children, grandchildren and extended relatives to

light up like lightbulbs. And they swore to me at WIPP it would never happen. But within a couple of months of my touring WIPP, it did happen there. And as I said, I know multiple people -- a neighbor, my former boss -- all dying or dead because of the Los Alamos situation. We don't want this. It's that simple.

And I am not just representing me, I am representing a lot of people. And I teach my students teacher, I teach my students. this. challenged the young people at the -when I was teaching in the Apache and the Navajo. They didn't even know that -- that we were doing storage on the reservations. And I challenged them to go home and ask their parents. Their parents didn't know. So they went to the tribal headquarters and found out that, yes indeed, we were. And they got upset and are making the government clean that up. And this isn't something that just popped out of my ear. I've been watching this for years. I grew up in Alomogordo part of my life is growing up there, even though I am Roswell native. I don't want it.

Again, I grew in Alomogordo, but I am from Roswell originally and I simply don't want it. Seen enough of it. We don't need it. Don't know how much

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 else to say other than I've watched it firsthand. So thank you so much. 2 3 PARTICIPANT: You said you grew up where? MS. BROOKS STEPHENS: I was born in 4 5 Roswell, I grew up in Alomogordo.. So I would have --I watched the Trinity site. I had the friends that 6 7 have died from that. Up in Los Alamos, I had a boss 8 that died from there. I had a neighbor that died from 9 working up there. All of them with these horrible 10 cancers and -- enough. And it's -we don't want our kids going up in smoke. Thank you so much. 11 let them keep it where they creat it -- onsite. 12 dripping it on our roads. Not dripping it past our 13 14 schools. Remember two years ago when they had the 15 WIPP site closed down and they were having them store 16 it on trains? 17 PARTICIPANT: Do you want this to be more of your comment? 18 Or -- -19 BROOKS STEPHENS: Yes, this part. Three years back, two years back they stored nuclear 20 waste on trains on our tracks. And some of those 21 trains were sitting on the railroad tracks between 22 here and Albuquerque. It was all over the new shows. 23 24 But we have schools next to these tracks. We have churches and homes and neighborhoods. 25 And again,

we've had enough. We don't want any more.

(Pause)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SUDERMAN KING: Ronda Suderman King. It's R-O-N-D-A and then S-U-D-E-R-M-A-N and then second name -- or, third name King, K-I-N-G.

PARTICIPANT: Whenever you're ready.

MS. SUDERMAN KING: Okay. Well, I am from Carlsbad, New Mexico. And I am one of the increasing number of people who oppose strongly the nation's deadliest radioactive waste in our community. waste site would consist of used fuel rods that have bene inside operating nuclear reactors. And much of those used fuel rods can be degraded within a century, but some remain active for 1,000,000 years. Му is it's considered concern that temporary repository. And that's what Holtec International's project is, is a temporary repository. But these fuel rods come from all over the country. But only for a temporary site. But there's no permanent site. Holtec has no long-range plans for a permanent site. haven't heard anything from the federal And government that they have plans for a long-range permanent site.

My concern is for the generations beyond me. I am not going to be here in 125 years when --

or maybe less than that when it needs to go to another site. But my children, my children's children, my children's children's children -- they're going to be here. And I think a permanent site needs to be planned before this temporary site comes into operation. In fact, the temporary site doesn't make much sense to me. A permanent site will, and I would be glad to entertain plans for what that permanent site is.

The federal government has failed to come up with a plan for a permanent site for many decades. Holtec International is a for-profit company. when they cease to make a profit over this, then what's going to happen to these spent nuclear rods? Are they going to stay where they're at? Or is there going to be a plan for a permanent site for these So it seems ridiculous to me how kinds of things? people can think that a temporary site is a good idea when there's no permanent plans for this nuclear Which is important. I agree that it's very waste. important to come up with a permanent site. agree that nobody wants nuclear waste in backyard. But at this point, it's because there is no permanency to this site and no permanency to what they're going to do with it. And that's my objection.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Okay, thank you.

(Pause)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Gene Harbaugh, G-E-N-E, MR. HARBAUGH: Harbaugh, H-A-R-B-A-U-G-H. Okay, just a moment there. Well, I think that the main objection to this proposal is that it is to be a temporary or interim site. do not consent to that for the reason that continuing to move nuclear waste around the country to temporary sites simply exposes more people to the dangers and raises the possibility of accidents, especially given the state of the infrastructure in I am speaking particularly of rail this country. I live within 300 yards of a railroad switch yard. They are constantly having to repair track and work on that facility and I am sure it is no different in other parts of the country where this waste will pass through. So until there is permanent repository, I believe the NRC would serve the best interest of the people of this country by denying this Holtec proposal.

(Pause)

MR. BURNAM: Okay, I am Lon Burnam, I live in Fort Worth, Texas. For 18 years I served Central City Fort Worth in the Texas Legislature. And during that time I learned quite a bit about the rail system

in Texas, but particularly in Fort Worth where we had eight different rail lines coming into Fort Worth. The rail transportation infrastructure in this country is totally inadequate to handle the proposed transport of these really, really heavy casks through our urban centers and over our rural bridges, some of which are 100 years old. It's ludicrous to think that our transportation system can handle what's being proposed and any environmental impact statement that is worth its weight in the paper it will be printed on will take into consideration that this is a national environmental impact. They're proposing to transport this waste from over 100 plants, most of which are east of the Mississippi, through my home community in Fort Worth, and to Southeastern New Mexico. And that's enough for now.

(Pause)

MS. C. SMITH: Okay, my concern is nuclear waste, accidents happen. I live in Pennsylvania where Three Mile Island happened and my youngest daughter ended up with a birth defect. I am part Native American, and I am not really concerned for our generation or the next generation, but for the next seven generations. That was one of my concerns of many, but that is my main concern -- that the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

environment will be safe. My generation and my children's generation and my grandchildren's generation -- their generations. That's it.

(Pause)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CARDONA: Patricia, P-A-T-R-I-C-I-A, Cardona, C-A-R-D-O-N-A. Okay, I am ready. Okay, what I would like to do is talk about several areas. is the liability for losses to the state -- in case of accidents to private individuals and property damage well as personal injury, devaluation and stigma that will -- that may occur to businesses well the property of as as to individual residential areas. But I'd also like to talk about stewardship and continuous stewardship of any proposed site to be sure that there is no abandonment in the future of the site and the casks. And the casks themselves, the process for possessing -- for taking possession of the casks -- who takes possession? And who has liability at what point in the process? How the casks will be labeled? And the documentation preserved in order to ensure that the company maintains liability for any casks that are improperly -- are improperly passed on to the -- you know, passed on to the -- to the next step.

One of the -- so, I am going to start

with the liability for losses. One of the things that
you have liability exposure and State Representative
Brown has stated that the federal government will
assume the liability for any and all losses. However,
it is not clear what the role is of the utility
company and whether or not the utility company has the
right to transfer the risk to other groups. Or to
another state or to another entity. One of the
problems is that if there is an LLC in the middle of
this, an LLC can declare bankruptcy. And in the case
this happened in New Mexico with the brine well.
We can end up with the state of New Mexico for any
accident or any loss of revenue because of an
accident, shutting down businesses, shutting down
state revenue. Who is going to assume the liability
for those losses? The State of New Mexico has a lot
of gas and oil. And activity at the near the site
and all along the area of Southern New Mexico. If
there is some kind of leak and shutdown, is it indeed
the federal government who is going to assume the
liability for the loss of the business as well as for
state revenue? Because the businesses generate
revenue to the state about 30 percent of our
revenue comes from gas and oil. So that those
issues need to be dealt with. Who is responsible for

that? Especially when an LLC can just declare bankruptcy and have no -- no liability in it.

The other thing in this area is if there is an incident or a release of radioactive material, it will devaluate the property. It will also devaluate products, especially if they're, like, dairy products, tourism -- people are going to be loathing to come to an area that is infected with radiation. And products become permanently stigmatized. Who pays for the property devaluation and who pays for the devaluation of products? Does the federal government, as stated by Cathrynn Brown, our representative? Does the federal government assume that liability?

I am moving on to another issue which is the issue of how that site, should it become -- it should become constructed, how will stewardship be handled? Will it continue on to how many generations? There is no provision at all that I can see for making sure that the site does not become abandoned after, say, ten, fifteen years. They -- something happens with a budget and there's no longer any money -- how are they going to ensure money will continue to be available for guarding the site and for repairing casks that may be damaged during the -- during the process of storage? And there is a real big issue,

which I am not going to talk about right now, is the fact that that area that is proposed has karst formation. There's a lot of caves, brine wells and that -- and water running around that -- underneath those areas -- in and around those areas. If there is an incident, who is going to repair the cask? Where's the money going to come from? Does it come from the federal government? Holtec is a company. They can declare bankruptcy. Then where is -- where is the population left?

The cask itself -- at what point does the federal government assume liability for the cask? And at what point in the initial transfer -- how is that cask going to be labeled? The source? The date? condition? How are they going to document condition of the cask? And if it is improperly transported because it, in fact, is damaged, who -who has the liability for that? And how is it going to be document? In other words, are the casks going The utility company's name on the to be numbered? cask? And the date of the transfer and the inspector? Who inspected the cask? And who verified that it was in good condition to be able to be transported? That's my statement for today.

(Pause)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. J. SMITH: So, my name is Judith Smith and I live in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Unfortunately, I had to travel three hours in order to be able to talk to the Holtec company and to talk to the EPA people about this -- whatever your group is --What is this? Whatever. They're very good -government people were very helpful. My biggest concern right now is that the way these canisters are going to be sticking up to the surface of the earth and the only thing protecting them is a six-inch steel plate on top. And I don't see how that can withstand some clever terrorist attack. Bomb, drone -- I don't It's a huge target. It's a huge field -out in the open, in the middle of the desert near the border with another country that's probably a little bit upset with us right now anyway, and I can't be sure that that steel plate is going to protect us.

I am also concerned about any cleanup because the government and the companies have been very unkind to New Mexico over the years with uranium cleanup, which is still making people in the northwest part of our state sick. And there are also companies here who are leaking methane all over the place and polluting our air. And the government and other -- whoever else is responsible doesn't seem to be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

stepping in. We're trying to struggle with it as a state, but we're taking waste from all over the country, which seems to us -- that this state shouldn't be held responsible for these possible disasters.

(Pause)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. J. SMITH: Should I just continue with my own comment? I just want to add a comment that the people from the NRC have been very kind and very forthcoming. However, the problem I have is that this opportunity is three hours from my home and along drive through the desert, and three hours drive back. It couldn't be much further from one end of the state to the other -- probably five hours -- and I think that these opportunities need to be spread out across the state, especially to places in our state where there are large populations who would like to make their thoughts known and ask questions. Because in this state, we all care about each other. aren't that many of us. It's big and we love it. And it's the Land of Enchantment. And it's not going to be enchanting if we get a reputation for leaked nuclear radioactivity. That's it. Thank you.

(Pause)

MR. JOHNSON: Daniel Johnson. Thank you.

My concern is from the permian basin. How will it affect the oil drilling in that area? Because of our dependence on the fossil fuels. And especially in New Mexico -- our economic impact. If our fossil fuels are somehow impeded or somehow they're not -can't get into them because of this area. And will it affect it going down, burying this stuff like they intend to -- if it will affect the fossil fuels. am looking at the economic impact of the oil industry -- and drilling and so forth. It's -see that as a possible problem. Also, something about that grade of waste in twenty year, Navy Marine. I've been around it. And dangerous. So that -- that's my comment.

(Pause)

MR. RAMERO: Okay, so I thought I would come out here today. I am the chairman of the Democratic Party of Chaves County. Just to give you a brief -- without getting into, you know, specifics of anything -- had a rudimentary sense, in my opinion, I know there will be arguments in favor of this. But my opinion is I am against this. I think, you know, dumping radioactive waste in our backyard, honestly, I think just at any level for me, at least, is a bad idea and I am against it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(Pause)

MR. CAMERON: Good evening, everybody. It's so nice to see all of you tonight and thank you for coming out to join us for the first of three NRC meetings in Southeastern New Mexico on the NRC's review of the license application that they received from Holtec International to build and construct an interim spent fuel storage facility in Lea County, New Mexico.

And my name is Chip Cameron and I'm going to be the facilitator for the meeting tonight, and in that role I'll try to help all of you to have a productive meeting.

The focus of tonight's meeting is on something called scoping, and scoping is a term that's used under the National Environmental Policy Act, a federal law that requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement in certain circumstances, and this is a circumstance that the NRC is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement.

So what does scoping mean? It's simple really. It's what should be evaluated in the Environmental Impact Statement? What doesn't need to be evaluated in the Environmental Impact Statement? In other words, what's the scope of the statement?

And the NRC staff is here tonight to hear any comments or suggestions you have on that matter.

And there's two objectives tonight for the meeting. First objective for the NRC staff is to clearly explain the NRC license review process to you. Second objective is for the NRC to have an opportunity to listen to your comments, your advice on the important issues. And those two objectives, they correspond to the two segments of the meeting, to the agenda of the meeting.

First of all, we're going to hear from the NRC staff. They're going to explain the review process to you on this license application. And the second part of the meeting is to hear public comment from all of you. And there's going to be a few minutes; and probably I should emphasize "few," to see if there's any clarifying questions on the license review process. And I'm emphasizing "process." See if we can answer some of those before we go on to public comment.

We have an amazing amount of people who want to talk tonight, around 50 people. And usually I set a guideline of five minutes a speaker, but because there's 50 people, we're going to go to four minutes. And I apologize to those of you who I have

to ask to finish your comments tonight because I know that you've spent time and energy preparing comments and coming to this meeting.

Now fortunately there are several other ways to comment, provide scoping comments to the NRC staff; and the staff will tell you how to do that, but basically you can send a comment in in writing. Even if you comment tonight, if you want to amplify on your comments, feel -- you're perfectly free to do that. So we have sort of a safety valve on that score for people to comment.

And only one comment per person, obviously. We won't go around for a second round, but it is for minutes. Try to be crisp in your comments, okay, so that we might get out of here at a decent time.

Now we are taking a transcript. We have a court reporter here. Matthew McMullen; thank you, Matthew, is here. He's taking a transcript, so that's going to be a formal record of everything that was said here tonight and it's going to be publicly available to all of you on the NRC web site. And I think we'll say a little bit more about how you will get into that. It's probably going to be two to three weeks before that transcript will be on there, but

you'll be able to see it all.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One important point is that the NRC staff is here to listen carefully to what you have to say. They're not going to be responding to your comments. They're not going to be responding to any questions that you have in your comments, okay, but they will be reviewing those comments including questions when they evaluate the scoping comments. And the NRC issues a Scoping Report that will also be on the web site where they evaluate the comments that were given.

So going be carefully they're to evaluating your comments and questions when they prepare the draft Environmental Impact Statement, when prepare the Scoping Report. The draft they Environmental Impact Statement is also subject to public comment, public meetings. So they'll be out here again with all of you.

And I know that when we're in a situation where there's a company, a private enterprise that is a license applicant to the NRC, people understandably have a lot of questions that they'd like to ask the license applicant. Well, we do have Holtec staff here with us tonight and they're going to be available after the meeting to talk with you, to tell you know you can contact them, if you want to communicate with

1 them. And I'd like to introduce Joy Russell. 2 Joy, can you just stand up? Joy is the leader of the team from Holtec 3 4 International. They'll be here to talk to you if you 5 need to talk to them. 6 In terms of the NRC presenters, 7 speakers tonight, we have three speakers: 8 Cinthya Roman, who's right here. Now she's Chief of 9 the Environmental Review Branch at the NRC, and it's in the Division of Fuel Cycles, Safequards, 10 Environmental Review in the NRC's Office of Nuclear 11 Material Safety and Safeguards. 12 So Cinthya is the branch chief. 13 14 The project manager for the environmental review of the Holtec application is Jill Caverly, and 15 she's going to be talking to you about the process. 16 And we also have our senior NRC official 17 here, Brian Smith. He's the Deputy Director of the 18 19 Division of Fuel Cycles, Safeguards, and Environmental He'll say a brief comment after Jill's 20 Protection. done, but he'll also close the meeting out for us. 21 I also want to introduce the main NRC 22 staffers who are responsible for the safety review. 23 24 And this is an important point. You're going to hear about it. When the NRC reviews a license application 25

if it should be granted, there is to an environmental review. Jill. Cinthya. And this is a scoping meeting on the environmental review, there's also a safety review to see if the application meets the NRC's safety regulations. And tonight we have John McKirgan here, right here, and John is the Branch Chief where the safety review for application takes place. Jose Cuadrado, he's the 9 project manager on the safety review. They're here tonight so that if any of your comments fall more in the safety area rather than the environment scoping area, they're here to listen, to know that you made those comments, to consider those safety issues as they do their safety review. We're fortunate to have the staff Okay. of two of New Mexico's congressional delegation here tonight. And Diane Ventura is right here, and Diane is with the Roswell Office of Senator Heinrich. We have Gloria Ann Salas. Gloria with Representative Steve Pearce. So thank you for being here and thank you for the attention of the congressmen. 22 Now what I'd like to do is just -- I don't

think I need to say this, but I always like for all of

us to remember courtesy, and I mean all of us: NRC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

1 staff, myself, whatever. You may hear comments tonight that you disagree with, but just respect the 2 3 person who's giving that particular comment. 4 Now I'm going to go to Cinthya Roman, the 5 branch chief, and she not only is going to give you an introduction to this, but she's also going to say a 6 7 few remarks in Spanish to you. So I'm turning it over 8 to Cinthya right now. 9 Thank you. I'm going to start MS. ROMAN: 10 with a Spanish person. It's basically summarize what he said. 11 (Spanish language spoken.) 12 MS. ROMAN: So as Chip mentioned, staff in 13 14 my branch is going to be working on the environment review for the license application for Holtec. 15 main goal today is to hear from you. So I'm going to 16 17 try to be very brief in my remarks. First, I want to give you a very guick 18 19 overview of what NRC does and what is our role in regulating the Holtec project. 20 Our agency is charged by federal law to be 21 the nation's only regulator of commercial nuclear 22 materials independently ensuring these materials are 23 24 used, handled and stored safely and securely.

mission is to protect the public health and safety,

promote common defense and security and protect the environment by regulating the civilian use of radioactive materials. To accomplish our mission we carefully review each license application we receive before making a decision on whether or not to grant the applicant's request.

Next slide. NRC regulates the operation of 99 nuclear power reactors that generate about 20 percent of the electricity in the United States. We also regulate civilian use of nuclear materials, research reactors at universities, transportation of nuclear materials and their storage and disposal.

NRC strives to be open and transparent in their reviews. As such, stakeholders may have many opportunities to participate in public meetings on environmental and safety issues. This scoping meeting is one of those opportunities.

Next slide. As an independent regulator the NRC determine whether it is safe to build and operate a storage facility at the proposed site. The NRC does not promote or build any nuclear facility. Also we do not own and operate the facilities. Our mission again is to protect the public and the workers and the environment.

Holtec is applying for a license to store

waste. They are not asking NRC for permission to reprocess or generate more nuclear waste. NRC does not select the location for the storage facility. We just evaluate the impacts of building and operating the storage facility at the location proposed by the licensee.

As will explain later in this presentation the results of our environmental review documented in Environmental will be an Statement which is a public document. This analysis along with other factors will inform the basis for the staff decision to issue a license or not. This concludes my remarks and now Jill Caverly will provide additional details about the environmental review process.

MS. CAVERLY: Thank you, Cinthya. So my name is Jill Caverly and I'm the environmental project manager for the review, and I'm assisted by Stacy Inboden who you might have met outside in the lobby.

The next few slides will be specific to the Holtec storage facility application and review.

Holtec has applied for a license to construct and operate a storage facility under 10 CFR Part 72. The NRC regulations governing storage of spent nuclear fuel and reactor-related greater than

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Class C waste. If granted, Holtec would receive a 40-year license to construct and operate the consolidated interim storage facility. The current application before the NRC requests construction and operation of only the first of up to 20 planned phases.

In this current application Holtec is requesting storage of up to 500 canisters of spent nuclear fuel. The spent nuclear fuel would come from shutdown and operating nuclear power plants from around the country. Holtec anticipates applying for up to 20 phases of construction and operation of 500 canisters of spent nuclear fuel each for a total of 10,000 canisters of spent fuel storage. these additional phases would require separate applications from Holtec and would be subject to their safety and environmental reviews. own Environmental Report provides information on the full build-out of the site, or 10,000 canisters.

Next slide, please. This slide shows the approximate location of the proposed consolidated interim storage facility in New Mexico, and as you can see the facility is located approximately halfway between the cities of Carlsbad and Hobbs in Lea County.

Next slide, please. Holtec plans to use

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the HI-STORM UMAX system for the storage of the spent fuel. HI-STORM UMAX stands for the Holtec International Storage Module Underground Maximum capacity and is an NRC-certified design, which means we have evaluated it and determined that it meets NRC regulations and can safely store spent fuel.

The system is a dry, in-ground spent fuel storage system. Each of these modules hold one canister of spent fuel and Holtec has applied for storage of 500 canisters of spent fuel. The canister transfer facility will be below ground. This is a low-profile design as seen in the conceptual drawing from Holtec's application.

Next slide, please. This flowchart provides an overview of the license application review process which can be described generally as a three parallel phase process. After the application is submitted the NRC conducts an acceptance review to determine if the application has sufficient information to begin a detailed technical review. so, the NRC dockets the application and this begins the safety and environmental review paths.

From the safety standpoint we work through a separate safety review to decide if a license should be issued. The result of this phase of the review is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

a Safety Evaluation Report. This is graphically represented in the left column of the flowchart or the steps in orange. Jose Cuadrado, as we mentioned, will be the project manager coordinating that aspect of the review.

The environmental review can be seen in the middle column and the results of that are the Environmental Impact Statement, which describes the impacts on the environment of the proposed project.

On the right-hand side you'll see the adjudicatory hearings. This blue box on the figure refers to the opportunity for the public to request a hearing on the application. These hearings would be held if a petition to intervene is granted.

The results of these three processes: a hearing if granted, the results of the environmental review documented in an Environmental Impact Statement, and the safety review documented in the Safety Evaluation Report, will factor into the NRC's final decision on whether or not to grant the license to Holtec for the storage facility. It's important to note that the focus of tonight's meeting is on the environment review process.

Next slide, please. This flow diagram outlines the environmental review process or the

middle column of the previous slide. And as you can see the opportunities for public involvement are highlighted in light blue. After staff receives an application it is reviewed to ensure it is complete and technically adequate, and if acceptable, the application is docketed and we proceed on both the environmental and safety reviews.

The NRC starts the environmental review by publishing a Notice of Intent which informs the public of our plan to prepare and Environmental Impact Statement and conduct the scoping process. The light blue box on the right identifies the current scoping process, which is the meeting tonight. The purpose of this phase is to gather more information to use to help us prepare our EIS.

Comments gathered from this meeting, as well as many other information collections, will be independently evaluated for impacts of this particular project on the environment. We will document your comments today in the meeting transcript. The public can also provide written comments through the end of the scoping period.

We analyze all the information gathered. We'll develop an EIS and issue it for public comment. At that time we again invite the public's comments on

the draft EIS, and that's represented in the lower blue box. At that time the staff will again -- at that time the staff will schedule a meeting to hear comments on the draft EIS. We'll again evaluate those comments and consider modifying the draft EIS before issuing a final EIS. The final EIS will result -- the final EIS and the results of the safety review, otherwise known as the Safety Evaluation Report, again contribute to our final decision.

Next slide, please. Our environmental review is based on the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. NEPA requires federal agencies to apply a systematic approach to evaluate the impacts of its actions. For major federal actions NEPA requires agencies to document their evaluation the EIS. NRC will prepare the EIS in accordance with these regulations and guidance. NEPA also encourages public participation in the process. That's why we're here. We are looking for public input to our environmental review process.

Next slide, please. So here's a graphical representation of the types and sources of information that NRC is gathering when we're preparing our EIS. We'll conduct a site visit, we'll meet with local and state officials and other federal agencies, and we'll

also meet with tribes. We're currently gathering that information for scoping to help us determine which issues should be considered in our review. We also expect to request additional information from Holtec following the completion of these activities.

Next slide, please. NRC will gather information on a wide range of topics related to the environmental issues, and this slide provides many of will consider the resource areas we in Environmental Impact Statement. So as you can see, we different resource areas include many including transportation and environment justice, groundwater, surface water, waste management, air quality, geology and soils.

Next slide, please. This slide is a highlevel timeline for anticipated environmental review.

This stepwise approach meets our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, that we talked about a little earlier. We stated that the review -- we started with the review with a Notice of Intent to Conduct Scoping and to prepare an EIS.

This started a 60-day scoping period. The public -- this public meeting is part of that process and we will continue to gather information and analyze information as the review continues and we develop the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

EIS.

We tentatively expect to publish the draft EIS in June 2019. At that point we'll publish a notice of availability, and that starts a period of at least 45 days for the public or other agencies to comment on the draft EIS. Those comments will also be addressed and the analysis adjusted if necessary. We tentatively expect to issue the final EIS in mid-2020.

Next slide, please. So the scoping process is intended to do many things: to determine the scope of the EIS and identify significant issues that NRC should analyze in depth; also to identify and eliminate issues which are not significant; to identify other environmental reviews and consultation requirements related to the proposed action. So in other words, we want to hear from you because you live in the local area and may bring issues to our attention that we're not aware of.

Next slide, please. The NRC is requesting information about -- the NRC is requesting information and input specific to the proposed facility regarding what should be included or excluded from the scope of the EIS. Some examples of information that NRC is requesting are are there local projects that are being planned or developed nearby? Have you identified

wildlife or habitat that should be considered? Are there cultural resources that should be considered in the evaluation? Are there particular populations nearby that should be considered? Are there unique characteristics of the project site local consider communities that NRC should in the evaluation?

Next slide, please. So there are many ways that you can provide your scoping comments. You may present comments orally or in writing at this public meeting. You may submit comments through the regulations.gov web site by searching for the docket ID listed here. And I'll just say it for the record. It's NRC-2018-0052. You may also mail comments to the address on this slide. Remember that all the comments should be submitted by May 29th in order to ensure that they will be considered.

Next slide, please. So additional information on the application and review can be found on the Federal Rulemaking web site or at the NRC's public document room through the NRC's Agencywide Document Access and Management System, also known as ADAMS, or through the NRC's project-specific web site for the Holtec application. And all those links are listed here. In addition, the public libraries in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 of the environmental report for public review. If you want to be on our mailing list or 3 our email list, please make sure that your name and 4 5 your address are provided to one of the NRC staff at the registration table. This is the one way to ensure 6 7 that you will be notified of upcoming meetings and issuance of the draft and final EIS. At the bottom of 8 the slide are the NRC's points of contact. And just 9 to remind you once again to please provide your 10 comments by May 29th. 11 And I'm going to pass -- turn this over to 12 Brian Smith for comments. 13 14 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Jill. 15 Good evening and thank you for coming out tonight and attending our scoping meeting. 16 My division, the Division of Fuel Cycle, 17 Safequards, Environmental and Review, 18 has 19 responsibility for leading and conducting and preparing this Environmental Impact Statement. 20 a responsibility that we take very seriously. 21 We encourage and welcome your comments 22 tonight on the scope of the NRC's EIS. The NRC's job 23 24 is to protect the public health and safety and the environment by thoroughly reviewing each license 25

Hobbs, Carlsbad and Roswell have agreed to hold a copy

application we receive before deciding whether or not to grant an applicant's request.

We understand that in the audience tonight there are those who may oppose Holtec's license application as well as those who may support it. want to assure you that we want to hear from both sides. However, I want to remind you that the purpose of this meeting is to gather comments for the scoping know what our EIS. We want to important information and issues we need to consider and analyze in our EIS. We treat all of the comments we receive the same, whether a comment was made by one person or by 100 people.

We give each comment we receive the same careful consideration during the preparation of our EIS. We will consider all of the oral and written comments we receive here tonight as well as those we receive via letter, email, or through the federal rulemaking web site, regulations.gov.

The EIS combined with the NRC's safety and security review of Holtec's license application request will result in an NRC licensing decision to either approve the license request or disapprove it.

And to allow as much time as we can for public comment I'll turn it over to Chip. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Cinthya
2	and Jill and Brian.
3	As I mentioned earlier, we have a few
4	minutes to see if there's any clarifying questions on
5	the process, the review process that we could answer.
6	And I wonder does anybody have a question? Yes?
7	PARTICIPANT: Thank you.
8	MR. CAMERON: Here, let me give you this
9	so they get you it's not
10	PARTICIPANT: I can speak up.
11	(Laughter.)
12	MR. CAMERON: It's not I'm not saying
13	anything on that.
14	PARTICIPANT: Oh, you're not he's
15	not
16	MR. CAMERON: I'm not saying anything.
17	But it's not so people can
18	PARTICIPANT: That's fine.
19	MR. CAMERON: hear you. It's so we get
20	it on the transcript.
21	PARTICIPANT: Oh, that's fine.
22	MR. CAMERON: That's why it has to be
23	on
24	PARTICIPANT: Well, my question is is what
25	is with the police presence? They come in. They go
I	I and the second se

1	out. They circle the room. They stare us down. I'm
2	afraid no offense, hon I'm afraid. I mean, what
3	is going on? I'm trying not to wiggle too much. I'm
4	trying to breathe too hard. Serious. What is with
5	the police presence? We're highly educated,
6	reasonably intelligent people. Why all the cops?
7	What are you guys going to do?
8	MR. CAMERON: Well, there are several
9	paddy wagons outside
10	(Laughter.)
11	MR. CAMERON: waiting for you.
12	(Laughter.)
13	PARTICIPANT: I wouldn't doubt it.
14	MR. CAMERON: Okay.
15	PARTICIPANT: You know, could they take
16	(Simultaneous speaking.)
17	MR. CAMERON: No, no. No, it's a and
18	I have to tell you that Chief Newberry and his people
19	have been very helpful all night in terms of making
20	sure that, for example, the NRC staff leave if we have
21	to bring people in. So the NRC and I'll answer
22	this process question for the NRC, is that when we go
23	to public meetings, we sometimes encounter people who
24	may be violent. Okay?
25	(Laughter.)

MR. CAMERON: I know you find that hard to believe, but that's why we have security. And in this case when we're -- and I have to thank the university. When we're using a space at the university, the university is going to want to make sure -- if it's a meeting on a controversial subject, they're going to want to make sure that they have their security staff here in case something does happen. so we'll all take a chill pill.

(Laughter.)

MR. CAMERON: Okay? So I'm going to go on to other questions. And I'm going to go to Kevin Kampus in the back and we'll come up to you next. Okay? Okay. This is Kevin Kampus.

Kevin?

MR. KAMPUS: Hi, Kevin Kampus with Beyond Nuclear, and I had this question last Wednesday, but didn't get to ask it because there was no time.

Twice now I've heard Cinthya Roman say that NRC is not a promotional agency, but I attended a Spent Fuel Project Office regulatory conference in North Bethesda where Tony Hsai, who was acting director at the time said, together we can get this done, speaking about centralized interim storage. And that was just a few years ago. So tremendous concern

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 that at least for him that day this was something he wanted to get done. So can you address NRC's role? 2 3 Has NRC ever denied a permit for something like this 4 in its history? 5 MR. CAMERON: And thank you for that question. And that is a process question because it 6 7 goes to the neutrality of the NRC review. 8 you, Kevin. 9 Is there -- I don't know if, Brian, you 10 can talk to Tony's remark, but you can certainly clarify what the NRC position is. 11 MR. SMITH: Yes, I was the 12 not at conference that you're referencing, so I don't know 13 14 the context in which Tony made that remark. Tony Hsai 15 is still the Deputy Director of the Division of Spent The division has the lead for the 16 Fuel Management. technical safety review of this license application. 17 Our role is, as Cinthya said a couple of 18 19 times, is not a promoter of the industry. mentioned in my remarks, our job is to protect public 20 health and safety and the environment to making sure 21 the applicants and the licensees meet 22 regulations so that they can be protective of their 23 24 workers, the public and the environment itself.

You had a question about have we ever

1	denied or turned down an application like this in the
2	past? I'm not aware that we have. There's only been
3	two other applications that I'm aware of. One was
4	private fuel storage in which we did issue a license
5	back in 2006. The facility was never constructed. We
6	did receive the waste control specialist license
7	application. That has been on hold for some months
8	now. And now we've received the Holtec license
9	application.
10	MR. CAMERON: So there haven't been many.
11	But thank you, Kevin, for that.
12	And thank you, Brian, for clarifying that.
13	And, yes, ma'am? Could you just please
14	just tell us your name, too?
15	MS. HERNANDEZ: My name is Charlene
16	Hernandez, a concerned citizen and I just want to ask
17	you a question, if the person is here that's applying
18	for the license, the agency or whatever?
19	MR. CAMERON: Yes, I introduced Joy
20	Russell, who's right back there, and she's here with
21	two of her colleagues. And in fact Joy, like
22	Holtec International, like anybody else here, can sign
23	up for their time to speak. So she's going to speak
24	later on and you'll be able to hear her and know who
25	she is.

1	MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
2	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
3	Let me go here and then we'll come up to
4	you. Yes?
5	MR. BURMAN: Chip, as you know, I'm Lon
6	Burman and I had 18 years in the Texas legislature, so
7	I'm real familiar with bureaucratese, but I'm still
8	struggling with the concept of bifurcating health and
9	safety with EIS. To me they're kind of interrelated
10	and I'm not sure how to frame my comments since I
11	think health and safety are the most important
12	environmental issues.
13	MR. CAMERON: Now that's a very good point
14	because they're separate reviews, but there will be
15	information probably in the environment review that
16	has safety implications. And I heard a good
17	discussion of how that works.
18	And, John, are you going to talk to that,
19	because that's a people need to know that?
20	MR. McKIRGAN: Yes, thank you. I
21	appreciate that question. So this is John McKirgan.
22	I'm Chief of the Licensing Branch.
23	And I think there are two very important
24	points to differentiate the environmental review and
25	the overall licensing process. And so it really has
I	

1 its roots in the statutory requirements that both of these review processes are seeking to comply with. 2 3 One is based, as you heard, in the Environmental 4 Policy Act and the other of course is based on the 5 Atomic Energy Act. And those two statutory requirements work together and the NRC implements both 6 of those to achieve an overall finding when we issue 7 the license, but the NRC is working towards ensuring 8 compliance with all of the relevant statutes there. 9 10 Chip mentioned, the environmental review and the safety review often touch on very 11 concepts and similar themes. Certainly siting 12 characteristics. Soil characteristics for example are 13 14 one that impacts both the environmental review and the 15 safety review. And we talk quite commonly amongst the reviewers to make sure that the information is shared 16 17 across those two. So even though the processes are somewhat unique, there is a great deal of connection 18 19 between those two activities. Thank you very much. 20 MR. CAMERON: And that last part about the consultation between the 21 review -- environmental staff and safety staff is a 22 very important one. 23 24 Yes, sir?

MR. CARASCO: Aldo Carasco and I live here

in Roswell, New Mexico and somehow have managed to live here since 1974.

In a couple of the slides the word "interim" was included in there. And it's interesting because my background is in linguistics. Believe it or not, I didn't waste my time at New Mexico State. And there -- in the field of linguistics you have what's called a gradable ambiguity, and some people would define for instance the climate in here as cold. Others may cool. Others may say warm.

So right now this university, if I'm not mistaken, has an interim president until they find a suitable replacement. So we know there will be eventually another president.

When we talk about interim storage who gets to stipulate the limits? Who gets to define that word? Will it be Holtec, or will it be you guys, or will it be the voters? But there has to be more accuracy in the definition of the word "interim," because I used to be a member of the Concerned Citizens of Roswell and we were concerned that this would happen eventually, that they would bring spent nuclear rods and store them here indefinitely. So if you could possibly -- one of you define the length of time, please.

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very 2 important question, and I don't know where the term "interim" 3 actually originated, okay, but, 4 Cinthya, Brian, I think you see what the concern is 5 behind the question. And there may not be something that we 6 7 really -- there may be a larger issue than the NRC, 8 but, John, do you want to talk to that? 9 MR. KcKIRGAN: Yes, thank you, if I could. So the application as put forward is for 10 40 years. And now we do need to be clear and candid, 11 right? There are opportunities to renew that license 12 for an additional 40 years. But that is the interim 13 14 concept that's being put forward today is a 40-year license. A renewal would be subject to further review 15 by the NRC staff, but that's the term that's put 16 forward here. 17 MR. CAMERON: And on that particular issue 18 19 all of us: NRC, citizens, you sort of have to follow 20 what the Congress is doing in terms of connections storage facility and Yucca Mountain or 21 between wherever the repository, if there is a repository --22 so that's sort of the game we're in and -- but great 23 24 question.

We have time for one more, and there's a

1	gentleman back there that we're going to go to on
2	this.
3	Yes, sir?
4	PARTICIPANT: Yes, you're asking for
5	names, addresses and contact information of everyone
6	who signs in here in the front, and that is all the
7	information that you have and the knowledge you have.
8	And knowledge is power. So may I suggest that as soon
9	as this meeting is over you post these lists on the
10	Internet so that we all have exactly the same
11	information that you NRC and Holtec have?
12	(Applause.)
13	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
14	Okay. There's a recommendation.
15	Okay. We're going to go to public comment
16	now, and we have a lot of commenters.
17	I'm going to start with people from
18	Albuquerque, from Midland, Texas, from Los Cruces, New
19	Mexico who have long travel. So we're going to go to
20	these people first. Okay?
21	PARTICIPANT: Sister Joan came with some
22	people that have to leave tonight. If her group could
23	speak first, that would be
24	(Simultaneous speaking.)
25	MR. CAMERON: You know what? That's
	1

exactly who I was referring to. How about that?

Okay. And in fact we're going to start with Sister

Joan. Where is Sister -- oh, here's Sister Joan. And

I'm going to put this here, okay, sister, and you can

talk to the NRC. The people will be able to hear you.

Okay. Go ahead.

SISTER JOAN BROWN: Okay. Everybody hear?
Okay. Great.

Thank you. My name is Sister Joan Brown, J-O-A-N, B-R-O-W-N, and I live in Albuquerque. I'm the Executive Director of New Mexico Interfaith Power and Light and I'm a Franciscan sister.

And I'm very happy to be here in this part of our state in this desert place, which quite beautiful actually. And I come from a long tradition and Christian tradition of people going to the desert, not because it was a throwaway place or a place where nobody lived or it was not important, but because that is where people find God and that is where we find our souls and we meet our souls and ourselves in a very deep place. So those of you coming from back East, I welcome you these days to uncover that and discover that here as well, as well as our friends from Holtec who do not live here in the state as well.

So as a Franciscan sister in my Catholic

tradition there are several things that are really important: One is that we are brothers and sisters to everyone and everything, every element. Again, there is no out there, there is nothing that is a waste, there is nothing that is to be thrown away or discriminated against. We're also called to use primacy of conscience, which means to follow the law of God inscribed in our hearts, and that is a moral law and a law that is high that we need to choose to do what is right.

Also within my tradition there are some environmental justice principles that we hold that I think are important for the NRC to understand. life and dignity, that every human life is important. It doesn't matter if you live in an urban area or if you live in a rural area. A life is a life and none are dispensable. We need to be concerned about the safety and health of all lives. And in this state we have a history of that not being respected. many people dying of cancer who are downwinders who are suffering from uranium mining, and we are very skeptical because do not we want to see continued. And that is why we are concerned with this new proposed Holtec project.

We're called to be stewards of creation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That means to be caretakers. Like your gardens at home, how many of us would put nuclear waste into my garden, which I just planted my tomato plants in. I do not think so. It is holy ground. We have an obligation to future generations far beyond -- I can't even imagine. In terms of religious traditions 250,000 years that we're dealing with with this nuclear waste is eternity. It's an eternity.

There is а concept of spirit of subsidiarity, which really addresses environmental justice. And this project is proposed in one of the poorer areas of the state, a predominantly Hispanicspeaking area and very low-income area, as if people here are not intelligent, do not have a voice and cannot say, yes, we want something or, no, we don't. It speaks of again human life and it is not just for economic gain for a few individuals or few companies.

MR. CAMERON: Sister, if I could have you sum up now?

SISTER JOAN BROWN: Okay. So these are a few of the concerns. I do have some suggestions and I'll make those very brief, that the storage site for this needs to stay where it is at the nuclear power plants where it is already stored.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 Second, we need a longer comment period and in other locations in the state because this will 2 3 be transported throughout the state and affect many of 4 us. 5 And finally, that we need to have all the information, adequate resources including financial 6 7 verifications and analysis. Thank you very much. 8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you 9 very much, sister. 10 (Applause.) MR. CAMERON: Sister Marlene Perrotte? 11 12 She's -- okay. How about Carol Merrill? And here's --13 14 Carol, do you want to use this microphone up here? 15 Thank you. 16 MS. MERRILL: Thank you. My name is Carol 17 Merrill, а retired librarian and teacher from I'm a published author and have been a Albuquerque. 18 19 CARD, Citizens for Alternatives member of Radioactive Deposit -- Dumping for 30 years. 20 you were having public meetings in Santa Fe and 21 Albuquerque so that more citizens could voice concerns 22 23 in person. 24 Two of my friends live in Cerrillos, New Mexico, one block from a railroad. They want to say 25

to you leave the high-level waste where it is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Another of my friends owns a newspaper north of Albuquerque in the village of Corrales, the Corrales Comment, where I work as freelance Не is unable to be here because it's deadline day. He wants to say; this is important, back in the '70s and '80s New Mexican citizens were repeated reassured that locating the Waste Isolation Pilot Project, WIPP, would not lead to the deposit of high-level waste in New Mexico. This current proposal is an unconscionable breach of those promises never to allow this to happen. This is inexcusable.

For my concerns personally there is no way to justify hauling high-level nuclear waste across thousands of miles of aging train tracks endangering countless communities. The canisters that Holtec is trying to get the Government to pay for are defective. For one, they are not able to withstand the high temperatures of Southern New Mexico. And engineer who studied Holtec's specifications for their proposed canisters told me this. Is this correct? I need to know that. I want it on paper one way or the other.

The temperature around Southern New Mexico sometimes reaches 120 degrees and their canisters are not effective at that high temperature. The canisters

1 will be 12 inches up out of the ground. Perhaps this project was not well-planned. 2 3 The spent fuel rods are from power plants 4 mostly on the East Coast. We do not even receive 5 benefit from the electricity that was generated. the nuclear waste is so safe for us here, why don't 6 7 the people around the nuclear plants keep it there? 8 (Applause.) The best solution is to 9 MS. MERRILL: 10 leave high-level waste near where it was generated. It is important to have effective sealed storage on 11 site where it is now without exposing millions of 12 people along railroads to deadly high-level waste in 13 14 ineffective canisters. One additional concern: If there would be 15 a serious example -- for example, a derailment in a 16 heavily-populated urban area with a breach of the seal 17 on the canister necessitating a mass evacuation, with 18 19 an area becoming uninhabitable for a long, long time; think Chernobyl --20 MR. CAMERON: And could you sum up for us, 21 Carol, please? 22 MS. MERRILL: -- and Fukushima, who would 23 24 be liable? I'm almost done. Is Holtec willing to be responsible should an accident occur? Do they have 25

1 good insurance? If they are not liable, if they go bankrupt, how can we as citizens expect them to invest 2 in an effective canister? 3 4 I have three more sentences. They require 5 an act of Congress -- they require an act of Congress to proceed. What they're doing now is illegal. 6 7 is out of the question. Time to reconsider. This 8 proposition is unacceptable. 9 One more sentence. For our energy 10 concerns in this great nation it is time to employ natural genius to find more elegant, safe generators 11 using wind, sun, water, tides, solar, geothermal for 12 Thank you for listening. 13 starters. Thank you. 14 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. 15 (Applause.) Thank you, Carol. 16 MR. CAMERON: And I'm going to follow the recommendation 17 of the gentleman in the back. I'm going to call a few 18 19 names so that you know you're coming up. And we have three people here from Interfaith Power and Light from 20 Albuquerque who signed up. They didn't give the last 21 One of them did, but Tom, Stephen and Judy 22 name. And then we have a group of five coming up. 23 Smith. 24 And is this Tom? 25 MR. GORMAN: Yes.

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. MR. GORMAN: Good evening. 2 I am Tom 3 Gorman and I live in Santa Fe County and I came down 4 here tonight just because I felt very strongly about 5 this project. background 6 Ι have in emergency 7 management. I was an emergency manager for a number of years in Colorado Springs and then when I moved to 8 New Mexico in 1992 I worked at the State Office of 9 10 Emergency Management for 14 years doing emergency planning. 11 everything I 12 can see about this And project tells me it's not properly planned. 13 14 with the gentleman that brought up the idea of interim 15 Interim is an interesting concept for storage. something that might last 120 years. 16 17 In emergency planning we didn't think along those terms. We always had a -- If we were 18 19 doing an interim plan we had a permanent plan in mind that we started working on. That isn't happening 20 right now. 21 So I am very much opposed to this and I 22 just, I don't want to go over the same comments others 23 24 have made, but I am very concerned on all of the risks

that are expected to be handled by the people of New

1	Mexico along the rail routes, around the communities,
2	near the site, and so for that reason I am very much
3	opposed to this. Thanks.
4	(Applause)
5	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
6	Gorman. And Stephen from Interfaith Power and Light
7	is here and then Judy Smith.
8	MR. PICHA: Good evening. My name is
9	Stephen Picha and I am from Albuquerque as well. We
10	were greeted earlier this afternoon by the Mayor who
11	was unable to then stay on because he said family is
12	first.
13	I make my passage here this evening
14	because my family is first, too, and that family is
15	not just my immediate family but my New Mexican family
16	and my Creation family.
17	This is an old place. People have
18	inhabited this land for many, many years, longer than
19	where people who have helped create this nuclear waste
20	come from, and that cannot be forgotten.
21	And it made me grateful to hear that you
22	said that there would be conversations with the elders
23	here because it is important in New Mexico that we
24	speak to our elders.
25	That has been lost in many places but that

1 is not lost here in New Mexico and the due diligence 2 calls us not as people of privilege to come in and do what we think is best but as you have said to listen 3 4 and to listen closely and to listen carefully to the 5 people who can tell us what 120 years means to them. In the native tradition they speak of 6 7 seven generations. We make decisions based upon seven generations, which, interestingly enough, is kind of 8 9 your 120 year model, and so I appeal to each of you to draw from a deep place of your own wisdom. 10 I come forth as well remembering my father 11 who died less than a year ago and he said sometimes 12 that in your gut when you know something just doesn't 13 14 sound right you got to believe it, and this is one of 15 those where in my gut, and I think in many people's guts, this just isn't right. 16 Thank you. 17 (Applause) MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you 18 19 And we have -- Judy Smith is coming up, very much. but we're going to go next to a group of five, Randy 20 Prude, Tim Carlisle, 21 Cody Rogers, and Steve This is Judy Smith. 22 Schafersman. Go ahead. So hello, everyone. 23 MS. SMITH: My name

is Judy Smith. I, too, am also living in Albuquerque.

I have been in New Mexico since 1979 and I love New

24

Mexico with all my heart.

When I heard about this project I thought about not only the 120 years of the temporary storage, because time matters, and it made me think back to the time when my congregation, I belong to Congregation Albert, which is a Jewish reform congregation that was established in New Mexico a little bit more than 120 years ago, and so we have incorporated the wisdom of the State into our own traditions and it made me think more and more about the passage of time and that what is temporary to some may not be the long view that we need to take.

For example, my religion, according to our scripture in the Old Testament, we received the wisdom of God from Mount Sinai 5778 years ago and that tradition was discovered in the desert so I take that as symbolic.

But I wanted to mention Genesis 2:15 which says that not only will we as humans rule over the earth but we are called on to tend it and keep it, and those thoughts have guided us for these 5778 years and sometimes we have been successful and sometimes not.

In this case I think we need to take a long view in order to be sure that we are successful and I call success keeping being, actions that keep in

1 mind justice, justice for the people of our State, for all of us who live in this beloved, enchanted land, 2 justice for the State itself and for the land, and 3 4 justice for the next generations in years to come, and 5 we need to think about the impact of these decisions on the next generations. 6 7 I am asking for some actions that have already been mentioned, including time for comments in 8 accessible locations for people across the State. 9 10 Thank you. (Applause) 11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you, 12 And this is Steve Schafersman. 13 MR. SCHAFERSMAN: Good evening, everybody. 14 15 Thank you, NRC, for scheduling this unscheduled 16 scoping session tonight. I am a consulting scientist in Midland. 17 work in both the petroleum and environmental 18 19 industries. In Midland I live downwind from a potential burning 20 interim waste site with radioactive plume. 21 I can't think of a -- I have taught 22 environmental science and environmental geology and 23 24 environmental law and I am very experienced in sites,

waste sites.

1 I have been to six different superfund sites in Houston where I got my Ph.D. at Rice and I 2 3 know I have been opposed to these sites from the 4 beginning. 5 I can't think of a worse place, well I can, but it's hard to think of a worse place to choose 6 7 for placing an interim waste site than right here. 8 The area is surrounded by aquifers, some close, some 9 far. 10 The sediments and the sedimentary rock are porous and permeable. The thin barrier they claim is 11 on the top is not sufficient. It's just like the WCS 12 site, which is really no better. 13 14 So this is not a good place to put a 15 hazardous waste site, especially one for nuclear 16 I could go into much more detail about these 17 since I am a geologist and understand this stuff, but I'm not. 18 19 The exposed casks on the surface are subject to terrorism. They are exposed and a simple 20 attack with heavy explosives would create that burning 21 plume that I spoke of without much difficulty. 22 23 There are soluble rocks below the site, limestone and rock salt. There is karst limestone in 24

the area, which is a soluble limestone that develops

1 caverns, the caverns collapse and sinkholes develop. 2 It is conceivable that a sinkhole would 3 collapse and take down the depository with it, which 4 would be a terrible, colossal tragedy. In addition 5 there is the soluble Salado formation below that. In West Texas unplugged wells carry fluids 6 7 to this formation, the salt dissolves, and sinkholes This is a matter of fact. 8 develop. Now I can't be 9 sure how close these are to the aquifers, but there is several aquifers nearby, especially the Capitan Reef 10 Aquifer. 11 I need more detailed maps to be sure, but 12 aquifer that has developed Carlsbad 13 the 14 This is just not a good place to site this. Caverns. 15 What about transportation issues? You always have to do a risk benefit analysis. 16 a risk to transporting these hazardous materials. 17 thousand canisters is calculated in a risk benefit 18 19 analysis that there would be one accident. be a terrible calamity. 20 If you double that transportation to move 21 it a second time that would double the risk, you would 22 have possibly two. You might have none but you might 23 24 have four, it's just a statistical calculus.

the risk --

Does

25

the risk

Is

1 acceptable? Yes. If you transport the waste once to a permanent waste depository the risk is acceptable, 2 3 and that's what should be done. MR. CAMERON: And, Steve, could you sum up 4 5 for us, please. 6 MR. SCHAFERSMAN: Sure. 7 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. 8 MR. SCHAFERSMAN: So why was the site put 9 here, proposed for this place, or for that matter the 10 one in Andrews County? The companies want to exploit the region's assumed favoritism for free enterprise 11 and business. 12 They also want to use who they think are 13 14 people who don't care much about dangers but just want 15 to get the jobs. In fact, the jobs are very few and 16 the dangers are enormous. The oil companies provide plenty of jobs 17 now, so this is not a good situation. The reason for 18 19 this proposal is that there is a fund of \$50 billion that the companies want to use to develop their waste 20 sites. 21 interim 22 Ιt is likely the site, if approved, would become a permanent site for two 23 24 reasons. First, there would be no more motivation to

develop a permanent site because the companies would

1 no longer have title, the government would. 2 And, second, by that time the \$50 billion 3 would be gone because they would be using that money 4 to transport the waste. So I want to make a modest 5 proposal, my last sentence. I propose that we look for a good site 6 7 which would be hard, igneous rock that is non-porous and non-permeable, bore into it, place the casks 8 9 there, call that the interim site, and then in 120 10 change the name to the permanent repository. 11 That would solve all of our problems. 12 Thank you very much. 13 14 (Applause) MR. CAMERON: 15 Thank you, Steve. Thank you, Steve. And, okay, please introduce yourself to 16 17 us. MR. ROGERS: All right. My name is Cody 18 19 I am going to be as brief as I can possibly I can never -- I can't believe I'm in front of 20 the NRC. 21 I am an ex-Navy nuke. 22 I have operated nuclear reactors for eight years. 23 I am a huge 24 proponent of nuclear power. I think we need it, we need to go to France's model. 25

Ladies and gentlemen, I was called here today along with my friends from Midland to talk about this issue. This is a major, major, major problem in the United States right now.

We have 99 operating nuclear reactors, we do not have anywhere to dispose of the spent fuel, okay. This is a major, major problem and we have to fix it.

I believe the NRC is doing their absolute best to fix this problem. As Navy nuclear operators we have been transporting full reactors across State lines on railroads for over 60 years successfully without accident or failure.

Now let me get to the main point that I am here today. I don't know what you guys have seen when it comes to the studies of the geological parts of Midland, Texas, but we are on the cusp of being the world's largest energy producer, okay.

We are going to control oil very soon. We are going to control our own destiny. So West Texas is one of the most valuable places in the world right now, especially the United States, and, unfortunately, because of this I implore you to look up Dr. Zong Liu's study from SMU, this is very, very new, West Texas is sinking.

1	We're not sinking slowly, we're sinking at
2	a rate of four inches per year. As a matter of fact
3	it is sinking so fast we have actually had a lake near
4	Pecos, it's a 4000 square mile area that is literally
5	sinking beneath us. I know we need a site. This is
6	not it.
7	If this thing sinks and we get something
8	like the WIPP accident, that was never supposed to
9	happen, that was a non-serialized container of
10	radioactive waste that they had no clue what was in it
11	and had to re-dig up to find out, we can't re-dig
12	these canisters up and if it sinks below us and we
13	lose them the environmental impact is forever and if
14	we lose West Texas oil, natural gas, the people of
15	Roswell, the people of New Mexico, the people of
16	Texas, the United States, we're done.
17	We're not going back to Saudi Arabia and
18	getting their oil. We need independence and this site
19	is sinking and I truly believe that we need to look at
20	that and study its environmental impact. That's all
21	I have to say. Thanks.
22	MR. CAMERON: Thank you.
23	(Applause)
24	MR. CAMERON: And I think we have This
25	is Jim Carlisle and after the Midland crew is done

1 we're going to go to Patty Hughs, Ed Hughs, and we're 2 going to hear from Joy Russell. Go ahead, Jim. 3 MR. CARLISLE: Thank you, sir, Ι appreciate it. My name is Jimmy Carlisle. I work for 4 5 Fasken Oil and Ranch based in Midland. We are an oil and gas company but we also are a major landowner in 6 7 the State of Texas. We own some 200,000 net acres in the State 8 9 Our largest ranch is a 165,000 acre Texas. 10 contiguous ranch just north and west of Midland. WCS site definitely into play 11 comes in this discussion. 12 The Holtec side, however, has the same 13 14 issues we believe, and Steve mentioned a few moments 15 ago talking about groundwater issues. On our ranches everything we look at, we look at vegetation, we look 16 at soil characteristics, we look at moisture in the 17 soil, but the thing we watch the closest is the 18 19 quantity and the quality of our groundwater. Our company is the first one really in 20 West Texas that made the determination to get off of 21 use of fresh water in our drilling and fracking 22 operations and we started recycling produced water and 23 24 using brackish water as a result.

So we believe firmly that the freshwater

issue is a major significance that has to be addressed. Steve mentioned the groundwater issues around this site, the Holtec site, and the lenses and the area that is unmapped in the New Mexico system.

The State Engineer's Office has maps, they don't have complete mapping of what's going on out here. We need a better understanding of the groundwater in New Mexico, which we don't have at the moment.

We're not alone in this battle when it comes to ranchers that have a real issue with these two sites. We secured in less than two hours four letters from major landowners in West Texas, the Cowden Ranch has been in the ranching business in West Texas since the 1880s, we received a letter from the Button Estes Ranch, they've been in business for over 100 years, the Barrow Ranch, been in business since 1906, and I don't think I said it, Fasken Oil and Ranch has been in business since 1913. All of these ranches are over 100 years old.

Groundwater, folks, is the life blood of the ranching business. If you don't have groundwater you'd just own dirt. Think about that for a second. The bottom line is we believe that this application and the WCS application need to be withdrawn.

1	We don't believe them. We think there are
2	great issues with both and it's a situation
3	(Applause)
4	MR. CARLISLE: It is a situation of
5	groundwater, because without groundwater in this area
6	of land that we live in we're out of, we don't have
7	anything.
8	MR. CAMERON: And, Jim, could you sum up
9	for us, please.
LO	MR. CARLISLE: Certainly. And please
L1	understand we are not against permanent disposal, and
L2	I mean permanent not this 120 year interim stuff. We
L3	know as was mentioned earlier by Cody there is an
L4	issue with this waste that has to be addressed, we
L5	agree with that completely.
L6	But let's find the real permanent site
L7	that doesn't have these issues, that doesn't impact
L8	people's lives, it doesn't impact groundwater, and the
L9	other things these other folks and all these folks are
20	talking about, let's get the right place the first
21	time and move this stuff, if it has to be moved let's
22	just move it once. Thank you very much.
23	(Applause)
24	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Jim.
25	MS. RENTERIA: Hi, guys. I am Christina

1 Renteria. I am a pilot out in Midland, Texas. Thank you for listening to all of our comments tonight, we 2 3 really appreciate you guys taking the time to make us 4 know all of us count, our voices count. 5 And thank you to all of you. We have come 6 from Texas, we support you guys, and we support not 7 having all of this moved over here. 8 As I pilot I have flown all around, you 9 know, Midland, New Mexico. One thing that we have in 10 common with you guys is oil. Midland is covered in it. You have Hobbs, Euince, Lovington, there is pump 11 jacks everywhere you go. 12 while drilling is 13 Now not 14 associated with earthquakes the extraction of water as 15 well basically your brine water and the as redistribution of that has been proven by scientists 16 at the University of Texas to cause earthquakes with 17 a magnitude of 3.0 or greater. There have been some 18 19 between 4.8 and 5.8. I think what we need to do is find ground 20 that is completely stable before we plan on moving any 21 of this nuclear waste because we want to make sure 22 that it's not going to leak out, obviously. 23 24 So, oil, we're all involved it.

However, it hasn't been, or the wealth associated with

1 that has not been proportionately allocated to everyone out here. 2 3 Where this is being proposed is 4 disproportionately not represented here. 5 millions of people that could be affected by this project, however, look at this, we have less than 100 6 7 people in this room. You know, in Andrews, Texas, there is also 8 9 a waste site. However, Odessa is one of the closest towns to there. Nobody there knows that it's there. 10 The citizens are not aware of this and that is one of 11 the biggest things that needs to change both in Texas 12 and in New Mexico. 13 14 We need our voices to be heard. You know, 15 there is also a disproportionate amount, or there is an age gap here, the people that this will be 16 17 affecting 80 years from now, no offense to anybody, are not in this room. 18 19 (Laughter) More people need to know 20 MS. RENTERIA: about this and about what is going on. There we go, 21 So I won't take up --22 right here. MR. CAMERON: I think you just scared her. 23 24 (Laughter) MS. RENTERIA: I won't take up much of you 25

1	all's time, but, in conclusion, I don't believe that
2	this is the right area because of the unstability of
3	the ground, or the instability of the ground, but also
4	simply we need more people to be involved and more
5	voices to be heard on this.
6	New Mexico, their citizens need to be
7	aware of what is going to be going on with their land.
8	So thank you again for listening and I hope you all
9	have a good evening.
10	(Applause)
11	MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. And this
12	is Randy Prude.
13	MR. PRUDE: Yes. My name is Randy Prude.
14	I am a county commissioner in Midland, Texas, and I
15	have a county commissioner for 20 years and I just
16	choked myself so my voice is about to go.
17	By the way, speaking of uranium I have
18	titanium in my back so I kind of like the rare metals.
19	It's keeping me standing up right here.
20	I have been elected again for my sixth
21	term, so, the Lord willing, I'll be serving for 24
22	years. I am very passionate about this subject. I
22	years. I am very passionate about this subject. I spent over \$2000 to bring our team here from Midland

I hope you have enjoyed meeting them this

74 1 evening. I am very proud of them. 2 (Applause) 3 MR. PRUDE: And I will tell you in our 4 commissioners court we had all the employees of WCS 5 and even some public citizens come try to tell us why this was a good idea to have WCS, which is similar, 6 7 all the employees of Holtec I am sure are really fine people, all the employees of WCS are fine people. 8 9 They are raising their families there, they believe in what they are doing, it's not a matter 10 of bad people. And I will just tell you, I said your 11 oops is going to ruin everything for us for eternity, 12 13 your oops. 14 Our land is the same processes that formed Carlsbad Caverns, I'll repeat something, are all 15 16 throughout this region. The land is going up and 17 down. These SME studies, the first I've heard 18 19 of, and in fact they just recently came out, about some pieces of land have come up 40 centimeters in the 20 last year and some have gone down. 21

100 times per year what we have ever extracted from

the permian basin, and I have lived here all my life,

since 1952, we've had oil and gas there for all these

We are extracting at a record, at ten to

22

23

24

1	years, and we are extracting more now by a factor of
2	ten to 100 than we have ever extracted, so whatever is
3	happening right now will be greater.
4	I intend I agree with everything my
5	partners have said, we need to find one place, one
6	time, and move it. I do know that there is a problem,
7	guys. There is a problem in all these sites in
8	America, they are running out of space.
9	We have 100 sites for potential terrorists
10	to attack. It does need to be moved. It does need to
11	be moved safely, it needs to go somewhere safe. The
12	Navy has proved that things can be moved safely, and
13	so let's find a real place, like a geologist would
14	say, with igneous rock that is hard and solid and not
15	in a place that is subject to oil and gas.
16	And I will tell you one last thing, so
17	I'll sum it up right now
18	MR. CAMERON: Thank you.
19	MR. PRUDE: is I intend to organize all
20	the ranchers and all the commissioner's courts and
21	everybody in all the governments in all this whole
22	region, right now many of them by the way, I will
23	tell you I am an odd duck, I am a Republican
24	(Laughter)
25	MR. PRUDE: and this is not a

1	Republican or a Democrat issue, this is an important
2	issue to all of us and I believe that there is I
3	just cannot tell you the horror that could happen if
4	we ever have an accident.
5	And so I intend to organize all of our
6	governments that are willing to listen, but the way I
7	am going to do that is get my friend Jimmy and all the
8	ranchers and all the ranch oil men to contact their
9	commissioners and their mayors and their
LO	representatives, house representatives, senators, and
11	so forth, and I don't intend to let this thing run
L2	over us.
L3	MR. CAMERON: Thank you.
L4	MR. PRUDE: So thank you so much, but
L5	thank you for coming to listen to us.
L6	(Applause)
L7	MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Randy.
L8	MR. PRUDE: And I apologize, my pilot has
L9	a real early flight tomorrow, so we have to leave. I
20	would love to hear the rest of your comments.
21	MR. CAMERON: Well thank you for coming
22	up, all of you.
23	(Applause)
24	MR. CAMERON: Okay. And we are going to
25	go to Ed Hughs and Do you want to talk, too?

(Off microphone comment)

MR. CAMERON: Yes, come on up. And then we're going to go to Joy Russell and then to Dan Holland and Timothy Jennings and Karen Howard-Winters. This is Ed Hughs. Go ahead, Ed.

MR. HUGHS: Thank you Mr. Cameron. My wife Patty and I own and operate a ranch, a small cattle ranch, in Quay County, New Mexico. My family has been there over 110 years.

We just have lived through the attempted borehole siting of high-level nuclear waste about 2-1/2 miles south of our south fence. Now looking at this current proposal one of the major transportation routes is the Union Pacific which runs right next to our south fence so the problem has even gotten closer if there is an accident somewhere, nobody knows where, it could be there.

Coming down here on Highway 70 between, north of Elida I passed about five railcars that had been turned over on the, had been in an accident. You know, those happen.

I think the question -- What we have learned in going through this borehole thing that we have been living through is that these consequences are essentially eternal and they are extremely non-

partisan, as has been stated.

We just finished our spring branding this weekend and we came down to this meeting. We are very concerned with passing on what we have to future generations. We have nine grandchildren right now who are very interested in the place and we hope to pass that on.

Well here is our experience that I want to share with you with the borehole. Our experience is that the high-level nuclear waste industry pushes the myth, and I want to repeat that, the myth, of economic development when actually it is the end of our sustainable base economy and it is an economic replacement or disaster.

What happened with the borehole is that several ranches were negotiating some loans from their bank for their current operating system, season, they didn't want to let their banker know what was happening because they were afraid they were going to have to put up more collateral.

Another rancher who wanted to get his ranch evaluated was told that he couldn't do it now because he didn't know the effects of the borehole site that was awfully close to his ranch, what that economic effect would be, but it would be negative.

1 So I think this -- A lot of things have already been said tonight in a sense that 2 3 concerned with, but one of the things that came out in 4 the borehole controversy in Quay County was what was 5 the kill zone. If there was an accident at the disposal 6 7 site what's the kill zone? It was a 50 mile radius. I want to know what the kill zone is for this site 8 9 with that southwest wind blowing or -- What is it? This is a much higher level contamination that what we 10 have had, what we were talking about at that borehole. 11 What is the kill zone? 12 you 13 Also, know, the ranchers and 14 businessmen that when we were going through this 15 borehole controversy in Quay County they made the 16 statement that death had come to our region with the proposed disposal of high-level nuclear waste. 17 And I want you to think about that, death 18 19 came to our region. We managed to fend it off in this occasion, but, you know, if we are already approved, 20 and this is already approved as a safe storage 21 concept, which I kind of took from your comments that 22 you made, why are we here. 23 24 You know, I think there is a real issue of

what we are talking about here. Where is the justice

in taking out whole regions that never benefitted from building the economy and destroying the economy with waste, high-level waste, that benefitted other economies, where is the justice in that?

(Applause)

MR. HUGHS: You know, we are putting at

MR. HUGHS: You know, we are putting at risk, it's already been mentioned, the infrastructure, huge infrastructure, incalculable costs if anything happens. Given that rail accident north of Elida there will be spills, the question is how many and where.

And I think that there are a lot of things to evaluate in this and looking at this, this just came out in December, I haven't had a chance to look at a lot of it, but there is a lot of questions in here that have not been answered at this kind of disposal site.

You know, what is -- One of the questions, how do you retrieve if there are accidents? How do you monitor? How do you repair? Those questions have not been answered.

So I guess in summing up I want to say that the Holtec and Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance, and I agree with an earlier statement that, you know, you aren't bad people in the sense that you are trying to

1 do us harm, but you are making a huge mistake, and I thank Mr. Heaton and the rest of you involved in that, 2 3 you are in fact proposing to bring death to New 4 Mexico. Thank you. 5 (Applause) MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Ed. 6 7 you, Ed. And now we are going to go to Patty, Patty 8 Hughs, and then Joy Russell, Dan Holland, Timothy 9 Jennings, Karen Howard-Winters, then Thomas Jennings. 10 Okay, Patty. I want to I guess reinforce 11 MS. HUGHS: the comments that Ed made about economic development, 12 whether this is economic development or not. 13 14 I have an article here from San Onofre who has nuclear waste that wants to see it leave their 15 area and some people may be happy for it to come here. 16 17 This article says in the search for finding a place to move the 3.55 million pounds of 18 19 nuclear waste from the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station one question always come up, sure, it would be 20 great to sent all that spent fuel as far away from the 21 beach as possible but who would ever be willing to 22 23 accept it. 24 On Thursday night those attending the

quarterly meeting of this community engagement panel

1 heard from representatives of a private entity wanting to do just that. 2 3 That person says "one person's waste is 4 another person's most valuable possession" and the 5 Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance wants to build a massive nuclear facility in the desert of Southeast New 6 7 Mexico. 8 He goes on to say "we think it's an 9 important project for us in terms of jobs and capital 10 investment in our part of the State." Unless the NRC can assure us that 11 transporting 10,000 canisters of high-level nuclear 12 waste across the country handling aging canisters and 13 14 in doing that that we will never have an accident, I 15 want to say that while the Energy Alliance is looking for jobs and capital investment in our part of the 16 State that one accident could take out jobs and 17 capital investment of whatever economy is there. 18 19 All of the infrastructure that has been built for the oil and gas industry, for the 20 industry, and for every other enterprise going in 21 southeastern New Mexico, one spill can eliminate all 22 23 that. 24 I was asked when I came in here to show

the contents of my purse to one of our security

1	people. This is what she said, in case I had
2	something in it that could do harm to someone else,
3	and I thought that's an interesting question to be
4	asked when we are going to be discussing one of the
5	most dangerous potential things on the planet.
6	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you,
7	Patty.
8	(Applause)
9	MR. CAMERON: And now we have Joy Russell
10	from Holtec International. Joy.
11	MS. RUSSELL: Hi, good evening everyone.
12	As Chip said, my name is Joy Russell, I'm the Vice
13	President of Business Development and Communications
14	for Holtec. I've been there for over 21 years.
15	It's my pleasure to be here tonight to
16	meet you. I had the opportunity to meet several of
17	you earlier at the open house. I appreciate the open
18	dialogue.
19	We'll be here after to continue the
20	dialogue should you choose to do so. Be happy to
21	provide to you, facts about our Hi-Store facility,
22	facts about storage of spent nuclear fuel,
23	transportation of spent nuclear fuel.
24	And I, overall, I ask, I come here asking
25	for your support. I appreciate the sign, could you

1 put it down because I like to see? Thank you. Thank 2 you. Because I know what it says. I like to see what everyone looks like. 3 Thank you. 4 Our partner, the Eddy-Lea Alliance, who 5 members of that Alliance are here tonight, was formed in 2006 to help you diversify the area, the economics 6 7 of the area and to help encourage economic growth in the area. And we're happy to be a part of that. 8 9 Holtec International, my company, is a strong technology company. We, our core business has 10 been, and is, the storage, the safe storage of spent 11 nuclear fuel and has been for the past 32 years. 12 Sixty percent of the nuclear plants in the 13 14 United States safely use our dry storage equipment every day with no issues, no incidents. 15 We're very 16 happy, we're very proud of that. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has 17 licensed all of those systems and they regulate the 18 19 They regulate the industry very rigorously. systems. All of the equipment that we supply from 20 Holtec is made here in the United States. 21 We're an Company. 22 American We have three manufacturing facilities here in the United States and we are the 23 24 largest exporter of nuclear products.

We have factors in Ohio, Pittsburgh and in

1 Camden, New Jersey. We're an American Company and we're very proud of that. 2 3 We have an impeccable safety record. None 4 of our equipment has ever experienced a safety issue, 5 leak, as you so call it. But I would like to point 6 out, spent nuclear fuel is not a liquid, it can't 7 leak. 8 (Applause) 9 MS. RUSSELL: Thank you. 10 MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's allow Joy to finish her remarks. 11 MS. RUSSELL: Thank you. Thank you. The 12 members of Lea asked Holtec to be their partner in 13 14 2013 after performing a very rigorous evaluation about 15 the safety and security of our dry storage system. 16 Our storage system stores the canister 17 completely below grade. Unlike what we've hear here this evening, it does not sit 12 inches above the 18 19 ground. I ask that you guys come and talk to us, 20 come and get the facts. You need to listen to both 21 sides of the story before you make your decision. 22 That's your prerogative, I understand that. 23 We have asked the NRC to review our 24 license application. The NRC will perform a rigorous 25

1 evaluation and review, taking into consideration, all of your comments this evening. And we look forward to 2 3 that review in responding to any information that is 4 requested of us. 5 The people here in the State of New Mexico are very well versed in technology. You have a very 6 7 technically savvy state, especially in the nuclear 8 technology industry with two national laboratories, both with offices in Carlsbad. 9 10 You have three air force bases, one Army And in this particular area of New Mexico you 11 base. also have WIPP and Urenco. 12 The geology, the site characteristics, 13 14 environment and other factors in this region are 15 actually idea and very well suited for the storage of 16 spent nuclear fuel. 17 (Off microphone comment) Our goal is to offer a MS. RUSSELL: 18 19 temporary, safe and secure used fuel storage facility to store the nation's used nuclear fuel. 20 We vow, we commit to be good stewards of the environment and also 21 good neighbors. 22 MR. CAMERON: And if you could just sum up 23 24 for us, Joy. 25 MS. RUSSELL: Absolutely.

1	MR. CAMERON: Thank you.
2	MS. RUSSELL: And I look forward to
3	speaking with any of you that wish to speak with us.
4	Again, my colleagues and our partners from Lea will be
5	in the adjacent room after. Thank you very much for
6	your time and your attention.
7	MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Joy. Thank you
8	very much. Thank you. Dan. Dan Holland? And then
9	Karen. Oh, come on, Karen. Go ahead.
10	MS. HOWARD-WINTERS: I wore this for you
11	all.
12	(Laughter)
13	MR. CAMERON: Karen, you're using your
14	time, but you can do it.
15	(Off record comments)
16	MS. HOWARD-WINTERS: Okay, thank you so
17	very much. I want to thank the Nuclear Regulatory
18	Commission for this opportunity to speak to you this
19	evening.
20	And thank you, Ms. Russell and all of the
21	people from Holtec. I know you all folks are not bad
22	people, I know you're not.
23	And you don't mean to do any harm,
24	personally. And I understand that. And all the other
25	folks here understand that, you all are not bad

people.

But one accident could just blow the whole game. And even though it may not be your fault or it could be a slip or something could happen, you know, who knows. Accidents happen. And, it could just ruin the whole ball game.

We didn't make this. We didn't make this, this stuff. This stuff is made on the east coast, it's made on the west coast. We didn't make it, we didn't benefit from it, I don't believe that it should come here.

I live in Odessa. I live 202 miles away from here. Although I live very close to Andrews, and that's another thing that we're talking about, I just don't think that it's a good idea to move this, to have an interim site. I think we need to have a permanent site if you all are going to move it all, okay.

The karst topography, huge. Just like the gentleman was saying, this place is sinking. You all really need to take a look at what's going on with the earth.

That alone, without any even accidents of human causes, nature has got a really big thing to do with this that none of us have control over. None of

1 Only, that guy up there or her, whoever, has got us. a big thing to do with this. 2 Also, we got bad people who might want to 3 4 drop a bomb, human domestic, I mean, enemies domestic, 5 foreign. And the oil. The oil, we are the largest, 6 7 the Permian Basin has got the largest oil field in the 8 country. If anything happens to that, like that guy 9 was saying, we're shot, okay. 10 The railcars, we have got antiquated rails. And the infrastructure, the bridges, our 11 bridges are D minuses, how are we going to get that 12 heavy stuff across there? 13 14 I mean, you know, these, and we're not 15 thinking about this stuff. Notification. All the cities that are, these railcars are going through, 16 17 these people really need to be notified. They need to have a say in this. 18 19 People in New Orleans and Mobile, Alabama and Charlottesville, North Carolina, they all need to 20 have a hearing like we were having. They're important 21 22 too. I mean, our lives, out here, have just as 23 24 much meaning as those lives do on the east coast. And if they want to get rid of it, you know, why is my 25

1	life less important than theirs.
2	You got to follow the money. I mean, no
3	offense to you all folks at Holtec
4	(Laughter)
5	MS. HOWARD-WINTERS: I'm sorry, but you
6	all people can come in here and build this thing, make
7	money, 40 years later, you're gone.
8	MR. CAMERON: And, Cinthya, could you sum
9	up for us too please?
10	MS. HOWARD-WINTERS: Yes, sir.
11	MR. CAMERON: Thank you.
12	MS. HOWARD-WINTERS: And the stuff could
13	still be here. The permanent site may not be built,
14	we don't know. We don't know into the future.
15	And the people who also live here and have
16	got the jobs there, we have to stay here. Our lives
17	are here.
18	So, there is so many things that we
19	haven't thought of yet. It's just not, it's just not
20	thought out yet, we need to think some more about this
21	before we do it, please.
22	And, again, I thank you for the
23	opportunity to
24	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you,
25	Karen.

1 MS. HOWARD-WINTERS: You're welcome. Thank you. 2 MR. CAMERON: 3 And, thank you, Karen. 4 usually don't do this, oh, good. I wanted to make 5 sure that my NRC colleagues did not miss anything that you had to say so I was going to call a bathroom break 6 7 for them but I think that that's being taken care of. 8 How about, I guess Dan Holland is not here 9 How about Timothy Jennings? Timothy and Thomas 10 Jennings and Sean McDaniels, Suderman King. 11 Okay, go ahead, Timothy. 12 I'm Timothy Jennings, MR. TIM JENNINGS: 13 14 I've been elected official in this area for 38 years. 15 I represent, I'm probably one of the, the only elected official who was here when we started, when they had 16 17 the hearings on WIPP. My brother is also here. We both attended 18 19 the hearings on WIPP. And I will just tell you, for something that started out as being nothing more than 20 transuranic waste, nothing but gloves and equipment, 21 we seem to have gone a little further a stream then 22 what they told us then. 23 24 Now, I would just tell you, in any public hearing I hope our congressional delegation will be 25

1 informed in the manner in which this public hearing 2 has been held. 3 Number one, anybody who comes to a public 4 hearing should be able to be free to express for or 5 against any idea without any fear of anyone clapping, any retribution, anybody saying anything. They should 6 7 have that. And that has not happened here. If you want to have a public hearing in 8 9 Albuquerque, have it, but don't come to Roswell and tell the people in Roswell that they have to wait for 10 three hours or four hours more than they were supposed 11 to, to come to a public hearing. When it was 4:00 to 12 7:00, it should have been 4:00 to 7:00. 13 14 And, you know, I'm just saying, you all need, NRC needs to be honest with us. 15 And they certainly weren't honest when they said WIPP was 16 17 nothing more than transuranic waste. It has not, look at it today, it's not 18 19 there. But that's exactly what they said, and we have film, I think Pete White filmed it. So just look at 20 that. 21 Now, I'm going to tell you that I think 22 when you look at this stuff, look at what you're doing 23 24 and come back and have a public hearing that is

meaningful and not one that comes in here and it's so

mismatched.

Our University here is placed with 400 seats in it, everybody can be there and sit in there. Everybody can see everything that you put on display up there. No one else in the back of the room, only the first three rows can see that stuff.

You know what, do a decent public hearing. You're a government employment, you should look after all of us and not just the ones that you want to look after.

You know what I'm going to tell you, I haven't complained much about WIPP or anything else in all my times with Mr. Heaton. I haven't said a whole lot about WIPP being so bad or anything else.

WIPP is here because we had very little political clout when it happened, that's why we got it, and so we're making the best of it.

But this thing here is, it's 50 miles from our ranch, and like other people from Midland and Texas and everything, I don't have a 160,000 acre ranch, I have one I share with my five other brothers and sisters. But you know what, it's just as important to me.

And I think we really need to look at that before we go through and you do this stuff, let's have

1 real decent public hearings. Have some in Hobbs, have some here, have some in Albuquerque, have some in 2 3 Midland. And let's have some real decent public 4 hearings and do a good job of what we're doing and be 5 honest with the people. And just remember that because I tell you, 6 7 transuranic waste is not what's in that place in WIPP 8 now. And that's exactly what the people were told, 9 no, don't clap. Please don't do that, that's not fair 10 in a public meeting. But, you know, I spent 38 years doing this 11 stuff, about listening to people, and you need to 12 listen as well as learned in the legislature in New 13 14 Mexico. And I really, I think this is something 15 that we need to really look at and study very deeply 16 and have more than just six or seven little posters on 17 the wall in there and tell people that's what this is 18 19 about. And so I really hope you will open this up and do it right. Thank you. 20 Thank you. 21 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, And now we're going to hear from Thomas. 22 Timothy. Thomas Jennings. 23 24 MR. TOM JENNINGS: Before my time starts

I'd like a point of order for this meeting.

25

This

1 meeting should be conducted under Robert's Rules of Order. 2 3 And there should be no clapping, cheering, 4 standing up and all that stuff, and the snide comments 5 in the back. So that's with due respect for the way 6 governments are run. 7 And, first of all, thank you for coming 8 and listening to us. I too was with the WIPP 9 hearings. 10 I went through almost all those hearings. We were promised there would never be high-level waste 11 12 here. And I can tell, George President Bush, 13 14 Senator Domenici, Senator Bingaman, Representative Joe 15 Skeen, DO Secretary John O'Leary, officials from Carlsbad, Hobbs in Lea Counties, all promised that 16 there would never be any high-level waste here. We've 17 been lied to, we've been deceived, we've been misled. 18 19 We need to stop that. You need to stop We don't want that any more. We're done with 20 that. that. 21 Our roads are bad, you know, they fixed 22 Roswell has a two-lane bypass. It's the 23 our road. 24 only WIPP route road in the country with a two-lane. And it has at-grade crossings, which are 25

1 dangerous as hell. I've had friends almost killed at 2 those crossings. That's not safe. We need to make it safe. 3 4 This Holtec deal, how much money comes out 5 of there for roads, for infrastructure, for training for our emergency preparedness, not a damn dime, 6 7 nothing. We got that with WIPP. We don't get 8 anything with Holtec. 9 And I'm in the oil business, and I'm drilling more wells this year than I ever have in my 10 whole life. And the Permian Basin is the hottest oil 11 play in the world. 12 There is major oil companies spending 13 14 literally multi-billions of dollars in this field. And to put this, whatever it is in the ointment --15 16 PARTICIPANT: Fly. 17 MR. TOM JENNINGS: -- fly in the ointment, I was going to say turd, but it should be fly in the 18 19 ointment, is wrong. You know, what happens if there is an 20 accident, what happens to our budget of our state? 21 Most of the money comes from the oil extracted 22 industries, including oil. 23 24 What happens to the State Permanent Fund? there is a reaction or there is incident or 25

1 accident, that funding will go away and we're going to have to stop and shutdown the oil business. 2 3 And all my life savings is in the oil 4 field. And I'll probably be broke. And I don't think that's fair to me. I don't think that we should have 5 this slammed down our throat. 6 7 It might be good for Carlsbad and Hobbs 15 8 years ago, but today with the oil business, the way 9 the technology is, it's all technology driven. Horizontal wells, three miles long. Think 10 how long of a threat that is. Underground lateral 11 costing millions, multimillions of dollars. 12 Technology, this is all technology driven. 13 14 We don't have the technology developed to store this 15 stuff in Southeast New Mexico. MR. CAMERON: And, Thomas, can I get you 16 17 to sum up for us please? MR. TOM JENNINGS: Okay. And, you know, 18 19 there is a lot of other businesses that are related. We have a lot of agriculture. If you look 20 at the Pecos River Valley, all the dairies, all that 21 stuff comes in on railroads and all that sand comes in 22 on for fracking, all the feed for dairies. You know, 23 24 it would be devastating to our industry in this area. I know we need jobs, but we don't need bad 25

1	jobs. This is like 55 jobs. Thanks for listening,
2	and I would ask you to refrain from clapping and
3	cheering and all that stuff because it's
4	inappropriate.
5	MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,
6	Thomas. Sean McDaniels?
7	Ronda Suderman King? Karen Hadden? I
8	know Karen is here. Oh, wait a minute, let's see if,
9	is this, no, that's not Ronda. Go ahead, Karen.
10	And then we're going to go to Mary Beth.
11	No? Okay. Noel Marquez, Patricia Cardona and Lon
12	Burnham. Okay. And this is Karen Hadden.
13	MS. HADDEN: Good evening, my name is
14	Karen Hadden, I'm the director of a nonprofit
15	organization called SEED Coalition, Sustainable Energy
16	and Economic Development Coalition.
17	There are so many reasons why I think this
18	project ought to be withdrawn. This and WCS. Many
19	speakers have made those comments.
20	This is not the right place for high-level
21	radioactive waste. There is no justice. It doesn't
22	make sense, and it is not safe.
23	In one of your first slides you mentioned
24	that you're here to ensure that it's safe. We're
25	here, I think you can get the message from the people

in this room tonight, it is not safe. Let's be clear about that.

And I've read through the documents, and I've never seen an application like this that is so full of holes. Its half done. It's sort of like the karst topography which is Swiss cheese. It's like the same thing. There is so much information missing.

And I've looked back, this land is the exact same site for the GNET Project that was proposed years ago. For decades, there are some people in this area who have been trying to bring in deadly poison and I don't know why. It's got to be greed, there is no other good explanation.

And when you compare that previous application and you the environmental look at analysis, you will find that it is much more complete than what is passing for an environmental report So in your review, I urge you to go back to that original document and study it and add in what has been left out.

I also encourage you to look at climate change, which to the best of my knowledge, is not being considered. And to look at the new SMU report. There are so many factors that need to be considered in this analysis.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Furthermore, when you come to alternatives, let's really consider some. Not just whether to do this site or not, let's consider what alternatives that land could be used for. Whatever it may be because there are many.

And there are many ways to build the

And there are many ways to build the economy and to build this community. And everybody wants that. But why risk everything existing for a few jobs and for money for some people.

I think the application should make clear some things that are not clear. How much money, who gets it, how does it get distributed. And I found myself trying to find an analogy for this.

It was very late at night and I was like, this is all about paying people to do what no one else will do. Nobody on the east coast wants it, nobody on the west coast wants this stuff so it's like, let's find a community that we can bride. How much money is it going to take, what will it take.

And so I started thinking about the fact that, okay, I like rattlesnakes, I'm fine with them, but I kind of like them where they are, they have their role, their place in nature. I have no desire to have a lose rattlesnake in my bedroom. And you could not pay me to, any amount of money, to have a

1 rattlesnake in my bedroom loose for 24 hours. That would be a deadly poison. 2 3 And then you could not even pay me more to 4 do it for a year or 100 or 120 years, nor could you 5 give me any money that would say, okay, we're going to keep adding snakes, so there is 10,000 of them in your 6 7 room over 20 years. 8 And you know, I can see some fancy math 9 because I look at the license application and I see these fancy formulas that reduce it down to no risk 10 because it's never happened before. Well, I'll bet 11 every single one of 10,000 snakes never bit anybody 12 before, but I'll bet if you put them all in my room I 13 14 get bitten. And who knows if I'd survive. 15 And I know that this is a very strange 16 analyses but, you know, I think this high-level 17 radioactive waste is a thousand times more risky than the rattlesnake that never bit anybody. 18 19 And I don't by this mathematical magic where we say, it's never happen before so it's not 20 going to. NRCs own studies done for Yucca Mountain 21 show that accidents are going to happen, the question 22 is, how fast. 23 24 testing, we see posters the 25 testing. That testing has mostly been computer

1	modeling, it is not full-scale testing.
2	A lot of times it can be small scale
3	testing, in a few instances, and they don't tell you
4	the full picture. They don't tell you what happened
5	after the test period, they don't tell you all the
6	details.
7	We have already had train crashes head-on,
8	65 miles per hour in West Texas.
9	MR. CAMERON: Can you sum up for us Karen?
10	MS. HADDEN: I will. That exceeds all of
11	the testing that's been done.
12	Furthermore, I think that this license
13	application needs to clarify. Because it says,
14	conflicting things on many points.
15	One of them who would have title to the
16	waste, whether it's DOE or private hands. That has
17	got to be made clear because depending on that is
18	whether this is legal to move forward at all.
19	Secondly, there are two different numbers
20	for the tons of waste and there is not total number of
21	waste. So, if you do 8,680 tons for 500 canisters
22	times 20, you come out with 173,000 tons of waste,
23	whereas we are told this is going to be kept at
24	100,000. This needs to be clarified.
25	I will wrap-up in just a moment.

1 Furthermore, there needs to be a legal description of the property because how can we, as members of the 2 3 public, truly analyze the site and get down into the 4 exact environmental issues when the defining 5 boundaries are not given. I cannot understand why that is not in there. 6 7 The heavy train cars need to be looked at and the crumbling infrastructure of the rail lines. 8 9 Thank you. MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Karen. Can 10 we have Noel Marquez? Okay, hi, Noel. Go ahead. 11 MARQUEZ: Hello, my name is Noel 12 MR. I'm from the rural area of Artesia, New 13 14 Mexico. The Town of Artesia is one of many rural communities in New Mexico being left out of these NRC 15 16 hearings. I am the face of ground zero and the 17 father of this 11 year-old-daughter here that always 18 19 ask, why is that old people always make rules and choices without considering us and future generations. 20 The NRC and Holtec International are 21 intentionally drowning the voices of thousands, if not 22 millions, of New Mexico people by limiting our 23 24 participation in the destination outcome of this

extremely hazardous and toxic waste proposal.

1 Your rush to make this Holtec dump a 2 nightmare for us who live along the railroad tracks, 3 that only have one home, and we plant our own gardens, 4 we are outraged that you would disregard our families 5 and children and unborn generations. Your nuclear regulated industries have 6 7 little consideration for our livelihoods 8 native people of the State of New Mexico. 9 power plants want to pass on their worst waste 10 product, spent uranium fuel rods where it is now currently in a safer mode of storage to a centralized 11 temporary storage facility. 12 Who can blame them, it's killer stuff. 13 14 And for the most part, 80 percent of our communities in New Mexico do not know what the NRC and Holtec are 15 16 planning. And the issue as critically important as 17 this one, there should be an available environment 18 19 impact study available in English, Spanish and Navajo. With plenty of time to inform the public through 20 newspaper, radio, television, billboards and other 21 public spaces in order for us to make an informed 22 23 decision. Thirty state representatives wrote 24

letter to you, the NRC, to slow the process down for

1 this same purpose and you denied the request. The reality is we don't live in the People First Democracy 2 3 but rather a Money Power First Reality, and the NRC is 4 their tomb. 5 The science and technology your experiments are always flawed as we have seen the WIPP 6 7 in Los Alamos where the nuclear industries are always 8 desecrating more of our lands, air and water. 9 Billions of tax payer dollars are being spent at WIPP 10 to repair the damages. The State of New Mexico is already 11 overburden with ten official radioactive dumps. 12 now you want to crown us with this worst possible dump 13 14 ever. Our current and future generations would 15 have suffered this stigma and health consequences for 16 hundreds, if not thousands of year, for being crowned 17 the official nuclear dump of America. Many possible 18 better job industries will reconsider before coming to 19 our hazardous radioactive waste first state. 20 The plain and simple truth is the ionizing 21 radiation hazards will not be contained to the Holtec 22 Site. My daughter always says, what makes you think 23 you can control the molecules. 24

(Laughter)

1	MR. MARQUEZ: It will contaminate more and
2	more lands through the transportation route, railway
3	accidents from the eastern and western United States,
4	accidents, acts of terrorism, weather related causes
5	and sinkhole geology from the nearby extractive
6	industries.
7	There is also major concern of
8	contamination that the site with casks, that are made
9	for temporary storage, but will probably never make it
10	out of New Mexico.
11	Holtec's guinea pig experiment is to stack
12	these casks on top of each other, which has never been
13	done before.
14	MR. CAMERON: And, Noel, can I get you to
15	sum up for us please?
16	MR. MARQUEZ: Well, the State of New
17	Mexico deserves better than this low-quality science
18	scheme and we will never consent to poisoning our
19	current and future generations. Thank you.
20	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very
21	much. Patricia? Patricia Cardona.
22	(Off microphone comment)
23	MR. CAMERON: Okay.
24	(Off microphone comment)
25	MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Patricia. How

1 about Lon Burnham? Aha, here he is. MR. BURNHAM: So, good evening, my name is 2 3 Lon Burnham and I live in Fort Worth, Texas but I was 4 born in Artesia and my mother went to public school 5 there, my grandparents are buried there and I've come to this part of the world every year of my life. 6 7 Sixty-five of them now. I was also in the Texas legislature for 18 8 9 years and known as like the environmental activist in And one of the thing in the 10 the Texas Legislature. environmental, I always call it the DREG committee 11 because that's the nature of Texas politics. 12 In theory, it's about protecting people's 13 14 health. And there is a permitting process. always remind people, the permitting process 15 permission from the government to pollute your air and 16 17 water. And so the question is, we now have an 18 19 application to pollute the air and water. inherently a polluting activity. And the question is, 20 just dangerous is what 21 how this and are the probabilities, what kind of risk management are we 22 looking at. 23 24 In the environmental reg committee of the

House of Representatives, we talked about

Texas

1 cumulative impacts of air pollution permits. were to do a proper environmental impact statement, 2 3 take into consideration the cumulative 4 impacts on the communities of New Mexico, starting 5 with the mining process where the Denae (phonetic) had been so polluted that they died disproportionately of 6 7 cancer for any population in the country. 8 You will think about the cumulative 9 impacts on the plutonium that's already in the Rio Grande River, which is a water supply for people from 10 Santa Fe downstream from them. 11 You will think about the cumulative 12 impacts of the three-year hiatus of the WIPP site. 13 14 What if that had been worse, what if that had been an accident above ground, what kind of economic impacts 15 16 are we talking about? See, I think the system is fundamentally 17 flawed because the NRC does not exist to support 18 19 public health and welfare in the environment. exists to serve as a Chamber of Commerce Agency of a 20 fundamentally flawed, and I think immoral industry. 21 I take it as immoral to split the atom and create 22 plutonium. 23 24 So I agree with the earlier speakers, the Faith Community. We are committing a sin against 25

1 creation and it is a cumulative impact as the NRC has, as Kevin tried to point out with his question that was 2 3 parse the nuance, they've never denied a permit to 4 pollute our air/water and soil. They have never shown 5 restraint that needs to be shown. So I would ask each of you, as a person of 6 7 conscious, as Bishop Matthiesen said to the Pantex 8 workers, resign your post, you work а 9 fundamentally flawed agency that is not 10 protecting the health and welfare, it is corporate greed and corporate money, it is time to put 11 an end to this. 12 A true environmental impact statement will 13 14 look at the concerns that I talked to Jose about. know, I live within a mile of Tower 55. 15 The 16 transportation system in this country is fundamentally flawed. 17 The railroad system is not owed by the 18 19 national government, they don't have to take this product. And they can't. 20 A lot of those bridges you know are over 21 a hundred years old. My grandfather worked on the 22 Santa Fe Railroad, they're fundamentally flawed. 23 The process here is fundamentally flawed 24

because you are serving the industry that you're

1	supposed to be protecting us from. Thank you for your
2	time.
3	MR. CAMERON: All right, thank you. Thank
4	you, Lon. Rose, would you come up and talk to us?
5	And then we're going to go to Bobbi
6	Reydel, Robin Gail Seydel, John Buchser and Linda
7	Squire and Allen Squire. Rose.
8	MS. GARDENER: Hi everybody, I'm Rose
9	Gardner, I'm from Eunice, New Mexico. I'm also a
LO	founder of the Alliance for Environmental Strategies.
L1	I'm here to tell Holtec hell no, we don't
L2	want it. I am so sick and tired of all these big
L3	companies coming into New Mexico or close to my town
L4	in Eunice, wanting to give us all this crap. This
L5	crap that could kill us.
L6	And you know what, these folks are sitting
L7	up in their little mansions in New York, Minnesota,
L8	San Antonio, heck, I don't know where you live and I
L9	really don't care.
20	(Laughter)
21	MS. GARDENER: But I am concerned about
22	the transportation issue of this cargo, 10,000 cargo
23	cars. They're already too heavy. They're too heavy
24	for the cars, they're too heavy for the railways.
25	I'm also concerned about the impacts that

1 it's going to have on the oil and gas and potash industries. 2 3 Also, how is the health and welfare going to be considered in this area. We're already poor. 4 We don't have insurance. You got to have a good job 5 to get good insurance. 6 7 I'm also concerned that these canisters 8 are inferior. Do you realize there are canisters out 9 there this thick and we're settling for something 10 that's this thick? That's stupid. I'm also concerned that the waste will 11 never be moved. We already know that 120 years will 12 be way longer than any of us in this room. My little 13 14 Pai there, it will be past her lifestyle, my time. This isn't the right thing to do. It's an 15 16 injustice to this state, to this community, to these 17 peoples. Most of the people in this area are like 18 19 Brown-skinned or darker. We speak another me, language and we're at least 50 percent here. 20 And that's an environmental injustice 21 because they're basically saying it's okay to duck 22 because those people aren't going to speak up, because 23 24 they can get run over just like they've been run over

for the last several hundred years.

What I do think ought to happen is that those big containers that I'm talking about, ought to be implemented at all nuclear facilities now. They should be protected from that nasty waste that's been created.

They've had to live with it for this long, they're going to have to live with it a little longer. Let's make it safe for them until a permanent repository is found. Let's make sure that they're going to be okay, that they're babies are okay and that they're babies are okay.

One thing I wanted to mention is that, I think it's already been mentioned that there were about 30 political leaders in our state that sign on to a letter to the NRC that asked for more time. I have copies of the letter in the other room if you want to review it, and you can see some of those people who signed that letter.

But then we got seven other, apparently more qualified, more intelligent, maybe they are on the take, I don't know. But Senator Carroll Leavell, Senator Gay Kernan, Senator Ron Griggs, Representative Cathrynn Brown, Representative Jim Townsend, Representative Larry Scott and Representative David Gallegos, how dare you.

1 How dare you withhold evidence, material that they need to know to make fair decisions about me 2 and my family. How dare they. 3 They are wrong and 4 they should be called out on it. 5 And you know what, they got voted into office, let's boot them out. Thank you. 6 7 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Rose. I promised one of the public that I would 8 9 put one thing out that he wanted to say. This is Bob I don't know if any of you know him but his 10 ride was leaving so he just wanted me to offer one 11 And as the Facilitator, I'll do 12 comment for him. that. 13 14 He said that this should be put before, it should be put on the ballot in New Mexico about 15 whether this facility should be here or not. 16 offer that, for him. 17 And is Bobbi, Bobbi Reydel? This is 18 19 Bobbi. Hi, Bobbi. And then we're going to go to Robin Gail Seydel and John Buchser. And the Squire's. 20 (Speaking foreign language) 21 MS. SCHROM: I can do this in both English 22 and Spanish, but I don't know how many people speak 23 24 Spanish here in this room, but I'm here representing Hispanic Women in Science. 25

1 My name is not Bobbi, my name is Jenna Schrom, but she gave me her place to speak to you 2 3 tonight, so I just want to say that I'm woman, I'm Hispanic and I'm coming from a very conservative 4 5 Catholic family. And I grew in a place where I was raised 6 7 to be intuitive and to always make questions about how to make this world a better place. So, and one of the 8 9 other things that is also very important to mention, is that I'm coming from this new generation. 10 So, and I'm here to give voice to this new 11 generation. And the reason why I am here is because 12 I decided to choose a career that is going to change 13 14 people's lives in a positive way, and that is nuclear Because I do believe that nuclear 15 engineering. engineers will be able to provide a better future for 16 17 everybody. So, I think that this consolidated interim 18 19 storage is going to work. So, I know that many people don't agree to that, but I mean, we need to use facts. 20 And I don't know if you guys have already checked the 21 reports, environmental reports, all the information is 22 23 there. 24 And the other thing that I would like to

mention is, that thousands of people in this world,

1 they benefit from nuclear industry. Thousands of people. So, that's also something that we need to be 2 3 aware of. 4 So, one of the things that I've been 5 seeing, while being in this industry, is that I can smell the fear of the oil industry. I can smell it in 6 7 this room unfortunately. 8 So we know, actually, we already 9 transferred spent fuel and we haven't had a single accident. So I am here, as a woman, as a Hispanic, as 10 a millennial, to bring innovative ideas in the nuclear 11 industrial realm. 12 And also, I have a moral obligation to 13 14 defend our future. And I believe that ignorance is a very dangerous weapon, so I am here to defend this 15 future with knowledge and facts. 16 the technical 17 So. all details about security in environmental aspect, if they have been 18 19 realized, they have been checked already. But we're still dealing with ignorance and that's why I'm here 20 because I believe that the nuclear industry is going 21 to regenerate the world in a positive way. 22 And I know, even do you guys want it or 23 24 not, we are getting benefits from nuclear industry

So, that's all that I am going to say

already.

1	tonight because we already have all the records and
2	everything out there.
3	And I will invite you, everybody, to read
4	and to learn a little bit more. Thank you so much.
5	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Robin? Robin
6	Seydel.
7	MS. SEYDEL: Thank you so much. Thank you
8	for your patience. I really appreciate you all being
9	here. It was good to talk to some of you earlier. I
10	really appreciated that.
11	(Off microphone comment)
12	MS. SEYDEL: This mic? This mic. Oh,
13	okay, I got the right mic now.
14	So, I live two miles from the railroad
15	tracks and the transportation issue is very concerning
16	to me. And just because there hasn't been an accident
17	doesn't mean that there wouldn't be an accident.
18	And really, statistically speaking, when
19	there hasn't been an accident yet, you have a greater
20	possibility or probability of having that accident
21	soon.
22	I also ran a small food company for almost
23	35 years and we built six stores, six retail stores,
24	we employed 300 people and we worked with over 300
25	farmers around the state. So, any kind of accident

1 could cause for us what people are calling radioactive stigma. 2 Which is, that all of those farmers, that 3 4 \$40 million business, which is really a drop in the 5 bucket when you think that the, just the dairy industry alone is worth about \$5 billion annually in 6 7 New Mexico, our \$40 million looks really tiny. 8 it's the livelihood of 600 people. And to trade that for a mere 55 jobs just 9 10 doesn't make sense. And it seems that it's really not a very well thought out project. 11 One of the things that your poster said is 12 that you're taking into consideration socioeconomic 13 14 issues. And so that to me is really important, that you could bring, for 55 jobs, right, you could take 15 away 23,000 jobs in the dairy industry and our messily 16 little 600 jobs, 300 farmers and their livelihood and 17 300 retail grocery store workers. 18 19 So I would ask you also, if you've never denied a project before, maybe now is the time to 20 change that record. That you take a good look at 21 what's happening. 22 People 23 here have much SO more 24 technological knowledge than I have, and so I would many people have spoken much 25 to you,

eloquently than I could, but it's really time to deny a project.

And I also would say that you need to, and I'll wrap-up in a second, that you would need to include in your financial strategies and information, the alternatives of what happens if the dairy industry goes down and how are you going to indemnify people, how are you going to reimburse all of those people whose livelihood is one little accident, one little leak has taken away.

And so, that's really important. And that needs to be in your environmental impact statement, how much, where are you going to find the money, who's going to cover that insurance cost, how are you going to make all of us whole who might experience an accident who live along the railroad lines, who farm, who do all that. So, I would ask that.

And, Rose, you were so eloquent and so beautiful and so many people here have such deep spiritual and social and cultural concerns and all of that needs to be written really clearly in your environmental impact statement. And I really look forward to seeing you again at the EIS draft hearings. Thank you so much for your time.

MR. CAMERON: No, thank you. Thank you

1 very much. John. Is it cold? MR. BUCHSER: Hi, my name is John Buchser, 2 3 I live in Santa Fe. I have lived in New Mexico most of my life and I have come to love New Mexico and I 4 5 even come to love Texans. 6 (Laughter) 7 MR. BUCHSER: They bring a lot of money to our state and by golly, they are pretty nice people. 8 9 I think that Holtec is actually providing a needed solution, however, they are proposing to use 10 it in an extremely inappropriate manner. 11 Currently, nuclear reactors produce 12 electricity. I use a lot of it, but I think we have 13 14 other alternatives at this point in time. When a reactor fuel rods are used up they 15 are placed into fuel pools, and that's actually the 16 most vulnerable part of the fuel process after the 17 used fuel. Then it's placed into a cask and left, at 18 19 present, it's mostly left onsite. It may actually be that leaving the waste 20 for a longer period of time, at ground level, is good 21 because it generates a lot of thermal heat. 22 you stick it in a long-term facility, it may not work 23 out so well because of the amount of heat generated 24

25

that's not dissipated.

1 We should be looking at a process that considers potentially a waste site in every single 2 3 state, because this problem is not just New Mexico's, 4 it's everybody's problem. Until a permanent solution 5 is determined, the waste should not move unless it's a high-risk location. 6 7 San Onofre is a good example. It's both at risk due to tsunami, due to corrosion from salt 8 water and from being very close to a fault line. 9 Potential destinations for this waste, 10 that's particularly high-risk, could be Military bases 11 or nearby reactor sites that are already guarded. 12 Holtec site is not a controlled airspace. 13 14 The public along routes needs to 15 engaged on a regular basis not grandfathered 16 because of a past NRC decision. 17 We should stop creating this waste. We should not reprocess it and perpetuate the problem. 18 19 We have a super nuclear reaction a few million away, the waste is handled, our atmosphere deals with what 20 waste products come our way. Let's use that, let's 21 not turn Southeast New Mexico and West Texas into a 22 23 waste site. Thank you. 24 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, John. Thank you

Is Linda Squire or Allen Squire, Linda,

very much.

come on up. Please, talk to us.

MS. SQUIRE: Thank you for hearing us tonight. My name is Linda Squire and my husband and I are here to speak tonight because of our experiences owning and running a dairy in Hagerman, New Mexico.

My husband and I are both veterinarians. We both graduated from Ohio State University in 1975. And I was one of the first women to be allowed into vet school in any great numbers and I remember well being a woman in a man's profession.

And I will say to some of the younger people here that I believe that, I thought I knew more when I graduated than after I had worked for an older veterinarian who was about 65 years old, worked for him for a couple years. So there is a learning curve to all professions.

One book that I have found helpful recently is a book called Nuclear Wastelands. And it gives a history of the nuclear industry and all things nuclear. So that's a really good reference book.

For the past 25 years our family has had this farm and I believe that a serious incident at a nuclear storage facility, in really close proximity to the dairy farms, could have a really serious negative impact on the local economy. I also see this facility

1 as a potential health threat to myself and my herd. Animals can serve as sentinels to warn us 2 3 of impending human health issues. Animals all around 4 us are telling us about the effects of exposure to 5 radioactive materials. The materials can enter the bodies of the 6 7 animals through the respiratory tract or through 8 inhalation of airborne particles, followed by 9 deposition in lung tissue or absorption into the blood 10 stream. Entry into the gastrointestinal system is 11 If the animal drinks contaminated also possible. 12 water or eats plants that have been contaminated with 13 14 radioactive elements. And radionuclides absorption can also 15 occur across the skin. Direct skin contact. 16 Most of the uranium, thorium and radium, 17 taken in orally, will be eliminated by the kidneys and 18 19 via the intestinal tract. But the fact that these elements are of the heavy metal category means that a 20 certain amount of each of these will end up being 21 deposited in bone where they will be sequestered for 22 a very long time. 23 24 In the early 1990's, New Mexico 25 Environment Department, Division, Environment

1 Improvement Division, found high radionuclide levels in cattle that were raised in proximity to abandoned 2 uranium mines and mills. 3 Levels of uranium in the 4 kidneys of these cattle were found to be over eight 5 times the levels of the control animals. Concentrations of Radium 226 in the femur 6 7

bones, of exposed cattle, were almost 50 times the level of the control animals. And this is from the New Mexico Environment and Improvement Division.

Rabbits captured near tailings piles near Grants were found to have radium concentration in muscle that was about four to 40 times the background levels.

Strontium 90 can enter the food chain when it falls from the air as fallout, onto grasses or forages that are then eaten by a cow. Later it can appear in the cow's milk. Eventually it may deposit in the bones of a milk drinker. Strontium 90 from fallout has also been detected in deer bone, antlers and teeth.

Isotopes of iodine can also be taken in with forages and they can appear in milk and it can potentially cause thyroid cancers in the consumer. Cesium 137 is another one that can appear in meat and milk.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

After the Chernobyl incident, there were reports of wild boar, who had eaten mushrooms, which bioaccumulate radionuclides. And these wild boar, which are considered a delicacy in that area, were declared unfit for human consumption because of the radionuclide contamination.

So, after many years, contaminated regions are still dangerous, potentially, because wildfires can release the stored radioactive elements that the plants have absorbed. So during a smoke incident, animals and plants downwind of the burn can actually become contaminated by virtue of the smoke.

Fifty years after two plutonium fires that have occurred at the Rocky Flats facility north of Denver, they did some studies on deer carcasses and they still found that two of the analyses for the various isotopes still exceeded the thresholds for "acceptable risk range associated with ingestion of those tissues."

The Hanford site in Washington, the Idaho National Laboratories, Fernald in Ohio, Oak Ridge in Tennessee and Pantex in Texas, and the Savannah River site are all just a few of the glaring examples of what can go wrong when government fails to provide reasonable planning, oversight and management of

1	dangerous facilities and then chooses to ignore and
2	minimize the damage.
3	MR. CAMERON: And, Linda, can I ask you to
4	sum up?
5	MS. SQUIRE: Sure.
6	MR. CAMERON: Thank you.
7	MS. SQUIRE: For the past five years I've
8	been doing an independent study of geographical areas
9	that have been recognized as places where human or
10	animal prion diseases have occurred.
11	I've looked at clusters of chronic wasting
12	disease in deer and elk. I've examined the sparse
13	information out there about BSE and Creutzfeldt-Jakob
14	disease, which is the human form of BSE.
15	I've identified four factors that seem to
16	be present in almost every location that I study.
17	Radionuclide contamination, the presence of various
18	heavy metals, including manganese and lead in many of
19	the sites.
20	Fluorides is another thing that's in these
21	sites. And aluminum. Usually in the form of
22	bentonite or montmorillonite.
23	So I am urging you to study these clusters
24	of Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease and BSE and chronic
25	wasting disease. If you map up a line, a map of

1	Colorado where these diseases occur in deer and elk
2	and you superimpose abandon mine tailings and uranium
3	deposits and the fluoride sites where they have high
4	fluoride in wells and the clays in those formations,
5	you will find that they are almost the identical maps.
6	And I hope that you'll study this because
7	it really needs to be studied. If not by your Agency
8	then by possibly the Department of Defense, who are
9	doing active research on prions right now. They are
10	funding prion research.
11	MR. CAMERON: Okay.
12	MS. SQUIRE: They must know something that
13	we don't know.
14	MR. CAMERON: Thank you.
15	MS. SQUIRE: Thank you.
16	MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Linda. And I
17	would just say that, you know, you have an opportunity
18	to also amplify on your comments by submitting written
19	comments. And scientific information, like that,
20	would be appreciated by the NRC.
21	Now we're going to Allen Squire.
22	MR. SQUIRE: My name is Al Squire. It's
23	kind of hard to follow my wife. She does a pretty
24	good job. And I think most of the other speakers
25	tonight have already covered most of the points I have

to say, but I'm going to try to do a few of them again anyway just to kind of refresh your memory.

My wife and I moved here 25 years ago, and we built, started building a dairy and we wound up currently to where we have 50-some employees. I like to tell you a little bit about the Mexico dairy industry. We currently, and somebody else has already used my fire here but I'm going to repeat it anyhow, we currently have a total economic impact in the state exceeding \$5 billion a year. And that is second only, I guess a pretty small second, to the gas and oil industry as far as contributions to the state and the state economy. We're still proud of our industry anyway.

The dairy industry currently provides employment for nearly 6,000 people directly and over 17,000 people indirectly with the various businesses that we do business with. Part of that is the fact that we ship our milk to two of the largest cheese plants in the world, the Leprino plant in Roswell and Southwest Cheese in Clovis. So if you compare that to the number of jobs that Holtec is planning on having, I think 50 or 60 jobs there, I think we have a fairly major contribution to the state.

A large majority of our feeds that we do

not raise come in on railcars, and so they'll be using the same transportation routes that these fuel rods would be using. A lot of the feeds that we raise we have to have irrigation, so we depend on clean water not only for our cows to drink but also for raising the crops. Basically, everything we do has to be really, really clean, and we depend on a really clean water supply with no contaminants in it to feed our dairies and our cows and calves.

Our dairy industry depends upon being able to deliver a very safe and wholesome nutritious dairy product, milk. Any hint of radioactive contamination of any of our feed, any of our milk supply, would cause an immediate loss of our markets for milk and beef. That actually happened after the Three Mile Island accident in Pennsylvania. They told people put your cows in the barn and just feed them stored feed, we don't know what's going to happen. Well, we can't really do that out here.

I quess one of the biggest concerns have is then what do Ιf we do? we have if we have something that contamination, substantial as what happened in Colorado or any of the other nuclear accidents, you know, these are the rods that cause things like Chernobyl and Three Mile Island

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and Fukushima.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So what happens if we contaminated our feed and our cows and we can't sell the milk? What do we do? What do we do? We've got 4,000 cows. Wе can't sell the milk, we can't afford to keep them, and we can't sell the beef. Now, who in the hell is going to be responsible to indemnify the dairy producers for something that's happened like that? Who is responsible? I want to know who is responsible for the liability that is created by this situation? those of us in the southern part of the state know this well: we feed the rest of the state, not only the dairy industry, the ranching industry, the gas and oil industry. The rest of the state lives off of us. whatever happens down here, negative or positive, affects the rest of our state.

And I guess I'm going to close with the age old comment, don't poop where you eat.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, Al. Thank you. We're going to go to Melanie Deason. Then we're going to get Kevin Kampus up here, and then we're going to go to Ramda Galo, James Pike, Deiter Hanbicki, and Jemma Strong. But this is Melanie and next Kevin.

MS. DEASON: Thank you for hosting us. I know it was a bit of journey, but thank you for being

here. My name is Melanie Deason. I've lived a decade in Roswell. Shortly before retiring, I spent eight years as wetlands coordinator with the New Mexico Environment Department and wrote the state's EPA-funded wetlands conservation plan.

I seriously question the science of Holtec's environmental assessment and section on water resources because Holtec violates two siting premises: isolated from populated areas -- pay attention on this one -- and away from water sources. Their proposed site puts both at risk.

Point one: I disagree that there are no sensitive or unique aquatic or riparian habitats or wetlands at their site. Holtec uses a federal jurisdictional wetland definition and fails to mention the 1997 NMED included plio lakes as wetlands. Truth: plio lakes at Holtec's site do meet criteria for New Mexico's wetlands. Only one of three defining wetland characteristics must be met: wet soils, wet living plants, or wet conditions.

Point two: I take exception to Holtec's misleading surface water statements that there is no external drainage within two plios on site, that losses are only by evaporation including four off-site ephemeral plios, and that runoff does not drain to the

river 26 miles to the west. Because they portray plio lakes as self-contained holding ponds, like stock tanks, that catch and contain but do not drain. Truth: plio hydrology is unique and external drainage does exist by draining down to unseen water tables and aquifers below and substantiated by Holtec's own report, my next point.

Point three: I commend Holtec's report for stating the site's near surface water table appears to be 35 to 50 feet deep, likely controlled by water levels in plio lakes, highly saline from industry abuse, but Holtec ignores the obvious. They propose digging approximately 20 feet below grade, which is dangerously near their admitted fluctuating water Past dumping of brine into plios has reached table. the Pecos River in this region, proof that should radiation escape Holtec's storage it could reach the aguifers not just in New Mexico but Texas and possibly Ogallala of eight states. Truth: Holtec's storage caster design is for breathing air, not drowning from ground water below or rain above. Any breach, in or intensifies and releases radiation to water, Regional heating and ground ground, and air. subsidence, common in New Mexico and nearby Texas, could flood Holtec's below-ground storage and drop it

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

into the water table below, poisoning the Trans-Pecos area.

Point four: per Holtec's report, April to September thunderstorms provide 60 percent of the annual flow in the Pecos basin. But has Holtec forgotten New Mexico's 1938 Pecos River Compact with Texas and the 2009 settlement for sharing the river's irrigation waters equally as beneficial use of any unappropriated flood waters? Truth: the region's plio lakes hydrology ensures these important seasonal rains reach the Pecos River and, because Holtec's own report acknowledges impoundment of all surface water into plios, we've now come full circle. Water does leave Holtec's site, impounded or not, due to plio basin's unique hydrology. Holtec's proposal violates the Pecos River Compact, radiation cannot benefit the food chain. Ιt causes irreversible harm to plants, animals, and humans. That is genocide. I, Melanie Deason, do not consent.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Melanie. Next, we're going to hear from Kevin Kampus, and then we're going to hear from Ramda and James Pike. Kevin?

MR. KAMPUS: Thanks, Chip. Good evening, everyone. Thank you, NRC, for hosting this town hall style public comment session. I have prepared several

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

sets of comments on different subject matter, different aspects of the high risks of the Holtec proposal. And if they're of use to anyone in preparing their own comments, please feel free to use them in any way that's helpful.

So tonight I'll start with transportation risks. The risks of transporting highly radioactive irradiated nuclear fuel, whether by train, truck, or barge, on rails, roads, or waterways, is a high risk. The risks include the release of disastrous amounts of hazardous radioactivity, whether due to severe Severe accidents accidents or intentional attacks. include high-speed crashes into immovable objects, like bridge abutments, or high-temperature long-duration fires, long-duration underwater or submergence. This is complete not а Intentional attacks, such as by anti-tank missiles or shaped charges, could also breach shipping containers and release their contents into the environment.

For these reasons, critics have long called such shipments potential mobile Chernobyls, dirty bombs on wheels, and floating Fukushimas. As Holtec has claimed in its license application that any and all NRC certified canisters can be accommodated at this facility, not only rail-sized shipping containers

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

must be worried about, but so too must legal weight truck casks which would travel on interstate highways. Thus, whether by truck, train, or barge, on roads, rails, or waterways, the mobile Chernobyl risks of this scheme must be addressed.

But another aspect of shipping risks is the risk of so-called routine or incident free shipments, nonetheless, being like mobile x-ray machines that can't be turned off. This phrase was coined by Lauren Olson more than 20 years ago. This is due to gamma and neutron radiation being emitted from the highly radioactive wastes aboard.

To shield it all would require radiation shielding thick that containers bluow be SO extraordinarily expensive to construct but also heavy as to be difficult or impossible to move. NRC allows a certain amount of gamma and neutron radiation to be emitted. Granted, this radioactivity dissipates quickly with distance, but, at six feet away from the container's exterior surface, a dose rate of 10 millirem per hour is allowed. That's about one to two chest x-rays' worth per hour.

At the exterior surface of the container, the allowable dose rate increases dramatically to 200 millirem per hour. That's 20 to 40 chest x-rays'

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

worth. Workers, such as truck drivers, locomotive engineers, inspectors, security quards, etcetera, who in very close physical proximity into shipping container would be exposed to the highest radiation dose rates. But even innocent passersby and in the general public would also bystanders exposed. This includes those who live close transport routes exposed to large numbers of shipments going by over time. Some people, such as pregnant women, should not be exposed to any radiation dose that can be avoided due to the high risk of harm caused to the fetus in the womb.

Of course, shipments externally contaminated with radioactivity would emit even worse The state of Nevada, based on radiation dose rates. federal government data, has documented 49 incidents of accidental surface contamination on these highly radioactive waste shipments between the years of 1949 and 1996. And in France, Areva Corporation had many hundreds of externally contaminated shipments, a full one-quarter to one-third of all shipments bound for the La Haque reprocessing facility. On average, these French contamination incidents emitted 500 times the allowable radiation dose rates. One even emitted 3,300 times the allowable dose rate. Allowable does

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 not mean safe. Any exposure to ionizing radioactivity carries a health risk, and these risks accumulate over 2 Thank you. 3 a lifetime. 4 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Kevin. 5 This is Ramda. Okay. And if you could just introduce 6 yourself to us. 7 MS. GARDENER: Okay. Hi, my name I'm a student at the University of New Mexico 8 9 and I'm studying nuclear engineering. I would like to start by saying that radiation is natural. We're all 10 radioactive. We produce radioactivity naturally. But 11 I understand the concern of high-level radioactive 12 material, and that's okay. But the only way to 13 14 overcome that fear is through true understanding and 15 knowledge without bias. main 16 One of the concerns is t.he 17 transportation of the spent fuel. Transportation of spent fuel or radioactive material is not new and it 18 19 has already been done. URENCO stores and ships tons of radioactive material by rail and truck without any 20 incident. And I can be more than certain that this 21 project wouldn't take off without first thoroughly 22 testing and assuring safe transportation. 23 24 In one of the posters outside today, we

can see the different environmental and hypothetical

accidents the canisters can endure. Some of these are heat, cold, pressure fluctuation, vibration, water spray, free drop, compression, penetration, 30 feet free fall, crash emersion, puncture, and 800-degree Celsius fires. And so I would highly doubt that, you know, they would put people in danger without testing these things.

I would also like to mention that Holtec has already been transporting spent nuclear fuel for decades here in the U.S. and around the world. So it is not new and it's not a mere luck that this has been done with excellence. It is not luck. We have tested and taken and are still taking the precautions these materials to their to get destination safe.

So there's the question of the rails and how they are going to withstand the weight. And, yes, these things will get tested, and if they need repair there will be repair. And I understand our industry, the nuclear industry, is so fragile because we are constantly being watched by people, so we want no mistakes. So I believe that the NRC, along with Holtec, will do everything in their power to make this project safe for our environment, our community, and our next generation. Thank you for listening.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, We have -- this is James? Okay. 2 Ramda. And Jemma? 3 Okay. James, James Pike. Hello, everyone. 4 MR. PIKE: My name is 5 James Pike. I'm also a student at the University of New Mexico studying nuclear engineering. 6 7 graduate student looking into material science so a 8 lot of applications of radiation and how to store 9 stuff, too. I just want to point out I grew up in Los 10 Lunas, New Mexico. I know what a small town culture 11 I understand you guys' safety and 12 feels like. But I want to let you guys know that what 13 14 the NRC is doing is they are trying to keep you guys They are the guidelines for the world for any 15 safe. type of radioactive material handling or any type of 16 17 nuclear power plants. I just went to a talk recently, and they 18 19 talked about how countries around the world look to the NRC for safety and for health and for everything. 20 They model what they look at after the NRC, and I know 21 the NRC takes pride in that. So I don't think they 22 would lie to you guys because they are setting a world 23 24 example for you guys.

One thing I'd also like to mention, and my

colleague touched on it, radiation is everywhere. had a banana this morning? That had radiation in it. guys Also, one thing you might not know is radioactivity is used in the oil business, and you guys are not protesting that. They use radioactive tracers to put into the ground and they track oil. They use radioactivity to find the formation of where oil is.

So radioactivity, it is kind of scary, but we have knowledge of it and we know how to keep it safe and keep it away from dairy farms and from places like that. And as future nuclear engineers, we want to ensure that safety. That's why we're down here, too. We are listening to you guys' concerns and, in the future, we want to make sure you guys' concerns are in our design. Thank you guys for listening.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, James. Thank you, James. And is it Jemma? So in other words, when I called Bobbi Reydel, you guys are changing identities. But do you want to talk? Well, go ahead.

MS. REYDEL: Hello, my name is Bobbi Reydel. I'm sorry for any confusion. Today, I want to say I'm a nuclear engineer. I'm a graduate student and Ph.D. candidate of the University of New Mexico, and I want to say I ardently believe in this project.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Nuclear spent fuel casks are designed in such a way that they are designed to be with -- the 2 fuel, the dry fuel is in a leak-proof container that is sealed. And that is within a larger container that is filled with an inert gas that allows cooling of 6 that spent fuel.

I've heard a lot of really important concerns tonight about radiation leakage, about the fuel leaking out of these containers. And if you look at the actual designs of these spent fuel casks, you'll see that this isn't a problem. We are here today as experts in this field to talk to you about your concerns, to speak with you, and I'm so glad that I spoke to so many of you today.

I would also like to say that the fear that people have around radiation, it is a concern. But if you actually look at the design of this place, if you are at the edge of this facility, let's say you're at the fence of this proposed Holtec facility, you will receive 25 millirems per year if you stood at the edge of this Holtec facility for an entire year. Now, what is 25 millirems? Well, if you took a plane flight from New York to L.A., it's about that much. So if you stood there an entire year, day and night, that's what you would get.

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

How many of you like to take vacations?

I would assume that many of you like to take vacations. Many of you have flown in planes. Many of you have gone to the dentist. Many of you, I see we have an older population, maybe many of you have suffered from cancer. Did you know that all of the diagnostics for cancer treatment, that's radioactive material.

The nuclear industry, if you actually look at CANDU reactors up in Canada, they produce all of the medical isotopes for the U.S. Things that you use everyday, things that help you survive are radioactive.

And so what I'm here saying is is that you don't need to fear this. You don't need to fear, like, oh, my gosh, there's going to be some radiation that leaks. Like, okay. If you ate a banana this morning, you also got potassium-44 in your system, as well. That's a radioactive isotope.

I heard that people have said nuclear power hasn't done anything for me. The Palo Verde reactor in Arizona supports 35 percent of the carbon-neutral energy for New Mexico. Twenty percent of all power in the U.S. is from nuclear power plants, and all of that, zero carbon emissions. If we get rid of

1 our power plants, if we decide we don't want to find a place to store this nuclear waste, it would be like 2 3 getting rid of every single windmill in the U.S. 4 would be destroying the environment. 5 I am here because I believe in supporting the environment and mitigating climate change. 6 7 here because I believe that this is a safe facility, 8 and I believe that we, as a community, with knowledge 9 and understanding and talking to these people and reading the reports and learning about, okay, what is 10 ALARA, what is a millirem? How many of you know what 11 a millirem is? Learning those things 12 13 important. 14 I want to answer your questions. We'll be 15 here. You have questions for me? You have concerns? 16 You're a skeptic? Please ask me. Thank you. 17 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, This is Deiter, and then we're Bobbi. And Deiter. 18 19 going to go to Karen Bonime, Ira Strong, Charlene Hernandez, and Jimi Gadzia. Deiter. 20 MR. HANBICKI: Hello. I am Deiter 21 I'm a current junior at the University of 22 Hanbicki. New Mexico where I study nuclear engineering. Before 23 24 I get into my speech that I've prepared, one of my

classmates wanted to show this. It is a letter of

recommendation that we go along with the Holtec plan. We have 31 signatures on this petition along with it, including one of the distinguished faculty members at UNM, Dr. Robert Bush, and the incoming American Nuclear Society president.

So three years ago, I decided to move from my sleepy little town in Southeastern Pennsylvania to New Mexico for my degree. I had never visited the state before, and my first thought when getting off this plane was, wow, it's hot. Later, I would go to see the state and see everywhere and see how beautiful it is. I started my New Mexico journey because I saw online that the Bureau of Labor Statistics website say that nuclear engineers make a starting salary of \$80,000 a year, and I came to UNM because they accepted me.

Holtec states that they will have about a hundred operators, a hundred construction jobs, and perhaps 50 manufacturing jobs if they get to stage three just in this area. That may not seem like a lot, but that would be 250 well-paying secure jobs for a minimum of up to 40 years. The little town in Pennsylvania that I hail from has a population of only 3,000 people with a median income of \$56,000 per household. So while it doesn't seem like a lot, to

1 me, that seems like a lot of jobs and a lot of money. addition, my little town of 2 3 Britain, Pennsylvania recently vetoed, we had a town 4 hall meeting like this where a gas plant wanted to be 5 built in the town and we vetoed it. So I know, I sympathize with you guys of not knowing something that 6 7 we don't want in our town because we think it might be 8 dangerous. 9 Additionally, I agree with all of you we 10 should have a permanent waste solution site here in the United States. However, we don't, so this is the 11 12 next best thing that we can have. New Mexico was here in the beginning of 13 14 the nuclear industry, and it should continue to be there in the future of the industry. Even if it's for 15 selfish reasons, I want the Holtec plant to be here so 16 that I may be able to live here for the foreseeable 17 future. Thank you. 18 19 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Deiter. And, Karen, are you going to come up and talk to us? 20 Okay. And then we're going to Ira Strong, if Ira is 21 still here, and then to Charlene. 22 MS. BONIME: According to these -- can I 23 24 just hold it? Okay. According to this guideline for commenting on the scope of the EIS, some examples of 25

information NRC is requesting are, I'm going to skip
to the second one, what reasonable alternatives to the
proposed action should be analyzed and why? I think
the reasonable alternative that should be examined is,
sure, if these casks are so safe, great. Let's
distribute them to the places where the nuclear power
plants are, and I think this would be safer because
having a centralized target for terrorism is a dumb
idea. I know that they're vulnerable just being in
pools with a roof over them or whatever. I don't know
enough about that. I'd like to know more. But if
these dry casks are really so great and I want to
thank John McKirgan for explaining to me how they
actually go about putting the fuel rods into these
casks. It's done underwater, and then there's a
drying-out process where helium, an inert gas,
replaces the water vapor that's left. And I like
that, and I think it's a great idea, and I think they
should stay right there where they've lived their
whole active lives.

Also, he did mention that a tiny bit of water vapor -- can you all hear me -- would probably remain inside the cask but only a tiny amount but that radiation escaping the inner container, the stainless steel cask, which someone mentioned is only a half-

inch thick and in Europe they're much bigger. I wonder why NRC is considered model if Europe has something better. Something is funny?

So, anyway, the little bit of radiation that can exist inside the larger cask could cause that water vapor to separate into hydrogen and oxygen and hydrogen, of course, is explosive in the presence of oxygen. So that sounded to me like a concern. I hope that that can be controlled somehow. Maybe it's not enough. Maybe I didn't understand you completely, but maybe it's not enough to cause harm.

But I also learned from talking with you, John, about the fact that when the fuel rods are first transported to the nuclear power plants they're not as hot as they are later because, as uranium breaks down, giving off this tremendous energy that's used to boil water to drive turbines to make electricity, they break down into other radioactive elements. And so some of those have longer half lives or, instead of alpha, maybe they've got beta or gamma radiation so the things actually get hotter, and this is a concern to me.

But what I'd like to move to is what local sources of information should the NRC consider? I think you've already heard eloquent testimony from the

dairy industry, and I know you're going to hear about the pecans that we grow here, which are yummy. And then you've heard about the immense amount of oil that we're sitting on that could be at risk.

What I'd like to look at in terms of local information, and I don't mean just local to Southeast New Mexico, I'm talking about the state as a whole. We have paid our nuclear dues starting at the Trinity site where the first bomb was exploded. The people of the Tularosa Basin who lived, I forget, 16 - 18 miles away were never warned, were never acknowledged. They suffer still. Even the ones who've moved away from that poisoned community have children who develop cancers that are thyroid cancers especially that are associated with exposure to radiation.

MR. CAMERON: Karen, I'm going to have to ask you sum up, please.

MS. BONIME: All right. I will. Other people have mentioned the Navajo miners, and it wasn't just Navajos it was also Laguna Pueblo people, a woman named Dorothy Perly testified in the 90s at an event that was sponsored by CARD -- oh, and I forgot to say I'm a member of CARD and a retired teacher. She testified about how she was given no warning and no protection as she drove trucks full of mining, the

1 uranium ore to the milling sites and all the dust that she was inhaling and so forth. She was already dying 2 3 of cancer at that time. It's environmental racism all 4 over the state. 5 The first nuclear victims be compensated were white. 6 They were the Utah Mormon 7 Downwinders. One of them was also at this dinner 8 honoring atomic veterans, and she said, "We are the 9 most patriotic people in the United States, Mormons. 10 We could not believe our government did this to us." Then, finally, after a while, after a lot 11 of legal work --12 MR. CAMERON: Karen, I'm going to have to 13 14 ask you to wrap up, please. 15 Yes. Navajos began to be MS. BONIME: compensated but not the ones in New Mexico and not the 16 ones who worked in mines and mills after 1970. There 17 are so many gaps. We have paid our dues, and we have 18 19 some of us, the most vulnerable, not been compensated or acknowledged. 20 That's it. And, Karen, just for the 21 MR. CAMERON: record, could you tell people what CARD stands for? 22 I don't know if people know. 23 24 MS. BONIME: Oh, yes, yes. CARD, and I've only been a member for a few short years, although I 25

1	attended many of the hearings that they invited me to,
2	it stands for Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive
3	Dumping. We don't want our state to be a dump.
4	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. And that's a New
5	Mexico group?
6	MS. BONIME: Yes.
7	MR. CAMERON: Okay.
8	MS. BONIME: It formed when WIPP was first
9	being discussed.
LO	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank
L1	you, Karen.
L2	MS. BONIME: Thank you.
L3	MR. CAMERON: All right. And is Ira, Ira
L4	Strong here? How about Jimi, J-I-M-I? Oh, here comes
L5	Jimi. And then we're going to go to Charlene. Hey,
L6	thank you, everybody, for your patience tonight, but
L7	I think we're in the homestretch or at least at the
L8	far turn.
L9	MS. GADZIA: I'm the one that's going to
20	talk about pecans. A lot of my concern sorry. My
21	name is Jimi Gadzia. My family and I came here in
22	1906, so we've been here a long time, love New Mexico
23	and really care about it.
24	I could talk about a lot of issues, but
25	they've really been covered here tonight. Health is

1 a concern for me. Water is a concern, been discussed, and the oil and gas industry which has also been 2 3 discussed. 4 Our family has three properties, oil and 5 gas interest, that's within ten miles of the site. 6 it is a deep concern that we depend on, as our family. 7 But tonight I'm going to focus 8 agriculture because my family is also pecan farmers. 9 Just after oil and gas, agriculture, and I'm going to 10 talk about agriculture in general, is the second largest industry in New Mexico. This region, Chaves, 11 Eddy, and Lea Counties, are the largest agricultural 12 region in the state. We have over 145,000 irrigated 13 14 acres just in the Pecos Valley Conservancy Districts 15 alone. specifically are 16 New Mexico's 17 number one food crop. In 2016, which is our latest numbers because we've just finished harvesting the 18 19 2017 crop, New Mexico producers produced 72 millions pounds of pecans worth over \$213 million in sales. 20 Now, New Mexico is only second in the 21 nation in producing pecans, second only to Georgia, 22 but we lead in cash receipts due to our improved 23 24 varieties and our superior quality. So New Mexico

also has the highest concentration of pecan production

in the nation, and this production is from Roswell south, also west but all in the southern part of the state.

There's a lot of front-end costs to starting a pecan field, so it's really a multi-generational kind of crop because the trees last a hundred years and it takes about seven to ten years before you even get a first crop. So there is a lot of front-end investment.

So we started our farm in 1965. It took us five years to get our trees in. So seven to ten years from then is when we first started seeing a little bit of crop. So we have had invested a lot of time and money into our pecan orchard.

My concern has been mentioned before when talking about the dairy industry. Consumers are really looking for cleaner foods. They're looking for higher-quality foods. They're buying organic foods. They want less contamination. People eat pecans because they taste great but also they're very nutritious, high in vitamins, fiber, and protein, high in good cholesterol-lowering fats. Pecans are heart healthy. The American Heart Association suggests that it reduces the risk of heart disease. So that's kind of our market and, as consumers demand better, higher-

quality products, our agriculture is moving in that direction, as well. So just the siting of this facility could seriously impact our product, as well as all agriculture in the state. And there's never been accumulation of this magnitude before, and so I truly believe that, once the association is made, I think it could be an insurmountable reputation to overcome and could seriously devalue our product or eliminate it altogether. Any accidents will just exacerbate that problem and really could gut the food industry in New Mexico.

And there's just an example of the E. coli contamination that's going on with romaine lettuce. It was discovered on one farm, and the message to consumers or consumers are deciding, you know, I'm not eating any romaine, I don't care where it's from. And that's the way it happens. Even the CDC is supporting that, even though they've already identified where it's happening. You can clean E. coli up but I don't know that you can even clean up contamination from radioactivity.

So I think, at that point, it's all over for us here and there's no coming back from it. That's my concern.

MR. CAMERON: And could you sum up for us?

1 MS. GADZIA: Really? I have five pages. Just kidding. So I want to restate that this isn't 2 3 really our waste. I mean, the gal said that we have 4 30 percent in New Mexico, but really most of this has 5 been produced in other areas. So I have a really hard time agreeing to house all this waste that was not 6 7 produced here. 8 So let me get to my last page. And I 9 think with so much that New Mexicans have to risk, I have to ask myself what are the benefits to us, to us 10 New Mexicans? And I can't come up with any. 11 mean, a few jobs maybe, but I think that's it. 12 we're asking for is to keep our clean environment so 13 14 we can continue to make our living, and that's really 15 all I have to say. So I don't consent to bringing material 16 17 here. I think it will impact my livelihood and my Thanks for being here and thanks life. So thanks. 18 19 for letting us speak. Thank you. 20 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. We're going to go to Charlene Hernandez, and then 21 we're going to go to Janet Greenwald. And then we're 22 going to go to Pakeia. 23 24 MS. HERNANDEZ: Good evening, everybody. My name is Charlene Hernandez, and I was born in 25

Capitan, New Mexico in 1945. No, actually, it was 1946. My mom was pregnant with me when the atomic bomb at Trinity site was exploded, okay? So that said, I want to say that I agree with most of the speakers that spoke tonight and I hope you listen well because this is my state where I was born. We were already blasted once, and we're still suffering the effects from that atomic bomb blast.

Now, if this is so safe, like these people have said here, why does it cost so much for clean-up? I have read that it costs not just hundreds, not just thousands, but billions of dollars to clean up after a problem with these waste containers, like we had at Carlsbad, okay? That was shut down for two years, and the clean-up, all that other stuff, and little brief places, I read it in the paper over the last few years, I've been keeping track of what's happened there. But I also have been in contact with people, like the Downwinders, who have families, who have lost entire families because of Trinity site.

Now there is, I've been telling people about the RECA Act. When I looked in the computer, the RECA Act is radiation compensation, Radiation Exposure Compensation Act. It was passed in Colorado, Utah, parts of Arizona, but not New Mexico. I've been

keeping track with Senator Udall who says that they're trying to expand the law to cover New Mexico and that means they will compensate people who have relatives who have certain cancers, and they will pay people up to \$50,000 for each loss for certain cancers. They will also pay your medical costs. If you're found to have those certain cancers, they'll pay your medical bills until you die. Now, not too many people know about that. I'm making that discovery, and it's a sad thing.

Why are New Mexico people always the last to know, and why did they pick New Mexico? They picked New Mexico to test the atomic bomb, and they didn't ask anybody. I mean, scientists that didn't know what was going to happen did it to us.

Now, Lincoln County used to be where they had the very best apples. You go over there now, you can't find a single good apple bigger than that. We had big, huge apples, wonderful apples, different kinds of apples, not just one little kind. You know, we had several different kinds of apples. Now nothing, nothing grows that's bigger than that. A lot of contamination has happened.

I agree very much with the scientist who spoke earlier, Mr. Steve Shuffleman, Schafersman?

Okay. He was from Texas. I totally agree with him 200 percent. The stability of this place is not good. I was in my house one day when my house shook like in California when I was out there. So what's up with that? My house shook. The ground is not stable here, and that man was absolutely correct.

Now, did you hear about the new caves that they found in Fort Stanton? The longest cave in the nation vertically, like this, or horizontally, But it's the longest one, more than 30 miles. The end of that cave is at the bottom of the Ruidoso Airport. It ends there. It's a beautiful And then my cousin said to me, my cousins live there, they said, "Charlene, that cave connects up to the other caves that are there and probably the Carlsbad cave." So I think that you pay attention to that gentleman. I think he had it all exactly correct, and that's all I have to say.

Thank you very much. And thank you for being here and for looking into this situation. I hope you can come to a good conclusion that this is not a safe state. My suggestion is to let the people who have those things where the radioactive waste is made, the nuclear reactor people who have those, they can keep it in their own place where they have their

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

reactors, not send it somewhere else.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Charlene. And we're going to go to Janet Greenwald, and then we're going to have Pakeia Marquez come up, and then Susybelle Gosslee, Soya Stevens, Alfredo Dominguez, and Stephen Picha I think. And this is Janet.

MS. GREENWALD: Hi, I'm Janet Greenwald.

I'm a coordinator of Citizens for Alternatives to

Radioactive Dumping, and that was an organization

formed 39 years ago by people in this part of the

state.

I'd like to report to you from a community that's close to a nuclear facility. It's the community where I raised my children, a beautiful little place in the Embudo Valley which some people consider the organic bread basket of New Mexico. It's in northern New Mexico. This community is a bedroom community from Los Alamos and it's also directly downwind from Los Alamos.

Over a decade ago, there was a fire there that Cerro Grande fire. And after that, the New Mexico Environment Department visited the valley and they said there's cobalt in your plums and there's cesium in your broccoli, but don't worry about it,

1	it's below regulatory concern. And then several
2	months later, my daughter-in-law became pregnant and
3	a few months later she lost one of her twins, and that
4	was the first time in our memory, and we have twins on
5	both sides of the family, first time anyone lost a
6	twin. And then they found out that the remaining
7	twin's fallopian tube was malformed. So then she had
8	a double-risk pregnancy. So in order to have her baby
9	in the Espanola hospital, my son and she had to look
10	through this book of the deformed babies from Espanola
11	Hospital. We're talking about badly deformed babies,
12	no arms, etcetera. And they had to look through this
13	book because they had to decide if their baby was born
14	deformed, would they want to hold it after it was born
15	or did they just want someone to take it away?
16	So we were very lucky because Olivia was
17	born whole. But Espanola is also downwind and a
18	bedroom community for Los Alamos.
19	Not long after that, we found out that one
20	of the mountain lakes that feeds the river that goes
21	through the Embudo Valley had so much cesium around
22	its shore that it was close to being a super fund
23	site. This is the head waters in the Embudo River and
24	also the Rio Grande.
25	Then the other day, Olivia and her

1 brother, Ezra, and I went to the library in this little community, and on the door there was a sign and 2 it said, "Support Group for Contaminated Los Alamos 3 4 Workers 9 a.m. on Saturday Morning." So what do you 5 think? Are nuclear facilities a benefit to the 6 communities around them? Perhaps you've had a 7 different experience than I've had. You can judge 8 from what I've said. 9 Thank you for this opportunity to speak. 10 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very Pakeia, could I ask you to come up? And this 11 much. is Pakeia Marquez, and I can hold this for you or do 12 you want to hold it? 13 14 MS. MARQUEZ: I can hold it myself. Thank 15 you. My name is Pakeia Marquez and I am 11 years old. I'm here on behalf of unborn kids and born kids like 16 I think this whole situation is very important 17 me. because it affects everything and everybody. 18 Ιt 19 affects the plants and wildlife around here. I have recently been writing an essay 20 about ecosystems and how it can be changed and 21 affected and damaged and, you know, but I read that 22 ecosystems can be very easily poisoned through water, 23 24 air, and soil. Water, if all this radiation leaks

into the water, everything needs water, everything

that's living needs water. It's going to suck up all of that, and it's going to get poisoned.

My house, it has a pump. We pump underground water to our house, and we use it for everyday necessities. What if that gets poisoned? We will get poisoned and all of our produce, our garden. My dad planted a bunch of trees. Is that going to get poisoned, too?

We also are pecan farmers, too, and we get a living off that, too. And we use it for our food. We also grow chili, tomatoes, and a lot of other stuff. Is that going to be affected, too? Who is going to be, you know, who is going to give us back all that produce that we just probably lost? Who is going to be, you know, who is going to pay for it? Who is going to, like, you know, reimburse us for it?

I've been reading this book on climate change. It says radioactivity does contribute to climate change. It doesn't really produce that much carbon dioxide, but, at the same time, it still does affect. And if you've seen a microwave, that's radiation. Imagine a microwave in the world. The whole world is a microwave. Microwaves make heat. That's going to be contributing to climate change. It's going to be contributing to a whole lot of

1	problems. You may think you might be solving a
2	problem but really you're just creating more problems
3	to solve, and they might just be forever and you might
4	just not be able to solve them.
5	So please do remember that I cannot vote,
6	so you need to vote for this because I don't really
7	have a vote for this. So please do vote against this
8	horrible mistake. Thank you.
9	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank
10	you, Pakeia. And that will be a hard act to follow,
11	but Susybelle? Yes, I know. It's been one of those
12	nights. Do you want to sit down and have me hold this
13	for you?
14	MS. GOSSLEE: No, no, I do not. I'm
15	perfectly capable.
16	MR. CAMERON: All right.
17	MS. GOSSLEE: Sorry. I'm Susybelle
18	Gosslee. I'm testifying as a member and on behalf of
19	the League of Women Voters of Texas regarding the
20	license application for the consolidated interim
21	storage facility that has been described today.
22	We appreciate the opportunity to appear
23	before you today and thank you for allowing us to
24	share the League of Women Voters of Texas position on
25	this issue. We are very concerned about many aspects

of the high-level radioactive waste disposal, the storage proposal, most importantly the health, safety of people and the environment and the transportation risks.

Our position on hazardous materials and high-level radioactive materials, like other League positions, is derived through a lengthy and thoughtful process involving the participation of 25 city leagues representing our members and supporters throughout the state of Texas. We support the League of Women Voters of New Mexico.

Neither Holtec International, WCS, or any other company should be allowed to develop an interim storage location without a plan for a permanent disposal site and a robust system for storage. Doing other site-wise would not protect local residents, their health, or the environment from having this temporary site become a permanent site. What is the plan for locating a permanent repository for this hazardous material?

More specific information is needed by a verifiable independent third party to authenticate the suitability of the proposed New Mexico and Texas sites by using data accumulated with the most up-to-date research, in addition to the past data that's been

accumulated. A conflict of interest and the appearance of a conflict of interest should be avoided.

Transportation issues are a great concern. We have a number of questions concerning those, in addition to the ones that have been presented. Accidents do happen. They said that there would be, you know, the Titanic would not sink and it did. can go on with numerous examples. What would be the standards and quarantees for the railroad routes for this highly-irradiated material? What would be the financial assurances provided by the railroad companies, the states, and Holtec International? would the financial assurances be monitored? Who would inspect and monitor these systems? What would penalties if the safety and assurances are not adequate? There are many questions that are posed in the paper that I will submit online.

I would also like to say, since the time is so limited, the same questions for the railroads apply for the roads and the highways that would be carrying the heavy high-level radioactive waste. How much transport of high-level radioactive waste would be on the highways exactly, really? Heavy loads do more damage to highways than the lighter traffic.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We can learn from past accidents. In fact, there was the comment about the incidents in Sweden, and 80 percent of the reindeer had to be killed after the Chernobyl site and every year reindeer have to be killed in Sweden because of continued contamination, even though that was over 30 years ago. The wind carried the radiation across Sweden, Europe, and the Northern Hemisphere. That can happen also in Texas and in this country.

Thank you for having the public comment meeting in Roswell in Carlsbad, New Mexico. However, none of these cities has easy access by airlines and are accessible to most people. Meetings should be held in Dallas and Fort Worth, a major hub of transportation by rail. San Antonio, El Paso, Albuquerque, Santa Fe. In addition, major cities across the U.S. that would be highly likely radiation transport routes. Thank you for considering the League of Women Voters' comments.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Is Soya, Soya Stevens? How about Alfredo Dominguez? Alfredo? And then we're going to try Stephen P-I-C-H-A. I'm not sure how you pronounce that. But, Alfredo, welcome.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: My name is Alfredo Dominguez. I live in Roswell since 1980. I thought

a lot about what I was going to say here tonight, and then when I get here and look at the slide show and it says this purpose is to determine if it's safe to build and operate a consolidated interim storage facility at the proposed site. And I cannot conceive any stretch of the imagination how transporting this nuclear waste across Texas and the nation is ever going to be safe. Each cannister is a target for terrorists that want to do us harm. Terrorists have already used our airlines against us, our postal They're trying to hack our internet to system. control the nuclear reactors. This is giving them a giant bomb. All they have to do is formulate a shape charge, and they won't set it off at the Holtec site, they'll set it off at a major metropolitan center. There is nothing that can stop, if that happens, there's nothing that will clean that up ever.

Licensing this site for 40 years for 500 canisters will not help alleviate the problem of permanent solution there. We'll just create another site that's going to be contaminated. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much. And is Stephen Picha here? Tom Gorman? Abraham, Abraham Guevara? Cole Ford? Okay. How about Morton, Morton Kral, K-R-A-L? Okay. Larry

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Martin? Larry.

MR. MARTIN: Am I the last one?

MR. CAMERON: No, that honor goes to Bill Madison if Bill is here. Is Bill here? Yes, Bill will be our last speaker.

MR. MARTIN: I didn't see anyone come in after me. That's why I said that. I'm sort of neutral on this. I didn't hear about it until yesterday, so I think the publicity was lacking, although I was obviously out of the loop. I suggest, just like Mr. Jimi said, that you get a bigger room. I mean, there's a theater down here with 406 seats in it. Instead, we're in this dinky little room here where not enough to argue with you.

I realize you have a problem. You've got all this waste sitting around on the East Coast, West Coast, that somebody wants to put somewhere else. And that's usually the politicians in those states, not here. On the other hand, I don't want the politicians in Austin and Santa Fe determining whether or not Roswell gets them, okay? That may be against a lot of the people who have come in from Santa Fe and have an argument, but southeast and southern New Mexico always seem to get on the short end of the stick in the politics in this state.

In Roswell, we have an aquifer. We don't share it with Clovis or Midland. I don't think we share it with Artesia. It's our own little lake down there, and it's very valuable. If it should be polluted, Roswell will dry up and blow away because industry will leave. I mean, the agriculture will leave and we're gone. The importance of maintaining a clean aquifer, and that would be a problem if something happened, would be catastrophic for Roswell.

The question I have is is the location near an aquifer, which I might have missed. You may have said it. I came in late. And also does this place have to be cooled? I would imagine so. And the problems with Fukushima, Chernobyl were cooling problems, and Fukushima is still a spot where no human can endure it's so hot and so polluted. And they don't know what to do.

So if you have a nuclear problem where you can no longer cool your trash, you are in serious trouble and it will eventually, like the old movie. I don't have much more to say other than that, but if something happened where the cooling system fails, such as a massive grid failure in this country, you would have approximately 99 uncooled nuclear bombs. You're talking about half the country totally out of

1 it forever. That's what they're trying to prevent, I think. 2 But I don't see anyone arguing the case 3 4 that you have to maintain these places to be cool. No 5 one talks about it, but that's a major, major factor. 6 Thanks. 7 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you for those 8 comments. Bill? 9 My name is Bill Madison. MR. MADISON: 10 MR. CAMERON: Let me get you in there. My name is Bill Madison. 11 MR. MADISON: I'm from Roswell. I live in Northern New Mexico also. 12 I have property in Roswell that I take care of. I was 13 14 at the WIPP hearings when the WIPP hearings came, and 15 I don't know, none of you obviously were there, you're too young. We were told that that would be all that 16 would be in New Mexico and there would be no high-17 level radiation in New Mexico, that there would be no 18 19 accidents at WIPP, it was failsafe, 100-percent So it's hard for me to kind of embrace 20 failsafe. what's going on here because the government has lied 21 22 to us, blatant lie. So I think that you should look at that 23 24 and understand that we've been told one thing and now all of a sudden there's this new thing that's coming 25

at us.

A lot of eloquent speakers today. There's a lot of information that you folks -- this thing at SMU. I'm not aware of it. It sounds kind of interesting. The fracking going on in the area and on the introduction of the liquids causing these tremors in Oklahoma, will that happen in the basin? It well could. Obviously, there's holes there, and I'm sure you folks are out looking at that.

But the really main thing is that we've been lied to. So that's my spiel. Thank you for your time and thank you for being here and listening to this, and I agree that -- I just found out about this today, but I'm not really in the loop very much. So thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Madison. In about a minute, I'm going to turn it over to the senior NRC official here, Brian Smith, who is just going to say a few final words. But I think that I mentioned earlier in the evening that the NRC would not be responding to any comments. Well, there's only one time when they do do that when there were statements or implications about NRC's statutory authority or responsibility, and we don't want people to leave thinking that the NRC regulates something

that it doesn't. I think he's going to talk about something like that.

But before Brian goes on, I just want to thank all of you for your patience and for your comments tonight. And I have to thank Chief Newberry and his officers again for helping us. And I have to thank Porter's father for bringing Porter in here. Maybe the most sensible sentient being that's here, but I'm not going to go further into that. But, Brian, go ahead.

MR. SMITH: All right. Thanks, Chip. I guess the clarification, the one thing there, is the WIPP site has been mentioned several times and has been correlated that the NRC has been involved with that. There's been no NRC involvement with the WIPP site. That's totally under the Department of Energy. So we are not a regulator of that site.

And just one other clarification. Earlier on in the session there was a question about has the NRC ever denied an application? The context of that, the way I took it was an application like the one that we're talking about here, a consolidated interim storage facility application. So that's how I answered the question. There's been three of those that have been submitted. One has been approved, one

1	is on hold, and we're reviewing the Holtec one now.
2	But when you look at the NRC as a whole,
3	and we do lots of licensing for lots of different
4	types of uses of material, and we have denied
5	licenses, applications in the past. But what
6	typically happens is we ask so many questions, raise
7	so many issues with certain applications that they end
8	up being withdrawn and not pursued any further. And
9	it gets to the point or we don't get to the point
10	where we terminate or deny those applications. So
11	those two clarifications there.
12	So I just want to thank everyone again for
13	attending the meeting tonight. We appreciate you
14	coming out and staying this late, as well. We value
15	all of your comments, and we'll consider those as we
16	prepare our draft EIS. Once the draft EIS is
17	published, I want to encourage you to review the
18	document and again provide us any comments you think
19	that we need to complete the document itself.
20	So thank you again and have a good
21	evening.
22	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. We're adjourned.
23	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
24	the record at 10:42 p.m.)