Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Scoping Meeting

Docket Number: N/A

Location: Albuquerque, New Mexico

Date: 05-22-18

Work Order No.: NRC-3722 Pages 1-166

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 IMPACT
5	STATEMENT FOR HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL'S HI-STORE
6	CONSOLIDATED INTERIM STORAGE FACILITY FOR SPENT
7	NUCLEAR FUEL LOCATED IN LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO
8	+ + + +
9	TUESDAY,
10	MAY 22, 2018
11	+ + + +
12	ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO
13	+ + + +
14	The Public Scoping Meeting was convened in
15	the Crown Plaza Albuquerque, Southeast Ballroom, 1901
16	University Boulevard, at 6:00 p.m., Chip Cameron,
17	facilitating.
18	
19	NRC STAFF PRESENT:
20	CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator
21	BRIAN SMITH, Deputy Director, Division of Fuel Cycle
22	Safety, Safeguards, and Environmental Review,
23	Office of Nuclear Material Safety and
24	Safeguards (NMSS)
25	

1	JILL CAVERLY, Environmental Review Project Manager,
2	Environmental Review Branch, NMSS
3	JOSÉ CUADRADO, Licensing and Safety Review Project
4	Manager, Spent Fuel Licensing Branch, NMSS
5	DAVID McINTYRE, Public Affairs Officer, Office of
6	Public Affairs
7	JOHN McKIRGAN, Chief, Spent Fuel Licensing Branch,
8	NMSS
9	ANGEL MORENO, Congressional Affairs Officer, Office
10	of Congressional Affairs
11	CINTHYA ROMAN, Chief, Environmental Review Branch,
12	NMSS
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	3
1	T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S
2	
3	Opening Remarks and Introductions 4
4	Welcome and Meeting Purpose4
5	NRC Licensing Review/EIS Process 10
6	Receive Public Comment
7	Closing Remarks
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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

2

1

6:04 p.m.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

MR. CAMERON: Well, good evening, My name is Chip Cameron and it is going to be my pleasure to serve as your facilitator for tonight's meeting, and in that role I'll try to help you all have a productive meeting tonight.

And this is a meeting that's been convened NRC. That's the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And we're going to try to not use many acronyms tonight. You will hear NRC. You're also going to hear NEPA. That stands for the National Environmental Policy Act. And you're going to hear EIS. That stands for Environmental Impact Statement.

And that's the focus of the meeting tonight, the NRC's environmental review of a license application that they received from the Holtec International Company to build and operate an interim spent fuel storage facility in Lea County. So the NRC is going to present information to you. It will be brief, but they're going to present information to you on the environmental review that they do and the safety review. Those are the two main components of the NRC review of the license application to help them determine whether they should grant the application;

in other words, grant the license.

After the NRC presentations we're going to go to the most important part of the meeting, and that's to give the NRC an opportunity to listen to you, to your comments, your advice on the issue of scoping.

Now scoping is a term that's used in connection with the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. And it's very simple: It's what should be evaluated in the EIS; what doesn't need to be evaluated in the EIS? And scoping is the very beginning of the NRC's licensing review, so we're right at the start of this particular process.

Your comments are going to be on the formal record tonight. We have Bruce Carlson over here. He's our court reporter, or stenographer. He's going to be transcribing your comments. That transcript will be available to you within about two weeks. And the NRC is going to tell you how you get access to that transcript so you can read all the comments that were given tonight.

Now I have a list of names of people who want to speak tonight from the blue cards that you filled out when you came in, if you filled out a blue card to speak. And I'm going to call your name. And

I'll call a few names at a time so that you'll have a preview of when you're coming up next. But I'll call your name and I'll just ask you to join me up here and to give your comment to us.

Now we have many speakers tonight, so I'm setting a four-minute limit for each comment. And at the end of that comment I'm going to ask you sit down and we're going to the next speaker.

Now fortunately you can also submit a written comment to the NRC so you can amplify on your four minutes in writing. And the NRC will tell you how to do that, how to submit comments in writing.

Now the NRC staff is here tonight to listen carefully to your comments. They're not going to be responding to any questions that you might include in your comments, but they're going to be listening and then we're going to carefully evaluate your comments, your questions as they prepare the draft EIS, the draft Environmental Impact Statement. And you're going to hear about that in a few minutes.

And we do have a representative from Holtec International here, representatives. They're the license applicant. And they'll be available after the meeting if you have any questions for them. And I'll just introduce Joy Russell who's right here. And

1 should tell you that we also offer the --2 representative of the license applicant an opportunity 3 to speak for their four minutes during the public 4 comment if they want to do so, and I think we're going 5 to have a speaker from the license applicant. don't want anybody to be shocked or surprised by that. 6 7 Let me introduce some representatives of 8 the congressional staff who are here tonight to be 9 able to tell their members what transpired here 10 tonight. And first of all, let me introduce Poqueen. Poqueen Rivera is right back there, and she's from 11 Congresswoman Michelle Lujan Grisham's staff. 12 We have Barbara Romero. Barbara? 13 14 MS. ROMERO: I'm right here. 15 MR. CAMERON: There's Barbara. Barbara is 16 from Congressman Steve Pearce's staff. We have Bill Goldman who's right back 17 And Bill is with Senator Tom Udall. 18 here. 19 And we also have Joshua Sanchez. And he is with -- also with Senator Udall's 20 Joshua. staff. 21 22 But thank you for being here and thank 23 your representative, your senator for sending you here 24 tonight. 25 Let me introduce the NRC staff to you, and then we're going to get -- we'll get started with the meeting.

First of all, we're going to hear from

First of all, we're going to hear from Cinthya Roman. This is Cinthya. And Cinthya is the Chief of the Branch -- Environmental Review Branch at the NRC in the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

Then we're going to hear from the key person here, Jill Caverly, who's right here. And she's the project manager for the environmental review. She's going to give you the most information. We also -- she works for Cinthya in the branch.

And we do have a senior NRC representative here, a senior manager who's with us, and that's Brian Smith. Okay? And Brian is the Deputy Division Director of the Division of Fuel Cycle, Safeguards and Environmental Review.

I also mentioned the safety review. We have representatives on the NRC staff who are here from the safety side. And where's José? Ah, Jose Cuadrado. He is the project manager for the safety review. We also have José's branch chief John McKirgan who's here, and that's the Spent Fuel Licensing Branch.

Dave McIntyre back here is from the NRC's

1 Office of Public Affairs. And if there's any media 2 people that haven't talked to Dave yet, please see him and he'll fix you up. 3 4 MR. McINTYRE: And just if Ι could 5 interrupt. We had a couple of requests for the pass 6 code for the WiFi. It is in all caps HPHK. 7 MR. CAMERON: So hold on a minute. Let me 8 get that on a microphone. 9 MR. McINTYRE: We've had a couple requests 10 for the pass code for the meeting room WiFi. HPHK, all capitals. 11 12 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Dave. And finally we have a representative here 13 14 from the NRC's Office of Congressional Affairs in Quantico, Maryland. 15 Thank you all for being here. 16 17 And the last thing is I would just ask everybody to be courteous, all of us to be courteous. 18 19 You may hear opinions tonight that don't agree with 20 your own opinions, but just be courteous. And I would 21 have to say this is our fifth meeting in New Mexico 22 and the meetings have been pretty courteous, which is 23 wonderful, and we've had good comments. But there was

a slight kerfuffle, okay, at the Carlsbad meeting

So we have new time keepers.

about time keeping.

24

1 They fired me. Okay? 2 (Laughter.) I was the kerfuffle, I 3 MR. CAMERON: 4 But any rate, we have time keepers down here 5 and we have Marla S. Morales, right, and Miriam Jucket, and they're going to be here. And when you 6 7 have -- when three minutes has gone by, Marla is going 8 to hold this up so you know to finish up. And then 9 when the four minutes is up, she's going to hold this up for you. And then we're going to go on from there. 10 So I just wanted you to plan accordingly for that. 11 And with that, Cinthya, do you want to 12 take us away here? 13 14 MS. ROMAN: Good evening. First I just 15 want to say a couple of remarks in Spanish. 16 (Foreign language spoken.) 17 MS. ROMAN: Good evening. As you mentioned, staff in my branch will be working with the 18 19 Environmental Review Branch on the environmental 20 review and the application. Our main goal today is to 21 hear from you, so I'm going to be very brief. 22 First I want to give you a very brief overview of what NRC does and our role in the Holtec 23 project. Our agency is charged by federal law to be 24 25 the nation's only regulator of commercial --

PARTICIPANT: You're speaking too fast and you're not loud enough.

MS. ROMAN: Okay. Can you hear me better?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

MS. ROMAN: Our agency is charged by federal law to be the nation's only regulator of commercial nuclear materials in the (unintelligible) ensuring these materials are used, handled and stored safely and securely. Our nation is protective of its health and safety for both the common defense and security and protect the environment by regulating the use of hazardous materials. So our mission we currently review each license application we receive before making a decision on whether or not to grant an applicant's request.

Next slide. NRC regulates the operation of many kinds of nuclear power reactors that generate about 20 percent of the electricity in the United We also regulate the significant use of nuclear materials, research reactors at universities, transportation of nuclear materials and their storage disposal. NRC trying and is to be open transparent in its review. As such, stakeholders have many opportunities to participate in public meetings on environmental and safety issues. This scoping

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

meeting is one of those opportunities.

Next slide. As an independent regulator the NRC determines whether it is safe to build and operate a storage facility at those sites. The NRC does not promote or build any nuclear facilities. We also do not own or operate the facilities. Again, our mission and our regulations are designed to protect both the public, workers and the environment.

Holtec is applying for a license to store waste. Holtec is not asking NRC for permission to reprocess or generate more waste. NRC does not select locations for a storage facility which is the impact of building and operating a storage facility at a location proposed by the licensee.

As we will explain later in this presentation there is also an environmental review that will be documented in an Environmental Impact Statement, which is up on the documents. This analysis along with other factors will form the basis for this -- our decision to issue a license or not.

These are all of my remarks and now Jill Caverly will provide additional details about the Holtec project and the environmental review process. Thank you.

MS. CAVERLY: So hello. My name is Jill

Caverly and I'm going to be acting as the environmental project manager for this review.

The next few slides we have will be specific to the Holtec storage facility application we're reviewing.

So Holtec has applied for a license to construct and operate a storage facility under 10 CFR, Part 72. That's NRC's regulations governing the storage of spent fuel and reactor-related greater than class C waste.

year license to construct and operate a consolidated interim storage facility. The current application before the NRC requests construction and operation of only the first phase 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 fuel would come from shut down and operating power plants around the country.

Holtec anticipates applying for up to 20 phases of construction and operation of 500 canisters of spent nuclear fuel for a total of 10,000 canisters. However, these additional phases would require separate applications from Holtec and would be subject to their own safety and environmental reviews. The

Environmental Report provides information on the full build-out of the site for 10,000 canisters.

Next slide, please. This slide shows the approximate location for the proposed consolidated interim storage facility in Southeastern New Mexico. The facility will be located approximately halfway between the cities of Carlsbad and Hobbs in Lea County.

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

This 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. The canister transfer facility will be below ground. And you can see from the picture that this is a low-profile design. This is the conceptual drawing from the Holtec application.

Next slide. So this flowchart provides an overview of the license application process which can be described as three -- a three-program reviews

process. So after the application is submitted NRC conducts an acceptance review to determine if the application has sufficient enough information to begin a detailed technical review. If so, the NRC dockets the application and this begins the safety and environmental review task.

So from a safety standpoint we work through a separate review to decide if the license should be issued. The results of that safety review is the Safety Evaluation Report. That's graphically represented on the left column of the flowchart. The environmental review results in an Environmental Impact Statement which describes the impacts on the environment of the proposed project.

On the right side you'll see the box saying adjudicatory hearings. That 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 was granted.

The results of these three processes is a hearing if granted. The results of the environmental review documented in an Environmental Impact Statement and the safety review documented in a Safety Evaluation Report will factor into NRC's final decision whether or not to grant the license to Holtec

for the storage facility. It's important to reiterate that the focus of tonight's meeting will be on the environmental review process.

Next slide. So this flow diagram outlines the environmental review process, or the middle column of the previous slide. The opportunities for the public involvement are highlighted in light blue. The NRC starts the environmental review by publishing a notice of intent to inform the public of our plans to prepare an EIS and to conduct these public hearings.

The light blue box on the right side identifies the current scoping process of which this meeting -- of which this meeting is included. The purpose of this phase is the added information to use to help us to prepare the EIS. Comments gathered from this meeting as well as other information collections will be independently evaluated for the impacts to this particular project. We will document your comments today in a meeting transcript, and the public can also provide written comments through the end of the scoping period.

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

blue box. We'll come out and schedule to hear those comments on the draft EIS. We'll evaluate your comments and adjust our EIS if necessary.

Next slide, please. So our environmental review is based on the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. NEPA requires that federal agencies apply a systematic approach to evaluate impacts on the environment. NRC will prepare the EIS in accordance with those regulations.

Next slide, please. So this graphical representation of the types of sources of information that NRC gathers when preparing an EIS. We will conduct site visits. We'll meet with local and state officials and other federal agencies. are currently gathering that information for scoping to determine which issues should considered in our review. We also expect to request additional information from Holtec after the completion of this portion.

Next slide. So the NRC will gather information on a wide range of topics related to environmental issues. And this slide shows for a period we will consider in our Environmental Impact Statement.

Moving on, this slide is a high-level

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

timeline for our anticipated environmental review. This stepwise approach meets our responsibility under the National Environmental Policy Act. We've started the review with the notice of intent to conduct scopings and prepare the EIS, and that started the 60-day scoping period. NRC received several requests to extend the scoping period, and did so. The revised scoping period will now end on July 30th.

We will continue to gather and analyze information related to the review and develop and publish the draft EIS. At that point we'll publish a notice of availability, and that will start a 45-day period for the public and other agencies to comment on the draft EIS. Again, those comments will be addressed.

Next slide. So the scoping process helps the NRC to determine the scope of the EIS and identify significant issues to be analyzed in depth. It also identifies and eliminates issues which are not significant. It also identifies other environmental reviews and computational requirements related to the proposed action.

Next slide. So the NRC is requesting information that is specific to this proposed facility regarding what should be included or excluded from the

EIS. Some examples of that information 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 any unique characteristics of the project site or local community that the NRC should consider in its evaluation?

Next slide. So these are the ways you can submit comments on the scope of the EIS. You may present your comments orally today in а You may submit comments through regulations.gov web site. And please search the docket ID, NRC-2018-0052. And you may mail comments to the address on the slide. And finally, you may email your comments to an email address which we recently added. So remember written comments are due by July 30th, and we would appreciate it if you try to get them in by that time.

Next slide. So these are ways to get -to find additional information on the application.
You can look at the federal OMB web site, or the NRC's
public document, or to the NRC's project-specific web
site for the Holtec application, which is listed on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

this slide here.

We've also provided copies of the Environmental Report to the public libraries in Hobbs, Carlsbad and Roswell for you to review.

If you'd like to be on the mailing list, please make sure that your name and your email address were provided to one of the NRC staff at the registration table. This is one way to ensure that you will be notified of upcoming meetings of issuance the draft and final EIS. At the bottom of the slide are the NRC's points of contacts for this application.

And that concludes my portion of the presentation. Please remember that the scoping period will end on July 30th.

MR. SMITH: Good evening to all of you and thank you for attending the public scoping meeting tonight. My name is Brian Smith. I'm Deputy Director for the Division of Fuel Cycle Safety, Safeguards and Environmental Review at the NRC Headquarters Office in Rockville, Maryland. Jill and Cinthya work with my division has responsibility for preparing and conducting the environmental review for the Holtec application. It's a responsibility they take very seriously.

I know that some of you in audience are

supportive of project and there are those of you that may be against the project. We're going to hear from both sides tonight, but most importantly we want to hear from you.

One thing I'd like to address like I did last night is in some of our previous scoping meetings the consent-based process was addressed by a number of commenters. This is not a process that the NRC It is a process that DOE undertook an initiative on a while back which they later then Under the NRC process the NRC writes the stopped. regulations that individual applicants have to meet to license to do work obtain a radioactive materials. An applicant will choose a site and then prepare their application based regulations and then submit that application to us prior to review.

As we complete our review, go through the safety review, security review, environmental review to decide how well we have met all of the regulations. If we determine that those regulations have been satisfied, we can then issue a license. With this particular license application we are nowhere near that point. We're in the very early stages of our review and no decision has been made yet on 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

whether to issue a license on this project or not.

Finally, I'd like to make an apology. In an effort to be more open and transparent for these two meetings we prepared -- we actually had an Navajo translator translate our slides into Navajo. Unfortunately, due to a computing error, when the slides printed off a number of errors worked their way into the slides. So we did not catch that and we did pass out those slides at the meeting and some of you in the audience identified those errors. So we apologize for that.

The next slide. Finally, we do want to hear your comments tonight. We look forward to hearing those. This is our sixth meeting that we've conducted on the project. We've received a lot of great comments so far, so we want to hear what you have to say tonight. So with that I'll turn over to Chip Cameron.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Cinthya and Jill and Brian. And let me follow up that apology with another apology to all of you. We have well over 60 people who signed up to talk tonight. And I originally was going to give everybody four minutes. We're going to have to go down to three minutes. And it's not because the NRC staff wants to

1	end the meeting at 9:00. Okay. We're going to stay
2	until we hear from all of you. But I just want to
3	make sure that all of you can get out of here before
4	midnight. Okay?
5	So just try to be brisk in your comments.
6	And if you need to follow it up, send in a written
7	comment. I at three minutes you're going to get the
8	point across. I know many of you who we've heard
9	before, you get the point across right away. We know
10	what it is. So if you could do that.
11	And let me just introduce two more
12	congressional staff. Where's Jennifer? Jennifer
13	is it Cataychiss?
14	MS. CATECHIS: Catechis.
15	MR. CAMERON: Ah, Catechis?
16	MS. CATECHIS: Yes.
17	MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Jennifer. And
18	she's with Congressman Ben Ray Lujan. Thank you for
19	being here.
20	And we also have Mike Solomon who's with
21	Senator Martin Heinrich.
22	Okay. Let's get started. And we're going
23	to State Senator Cisco McSorley first.
24	If you could come up here?
25	Then we're going to go to John Heaton, H.

1 Vern Payne, Joe Mumley and Ed Mayer. 2 Senator? 3 MR. McSORLEY: Thank you. I have worked 4 on nuclear waste disposal repository systems since the 5 1970s. I was tasked with researching the low-level nuclear waste site, the WIPP site. 6 At that time 7 UNESCO promised that we'd have a veto. When it became 8 evident New Mexico never agreed to such a ridiculous 9 site, the veto was withdrawn. It was just the first 10 long line of lies that's been told to the people of the State of New Mexico. 11 12 I have been in the legislature since 1985. I've served on virtually every 13 Since that time 14 committee that -- in both the House and the Senate 15 dealing with the environmental initiatives. We have 16 never had a presentation to the legislature on this 17 site. Your public representatives are totally in the dark. 18 19 Then a few years ago when Mr. Heaton was giving us a tour of the WIPP site, he claimed that the 20 21 WIPP site was able to take high-level nuclear waste. 22 I disagreed with him in public and I still disagree 23 with him. That's not true. 24 (Applause.) 25 MR. McSORLEY: The other thing is if you

look at what the NRC is supposed to do with it, it's not enough. New Mexico has borne the brunt from the mining of uranium to the atomic bomb to the sites at Los Alamos and each and every time promises were made and not yet -- even right now we're in the process of changing the person -- the group that oversees Los Alamos, and they have a horrible record of safety as it relates to uranium.

The idea that we are going to give a company, a for-profit company the ability to handle uranium that is going to be radioactive and deadly for 600 years, the ability and the license to do so with a 20-year bonding capacity to me seems absolutely ridiculous --

(Applause.)

MR. McSORLEY: The other thing I want to say is this: We were promised with WIPP that these safety regulations would be in effect and there would never be a 10,000-year accident like the one we just experienced. My God, if that happened at WIPP, what can happen here?

And lastly, this whole thing is like to me saying the sailing of the *Titanic* was a great success, because after all there were four great things. Well, ladies and gentlemen, 20 years are not the four great

1 things that my daughter will be living and your 2 daughter and our people after us. Please require more 3 input by the state legislature, not just the Executive 4 Branch, and expand your consideration of what we must 5 do, because it is certainly not enough. Thank you. (Applause.) 6 7 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, senator. 8 John Heaton? 9 Good evening. MR. HEATON: My name is 10 John Heaton and I am the Chair of the Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance, and we are the owners of property where the 11 site will occur. We've been involved with Holtec with 12 this and they are absolutely a great company and we're 13 14 proud to be associated with them. I am a private 15 citizen and a volunteer. For five meetings now I've heard so many what-ifs, and bogus, not factual 16 17 information. And I'd like to if I could straighten out a couple of those. 18 First, it's illegal to license or build a 19 20 private storage facility. If it's illegal, why are 21 there 70-some private storage facilities at the sites 22 in the United States? 23 Utilities are responsible for their spent 24 fuel until moved to a repository. Yes, that's true,

but in 1998 they were supposed to -- DOE was supposed

to take the fuel and didn't take the fuel. The utilities sued and they won. And now you the taxpayer are paying for the maintenance of this material at these sites. And that number is about \$500 million a year.

The casks -- another point is the casks will break and leak, destroying land everywhere. That's nonsense. Triple-containment -- fuel cladding, the canister and then the cask form a triple containment. These shipments are managed very carefully. Can't say that there won't be a leak, but I can say there -- there won't be an accident, but I can say there won't be a leak.

The rail can't handle the weight of the cask and rail car. This too is a ridiculous statement. The train engine that -- weighs more than the rail car and the cask itself and goes up and down the rail every day. Weight is managed with more axles and can distribute the weight.

A cask passing me will contaminate me and my children. Again, the outside of the cask is five times less than the NRC standard. You'd have to stand in one place for many, many hours to even get the dose of a dental X-ray, and that would be very close, two meters from the cask. People get X-rays, CT scans,

1	various other scans, valium stress tests with impunity
2	in the U.S. and never are concerned. In fact, there
3	are 50 million of these procedures done in the United
4	States on an annual basis. So is there so much
5	hysteria about a project like this?
6	This is a great project, job-creating and
7	clearly is a very important environmental project. If
8	you are concerned about the environment and where
9	waste is being stored now, you would support this
10	project because it is the responsible action to take.
11	Thank you.
12	(Applause.)
13	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank
14	you, John.
15	And this is Mr. Payne coming up join us at
16	the podium.
17	MR. PAYNE: Ladies and gentlemen, I was
18	born and raised down in Southwestern New Mexico.
19	PARTICIPANT: We can't hear you.
20	MR. PAYNE: I'm sorry. Can you hear me
21	now?
22	MR. CAMERON: That's much better. Thank
23	you.
24	MR. PAYNE: I was born and raised in
25	Southwestern New Mexico and early one morning in July
	·

of 1945 I was outside and saw a great flash, orange-ish/black flash cover the sky. So I probably am the only person in the room that saw the birth of the atomic age.

I've watched closely over those years as work been done and I can't say whether the site in Lea County is good, bad or indifferent, but what I have to offer is that there has been a recent development of an improved cement; it's called ceramic cement, that has about an 85 percent improvement of shielding the rays, gamma rays and other rays, and -- over cement. It has a much longer life. It doesn't leak like colored cement. And there are many, many other favorable things that has developed. been

Unfortunately, it wasn't developed 30 years ago or 40 years ago, but the scientists from North Carolina State University have improved it. I have provided a white paper and a little summary statement of what this product will do to give comfort to people that are concerned about the containment. And we believe that this would offer an alternative that would solve many of the current problems when we have the storage of radioactive or nuclear waste.

I recommend that you get into the transcript of this meeting and read those summaries.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I feel that we finally have a breakthrough in terms of a product that will help keep up with the concerns of every single one of you in this room, whether in favor or disfavor of the site and the account. I can only say that if I lived next to a site, I would sure want this product. And it's named ARMAKAP, A-R-M-A-K-A-P.

My time is up. I could take five hours and tell you my experiences with the first, last and thereafter, but I shan't do that tonight. Thank you so much.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Payne.

Is Mr. Mumley her, Joe Mumley?

Mr. Mumley?

Okay. Thank you. MR. MUMLEY: I signed up basically because my wife and I started going to fracking meetings in San Juan County, and we've had quite an education that basically there was protection for the water and air. Wasn't enough air monitors or inspectors for the state. There was no federal input to date. It might exist somewhere, but nothing that protects the water. The Albuquerque geologist that worked for oil and gas is pretty positive that the water is going to be polluted here. Nobody has tried to refute him and it continues.

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 I retired here from Brooklyn. We lived a 2 couple blocks from the nuclear waste storage site. A local school discovered it was there during a project. 3 4 They went in and took pictures; nobody stopped them, 5 and discovered all the regulations were being broken and not followed. 6 7 I have a friend in New Hampshire. Не worked on the first atomic nuclear reactor's safety 8 9 features and he said that it was just too expensive 10 and that 40 percent of them had to be eliminated. They couldn't -- and so basically what I learned from 11 12 the fracking is that the infrastructure, including the rows, the number of inspectors, the monitors will not 13 14 be -- will be not done in a responsible way. So I'm 15 against this project. Thank you. 16 (Applause.) 17 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Mumley. And I mentioned that the representative of 18 19 the license applicant was going to take three minutes 20 to talk to you about their intentions. And we have Ed 21 Mayer right here. Ed? 22 23 MR. MAYER: Okay. Good evening. My name 24 Ed Mayer and I'm a program director at Holtec

International, and specifically I'm a program director

for the interim storage facility, and it's really an honor to be here tonight to brief you.

First I'd like to provide Holtec's commitment to the NRC, that we're going to provide all responses in a timely manner to a short and accurate submission, and also to ensure this NRC schedule review process is met. But I think more importantly we're here tonight to provide the facts about the Hi-STORM facility, the consolidated interim storage facility, and to ask for your support for the project.

The Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance, also known as the ELEA, is our partner, and it was formed in 2006 with the express mission of bringing economic benefit to New Mexico. Another thing, what they do, all of its members are long-time proud members, or I should say citizens of New Mexico. So ELEA brings the deep understanding of their communities to the team, and we really appreciate the team.

Holtec International is a strong technology company. Our core business for the past 32 years is safe and secure storage of used nuclear fuel. All the equipment supplied by Holtec has been designed, engineered, licensed, applicated and in many cases operated by Holtec employees.

And Holtec is an American company. We

have three manufacturing facilities: one in Orrville,
Ohio. That's mostly our aluminum work. Pittsburgh,
Pennsylvania. Makes sense. Steel work. And then our
newest in Camden, New Jersey that does both aluminum
and steel work.

We have an impeccable safety record. None of our equipment has ever experienced a safety issue that leaked or caused any personal injury. The members of ELEA asked Holtec to be their partner in 2013 after careful evaluation of the safety and security of our used fuel storage and transportation equipment.

Holtec with outstanding support from ELEA will obtain the NRC license to construct and operate the consolidated interim storage facility. The name of the facility is facility HI-STORM.

So once the appropriate contract and final revisions are in place Holtec will construct and operate the facility. Local residents and companies will be hired for the construction and operations, and both will bring high-paying jobs to New Mexico. We expect about 100 construction jobs over the life of the construction, which will be about a decade, and about 100 operations jobs in the facility. And it will pay 60 to \$80,000 a year to the operations jobs.

1 The people of New Mexico are rich 2 technical knowledge, especially nuclear technology 3 with two national laboratories, three alternate flow 4 path bases and an Army base, the Waste Isolation Pilot 5 Plant an URENCO. geology site characteristics 6 The 7 environment and other factors for the proposed site are ideal for the storage of used nuclear fuel. 8 9 mission, Holtec's mission is to offer a temporary safe and secure storage facility for the nation's used 10 nuclear fuel. And temporary is measured in decades 11 and the final repository will be the Yucca or another 12 deep repository will be where the fuel will go after 13 14 this interim storage. 15 MR. CAMERON: Okay. I'm going to have to 16 ask you to finish up. MR. MAYER: 17 I guess the last thing I have to say is that I'll be at the table in the back. I've 18 19 had some great conversations with some of you and we'd 20 like to continue those conversations. So please come 21 back to meet with us. 22 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. 23 (Applause.) 24 CAMERON: We're going to 25 Magrath next and Greg Mello, Stan Fitch, Yemane

1 Asmerom and Terry Sloan. 2 And, Barney? This way the NRC staff will be able to --3 4 PARTICIPANT: Can we raise that 5 microphone? It's hard to hear. And they lean down a little bit at the beginning and then we can't hear 6 7 after they stand up. So can we can raise that? 8 have the technology, right? 9 (Laughter.) 10 (Simultaneous speaking.) MR. MAGRATH: All right. Thank you. 11 My 12 name is Barney Magrath. I'm from Santa Fe and I'm with the Santa Fe Democratic Party. 13 I have a BS in 14 physics and I know the science. And I want 15 highlight the false assumption that a centralized facility would be safer for our national security. 16 17 In 2001 Allison McFarland published a paper entitled, "Interim Storage of Spent Fuel in the 18 19 This 41-page report presents the United States." 20 concerns -- security concerns of interim storage, and 21 I'll quote it. 22 "One of the principal arguments for a 23 centralized interim storage facility is based on the 24 notion that a single facility will provide a much

higher level of physical security against sabotage or

theft than many nuclear reactors in which the spent fuel currently resides. Although this may be true in the abstract, an actual practice it is not likely to be so."

First, there is no evidence to suggest that spent fuel which is currently stored in reactors poses any unacknowledged security threat for which the reactors are not already prepared.

Second, a centralized site would put all of the spent fuel in one place. There would not -- with all this spent fuel in one place it would simply add one more place to the list of spent fuel locations because reactors as they continue to operate will continue to have spent fuel on site.

And last of all, the most ominous problem with the argument that a centralized facility is more secure is the fact that all spent fuel would have to be transported with literally thousands of shipments. For those concerned about security, that translates into thousands of opportunities for attacks or thefts of spent fuel. In actuality, spent fuel will be at a much higher risk for sabotage or theft on the roadways than at reactors. Reactors are relatively well-guarded and well-monitored places, whereas spent fuel presents a more plausibly security risk. Thank you

	37
1	very much.
2	(Applause.)
3	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you,
4	Barney.
5	Greg? Greg Mello?
6	MR. MELLO: Hello. Greg Mello with the
7	Los Alamos City.
8	(Applause.)
9	MR. MELLO: Thank you, NRC and Holtec, for
10	coming here and listening. I want to talk briefly
11	about things to analyze carefully in the EIS and
12	reasonable alternatives.
13	There's you need, Mr. Heaton, you
14	really do you need to look at some of the black swans
15	here. You need to look at the bankruptcy of Holtec,
16	bankruptcy of its subsequent operators, gaps between
17	management. Forty years is really a long time. Even
18	DOE doesn't issue 40-year contracts.
19	The problems of transportation which were
20	just mentioned are quite real and need to be looked at
21	very carefully. The how fuel will be transferred
22	to additional different casks for disposal once the
23	fuel is at the facility is going to be a problem
24	because of different disposal facilities and different

storage -- different cask needs. We don't know what

that disposal facility is.

We need to assume that there are broken fuel rods in casks and how will those be handled. What will the infrastructure be for managing loose fissle material and how one could be do the waste processing, the subsequent disposal of that secondary waste stream. Where will the spent fuel pools be, and so on.

We need to look -- terrorism is now big business and there's a lot of people funding it in the Middle East and elsewhere in East Asia. We need to look at attack scenarios that involve heavier weapons than we're used to seeing. And at our DOE facilities in force-on-force exercises there's been unfortunate successes in breaking into DOE facilities, even heavily-guarded ones.

We need to be looking at power failures, even long power failures. We need to be looking at scenarios of civil unrest and how this would affect the security of the facility. We need to look at --very carefully at the ultimate longevity of the facility. How many years of operations once open we're really talking about here and what kind of --what's our ability to look so far into the future.

We need to look at the contagion of

contamination such as we saw with Fukushima where there was an accident. There is contamination in one place that prevents handling, contamination of your body.

We need to look at insider threats. It's very important.

And we need to look at the socioeconomic analysis at the reputational impact and on the attractiveness of this state for businesses and residences. I think it would be quite severe and it's really a serious danger. Part of it is any job that would be created by this and the reputational -- practically our only asset is -- at this point is our attractiveness and our natural environment.

We need to look at the clean-up costs if a canister is breached in a successful attack.

On question of alternatives, there is a fundamental problem because it's difficult for an alternative to appear reasonable because there's not a multimillion dollar applicant process of -- so we have the one alternative, but there really are other alternatives which are much more reasonable, but we don't have an applicant. So the privatization process that lies in the NEPA process severely -- and it's a structural problem of our whole -- everything.

MR. CAMERON: Well, thank you very much. 1 2 I'm going to have to you ask you to --3 (Applause.) 4 MR. CAMERON: Mr. Mello's comments just 5 reminds me to ask all of you to follow up with written comments to the NRC, because there's going to be 6 7 excellent ideas presented here tonight. We don't have a lot of long speaking time, but if you can just 8 9 simply write those into the NRC, it would be really 10 appreciated. And, Stan Fitch? 11 12 And then we're going to go to Yemane. Good evening. 13 MR. FITCH: I appreciate 14 the NRC coming. First, I realize they're required to 15 under international law and the Environmental Policy Act, but I appreciate them coming. And the purpose of 16 this hearing is to accept feedback on siting. So I'll 17 address my initial comments on that. 18 19 It appears that the location is an ideal 20 location both from a geology standpoint 21 hydrological standpoint. Also it satisfies a lot of 22 the environmental justice issues. You have a ready 23 and willing group and a public that's more receptive than Southeastern New Mexico, much as the rest of the 24

state.

My name is Stanley Fitch. I am a resident of Sandia Park, New Mexico. I live in the Sandia Mountains. My family came here 150 years ago. Now, that's probably relative newcomers, because my wife's family came here 400 years ago. But I'm a New Mexican. My great-grandfather Asa Metz Fitch cofounded the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology.

I'm a former manager for the Green State Program and the Radiation Control Program at the New Mexico Environmental Department. While I was there I participated in a number of issues both in defense of the state and review of the environmental projects such as the National Enrichment Facility. I was the state's technical lead on the review of that application.

I have an undergraduate degree from New Mexico State University, I have a graduate degree in radiation safety from Thomas Edison State University in Trenton, New Jersey, and a nuclear engineering degree from the University of Texas, Austin. I'm certified by the American Board of Physics, which is the world's premier certifying organization for radiation protection. I believe I know what I'm talking about when I say I think that's a good

location.

Now when I look at New Mexico and what's going on with our cash flow and our problems with infrastructure and various issues, it's a totally a different state than what my great-grandfather came to. It was a much more progressive state at that time.

My one piece of advice is do thorough, thoughtful regulation. I know, because I helped write significant parts of the Energy Policy and Amendments Act of 2005 related to terrorism. I also wrote many of the regulations that the NRC implements to this day protecting materials from terrorists.

The NRC is not even credible. The people in this state are tired of being locked up. They're tired of being neglected. And so I would say also to the Holtec, be open to people. Be fair with people. Thank you.

(Applause.)

Thank you. Thank you, Stan.

Yemane? This is Yemane Asmerom.

MR. ASMEROM: First thank you to the NRC for coming to hear our voices and I challenge you to listen carefully and honor our input in the final decisions.

My name is Yemane Asmerom. I'm a professor of geochemistry at the University of New Mexico. I'm not here to represent the university. I'm here as a citizen of New Mexico.

First let me just say I think that the spent fuel would be treated materially are stronger. These materials are more radioactive than the material that starts at the reactor. By the end of the process what will happen is the fore mentioned materials that's being changed — the variety of chemistries across the periodic table through all kinds of stuff. That's why the process is not given. So we're actually spending much more material than we started with.

So let me address the germane issues of —
the issue at hand. To me the most critical thing is
long-term storage. The company has been negotiating
for nearly 40 years. The outcome of the project is no
more real than it was 40 years ago. By burdening us
with this facility will just simply delay the longterm eventuality of this material. And my concern is
that in 20 years or 40 years this material is going to
be (unintelligible). I am charging the federal
officials here if you can — how can you say you will
take care of this? The fact is you haven't taken care

1 of hundreds of sites right now that are burdening our 2 community. (Applause.) 3 4 MR. ASMEROM: -- how can we know the 5 ability to assure anyone? Secondly, I think the company assures us 6 7 this is safe material. Yes, it's zirconium and it's safer than steel and all that stuff. If it's that 8 9 safe, then why are you that this is an environmentally suitable place? It should be then safe to store it in 10 California, in Michigan or New York. 11 12 (Applause.) MR. ASMEROM: There is an underlying truth 13 14 though. You came to this community or want this 15 community support you because of economic distress. So this is an issue of economic justice. 16 My challenge to all of our citizens and 17 our representatives' staff, please don't let these 18 19 communities be vulnerable to these things. We can't just simply say no and not give our opinion. 20 21 communities are so filled and everything else. 22 need to come up with alternatives such as renewable 23 energy. 24 (Applause.) 25 MR. ASMEROM: This way they don't have to

1	move in. Thank you.
2	(Applause.)
3	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank
4	you, Yemane.
5	Dr. Terry Sloan. Terry?
6	DR. SLOAN: Thank you. That was a great
7	entrance. Good evening and thank you to the NRC for
8	allowing us to speak and be heard today.
9	My name is Terry Sloan and I am the
LO	director of Southwest Native Cultures out of
11	Albuquerque, New Mexico, where I'm an accredited
L2	member of the United Nations Department of Economic
L3	and Social Affairs. I'm also a board member for the
L 4	New Mexico Interfaith Power & Light, a board member
L 5	for the Community Development Corporation and a member
L 6	of the United Nations Association of Albuquerque
L7	Chapter.
L 8	I'm here to say that we need first and
L 9	foremost I think about Mother Earth and her
20	inhabitants
21	(Applause.)
22	DR. SLOAN: and our families, and our
23	children and their children and their children. And
24	Native Americans, we think seven generations ahead.
25	We need to think about what they're going to face

possibly if there is an accident or a spill in that area. And it terrifies me to think that having nuclear waste pass through our great city of Albuquerque and to our State of New Mexico and a possible spill that could occur during the process. Thousands of chances could happen, as previously mentioned.

I also think of Chernobyl and WIPP, those disasters and those problems that happened, the most current nuclear reactor disaster in Japan. Those are things that we could face and we're still feeling the effects of -- Japanese are still feeling the effects of those now. They can't even move back to that land yet.

And I also think about possibly their disposing of the cavity of one of our great landmarks in New Mexico, which is Carlsbad Caverns. My family, my children love to go visit Carlsbad Caverns. And possibly one day they're not being able to have it and -- you know it concerns me. But I also would suggest that for those investors or the land owners of this land, they should consider other alternatives, like we just heard about renewable energy. And we could build solar power farms, plants. We could build wind farms. We could build -- they could build another a casino.

1	They could build
2	(Laughter.)
3	DR. SLOAN: a resort, anything but a
4	nuclear waste storage site.
5	And another thing I'd like to mention it
6	is a human right to have clean air, clean land, clean
7	water and a safe environment.
8	(Applause.)
9	DR. SLOAN: And we all have that human
10	right. So as mentioned previously, let's all get out
11	and get your voice heard and speak up. Send in the
12	comments, make the comments, whatever you can. Let's
13	be heard. And let them hear what our real scoping
14	thoughts are on this. We don't want nuclear waste in
15	our backyard
16	(Applause.)
17	DR. SLOAN: Thank you.
18	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much.
19	We're going to go to Carol Merrill, Chris
20	Timm and then we're going to go to Pastor Erica.
21	And is. Carol Merrill oh, here she
22	comes.
23	MS. MERRILL: Because it's difficult to
24	get on the web site I thought I would just print it
25	out and hand it to you.
	I and the second

1 I am Carol Merrill, a retired librarian 2 and teacher from North Valley, Albuquerque, published author a member of CARD, Citizens for Alternatives to 3 4 Radioactive Dumping. 5 speak for Dorrie Bunting who entered. 6 7 (Applause.) Dorrie was a founder of 8 MS. MERRILL: 9 CARD, Citizens for Alternative to Radioactive Dumping. 10 Two days ago I asked her how do you feel 11 about this issue? She said outrage. Outrage. She 12 said why do they generate electricity in this way? What people will be able to use that electricity when 13 14 they're all dead from nuclear poisoning? Thank you, 15 Dorrie, for your quidance. In your mid-90s. 16 you. 17 (Applause.) MS. MERRILL: One of my greatest concerns, 18 19 recorded by The San Diego Union-Tribune 20 Thursday, May 10th, 2018. There was a loose bolt 21 inside one of Holtec's canisters designed to store 22 spent radioactive fuel at the Waterfront site of San 23 Onofre Nuclear Power Plant, which halted work for 10 24 days. Looks like there are some serious problems with

Holtec's engineering. Are these those canisters that

they're planning to send here?

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 additional concern: If there was an serious accident a derailment, and I don't mean an populated urban area, who pays the billions of dollars for the cleanup? Who is insuring this company? How can we know they're not going to go bankrupt and leave us holding the waste?

The other thought: A small bomb from a done in centralized surface location with 20 rods could wipe out half this state. What will they say then?

Chernobyl. The puppies of In the exclusion zone at Chernobyl where radioactive waste and atoms melted down decades ago, now free of humans for 20,000 years. When it will be safe again? are nearly 900 wild dogs of those left behind by their families 31 years ago. Playful puppies play around the cantina near reactor 4. The sign for tourists reads. "Don't touch the puppies. There radioactive particles in their fur." They've never had a toy. No one has cuddled them. They have no water dish. What's to become of them? Someday will we put lead-lined sweaters on our dogs in winter, nuclear winter just to take them for a walk, if it comes to that, with nuclear waste in the world? Ι

hope not.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Chris Timm?

MR. TIMM: Thank you, NRC, for the opportunity to speak. Welcome, Holtec. About the issue of nuclear waste disposal, safe disposal.

Think about it, spent nuclear fuel has been essentially around since 1968, so 50 years we've been dealing with spent nuclear fuel and haven't had one accident. Along the way things have happened big time. And I actually appreciate the people who were bringing up Chernobyl and Fukushima, because every time we've had an accident we've proved how we go forward and do better and better. We're not perfect; we'll never be perfect, but we learn and we try to do the best we can.

And I really think that Holtec is a very good location. Yes, they're will be issues with respect to transportation is a concern. But the issue with WIPP, I think. I know WIPP is involved in oversight work for five years. I know the nuclear industry is warmed up for more than 50 years. And with WIPP the transportation record has been very, very good. WIPP's safety record. The worst was a

1 fire, not in an underground facility like Holtec. 2 Believe me, that fire would have been a lot less 3 hazardous. There's a lot of pluses to an underground 4 storage facility. Think about it: You're 5 underground. You have a something fall and kill Kind of hard to do that above ground. 6 somebody. 7 So we do have a problem, but the point is every accident, every incident, everything that went 8 9 wrong safety-wise will be taken into consideration. 10 And people in the industry say how do we better next time and prevent such a thing from happening? 11 I'm 12 convinced the NRC will look at that very hard and Holtec will not have to answer 13 many, many, many 14 questions in that area and I think they can do a good 15 job. And I think, by the way, there's less accidents 16 in this business than there is in oil and gas, which 17 you all count on, or even solar. So think about what you want. 18 19 (Simultaneous speaking.) That's been an ongoing 20 MR. CAMERON: 21 issue. Okay. 22 (Applause.) 23 MR. CAMERON: Pastor. 24 REV. LEA-SIMKA: Good evening. My name is 25 Reverend Lea-Simka and I'm a pastor in Albuquerque

1	Mennonite Church. I'm not a scientist. I'm a pastor
2	and a student of world religions, so I'm going to stay
3	in my lane this evening.
4	I'm a Mennonite which means a lot of
5	things, including an excellent baker and I'm very
6	modest about it.
7	(Laughter.)
8	REV. LEA-SIMKA: It also means that I
9	value simplicity and community. It also means that as
10	Mennonites we value the Bible. We are Christians.
11	And my Bible says that we should love our neighbors.
12	Maybe you're not religious, so work with me on this.
13	(Laughter.)
14	REV. LEA-SIMKA: What would Mr. Rogers do?
15	(Laughter.)
16	REV. LEA-SIMKA: Mr. Rogers I feel
17	confident would not dump garbage in his neighbor's
18	yard.
19	(Applause.)
20	REV. LEA-SIMKA: New Mexico is not a
21	wasteland because we're a desert and New Mexico is not
22	a wasteland because we're a poor state, and New Mexico
23	is not a wasteland because we have a lot of ground and
24	Native people.
25	(Applause.)

1	REV. LEA-SIMKA: communities is sending
2	is that New Mexico is unimportant and it's disposable.
3	So what would Jesus do, or Moses, or
4	Buddha, or Muhammad, peace be upon him, or Visna or
5	Sophia or Oprah or Mr. Rogers?
6	(Laughter.)
7	REV. LEA-SIMKA: I cannot say for sure
8	exactly what they would do, but I feel reasonably
9	confident that they would not dump waste in their
10	neighbor's yard. I am your neighbor and New Mexico is
11	your neighbor. Thank you.
12	(Applause.)
13	MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
14	We're going to go to Peter Clark, then
15	Danny Rupper, Lynn Buck, Susanne Brown and Deborah
16	Reade.
17	So, Peter?
18	MR. CLARK: Good evening. As introduced,
19	I'm Peter Clark. I've been here in Albuquerque for
20	about 15 years. I'd like to start out tonight by
21	acknowledging that we're all meeting tonight on
22	occupied homelands of the Sandia and as well as Pueblo
23	people.
24	(Applause.)
25	MR. CLARK: I have been employed in the
ı	1

transportation industry for about 25 years with experience in rail and aviation as an inspector, safety inspector. I have extensive education in systems -- safety management systems, human factor errors and so forth.

The United States Congress charges the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission with protecting people and the environment from unnecessary exposure to radiation. Approval of this proposal to the transfer of high-level nuclear waste throughout the country would be captured under the NRC's mandate.

Every 40 years the American Society of Engineers provides a comprehensive assessment of the nation's 16 major infrastructure categories in an infrastructure report card with grades A through F. The most recent was 2017 and the transportation sector in the nation probably got a D-plus. Doesn't instill a lot of confidence in our roads. I'd like to quote from that report card.

It says, "While the nation's infrastructure earned a D-plus in 2017, New Mexico faces infrastructure challenges of its own. For example, driving down the roads in need of repair in New Mexico costs drivers \$594 per year. And 258 of the 397 bridges are structurally deficient. This

1 deteriorating infrastructure impedes New Mexico's 2 in increasingly ability to compete an 3 marketplace. This miserable D rating means that the 4 infrastructure is in poor to fair condition and mostly 5 below standard." Annually from 2009 through 2017 there were 6 7 700 with the max being 870 HAZMAT 8 derailments and damaged cars. New Mexico already has 16 superfund sites 9 10 on the national priority list. We don't need more. I'm going to cut myself short here to 11 12 allow more time for others, but I do want to say this, that the NRC follow proper procedure as prescribed in 13 14 the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of 15 Indigenous Peoples of the Organization of American 16 (Applause.) 17 MR. CLARK: ___ rights of indigenous peoples and seeking the fair prior informed consent to 18 19 the sovereign indigenous nations of this continent through 20 whose lands these materials will 21 transported. Proper consultation does not simply mean 22 inviting tribal governments to these type of meetings. 23 consultation include government-to-Proper must 24 government dialogue. Thank you. 25 (Applause.)

1	MR. CAMERON: Danny Rupper?
2	MR. RUPPER: Thank you for giving me a
3	chance to speak. I'm here as just a citizen of New
4	Mexico. If I say "we," I know there are many others
5	that feel the way I do.
6	We don't want this. I'm sorry, this is
7	just wrong
8	(Applause.)
9	MR. RUPPER: Nuclear radiation has harmed
10	this state in some many ways that, I'm sorry, NRC has
11	no credibility in regards to radiation or safety. We
12	still have people trying to keep seek compensation
13	for the first nuclear tests here 70 years ago.
14	(Applause.)
15	MR. RUPPER: We actually had one of the
16	worst nuclear accidents in history, which was totally
17	covered up, and I'm talking about the uranium tailings
18	pond spilling causing generations of birth defects on
19	the Navajo Nation.
20	(Applause.)
21	MR. RUPPER: renewable energy. This is
22	going back. Nuclear energy for generating electricity
23	is a dying industry. That needs to go away. We want
24	clean renewable energy.
25	(Applause.)
I	I and the second

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank 2 you, Danny. And Lynn Buck? My name is Lynn Buck. 3 MS. BUCK: I'm a 4 retired APS librarian and I'm speaking as a private 5 citizen. I stood on the bridge on Carlisle over by 6 7 40th to protest the first WIPP truck. I wanted a 8 bypass route like Santa Fe got. Albuquerque is 10 9 times more populated. I-40 passes a half a mile from 10 my middle school. We didn't the bypass route, nor did we get any emergency training at my school. 11 12 The nuclear industry has not been good for New Mexico. With two of the three national labs, New 13 14 Mexico has not benefitted. We are 50 in child 15 welfare. We're 48 in education. Thanks to 16 Mississippi and Alabama we're not 50. We're number 17 one -- we're way up there on poverty. We're number one in home theft and home burglaries. 18 We're a poor 19 This is environmental racism to shove more nuclear waste --20 21 (Applause.) MS. BUCK: -- financial benefits to our 22 23 New Mexico, we already have our share of state. 24 industry fallout both in waste disposal and high

Nuclear accidents are not supposed to

pollution.

1	happen. These new Holtec containers are supposed to
2	be safe. If these Holtec containers are so safe,
3	let's leave them where the waste is produced.
4	(Applause.)
5	MS. BUCK: Better still, let's use them
6	for landscaping around the U.S. Capitol or maybe
7	(Applause.)
8	MS. BUCK: I would like to talk to the
9	downwinders. And for New Mexico why can't we put this
LO	to a vote?
11	(Applause.)
12	MS. BUCK: about Holtec. Holtec is a
L3	for-profit company. They're not after a world
L 4	industry trying to make nice things for nuclear
L 5	safety. They're in there for the bottom line for
L 6	their investors. And we have a cap on health care and
L7	accident stuff, not Holtec. They're
L 8	(Applause.)
L 9	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Lynn.
20	We're going to go to Susanne Brown.
21	Susanne? Oh, here she is.
22	MS. BROWN: Thank you. I'm happy to be
23	here tonight. I really appreciated listening to the
24	speakers. It was incredible. And it talked to all my
25	points.

(Laughter.)

MS. BROWN: You know, I guess I just want to reemphasize that there's an elephant in the living room, and that's the fact that we're not talking about the fact that we continue making high-level nuclear waste.

(Applause.)

MS. BROWN: -- we have alternatives for energy. We all know that this is a state that's so well-positioned to do something other than receive nuclear waste. We can be on the edge of just standing out with nuclear waste.

The other thing is that, you know, I'm just struck by the fact that the Nobel Prize this year went to a group of people; that are young people actually, internationally that are trying to continue to get more and more countries to sign up to stop making nuclear weapons. And so there would be -- we could sign up for that, too. That would decrease our nuclear waste for sure.

The other thing I wanted to just emphasize that other people have been talking about is that -- the fact that there are alternatives to transporting all the waste here. That's what we're meeting about tonight. That's the scope that we're supposed to be

talking about is alternatives.

And I really appreciate the man who talked about the crystalline or ceramic cement, or whatever it was. I mean, there are other inert substances, there are solutions that we can keep nuclear waste at the sites that are well-guarded now and keep it above ground where we see it. And it's not -- I don't feel good about out of sight, out of mind. And I think that's what this is all about. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much Deborah Reed?

MS. READE: So I do have some materials to hand you afterwards: 60 names on a petition, a signed letter, an article about how across the nation many people speak -- do not speak English in the home, and also two maps, one of threats to all New Mexico and threats to Southeastern New Mexico.

One of the things that's important to look at is this map -- this little inset map here, which is a map of cancer mortality. Note that all the highest cancer mortality is in the south and southeast portion of the state of New Mexico. This is the area that has WCS in Texas. They're trying to put in Triassic Park. We have WIPP. We have -- now they're trying to put in

Holtec. We have URENCO. We have massive oil and gas development. This all contributes to this, plus the social factors that do not have good access all share, these kind of things. So this needs to be looked at more carefully.

And I did find it a little disturbing for people to talk about how this is safe and that you know so much about the geology, but in fact I've seen years of studies on the geology around Holtec, as we had around WIPP, and in WIPP they said, oh, you know, this is an island of a non-karst, which is a porous type of geological formation where water can run both vertically and horizontally easily underground. they said but WIPP is on an island. There's no karst in this huge karst area. What are the chances that Holtec is also an island of non-karst in this huge area? We need years of studies on the geology and hydrology around this site before we can say whether it is safe or not.

The other thing that I find disturbing is that in all of these presentations here there was one word to transportation once. This -- the transportation is the killing seal here. And we need many more meetings across the nation and other cities, and just as robust as we had for the Yucca Mountain

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

project.

We need also to have materials in other languages, not just Spanish, but Spanish is a primary language that people speak in the home when they don't speak English in the home. But there are other languages in some of these cities as well. These materials need to be up online well before the hearings and we need more time before the hearing actually occurs.

So I think there's a lot of magical thinking here. You have these canisters that are going to sit there possibly up to 300 years according to Holtec. A hundred and twenty years may be considered short term. It could be as much as 300 years. These materials are then working, working, working — the radiation is working away on this — on the concrete no matter how good it is. This could easily make the canisters too delicate to move and we could end up with a shallow high-level waste landfill forever.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

We're going to go to our next group, which is Kathleen Cody, Marcus Nells, Frank Giles, Juan Reynosa and Denise Tessier.

1 MS. CODY: My name is Kathleen Cody and 2 I'm a resident of New Mexico. I do not consent to the 3 proposed Holtec high-level waste site. 4 New Mexico has given enough to nuclear 5 radiation. As the first state to have a nuclear bomb explosion, putting hundreds of people's health and 6 7 welfare at stake, more than 70 years later, people in 8 the area, and downwind are still suffering from 9 cancer, tumors, and other life-threatening illnesses. 10 WIP waste isolation pilot projects started at the lower level of radiation waste, had to shut 11 down for the radiation leak just 15 years after it 12 went into operation, affecting 21 employees. And some 13 14 of the radiation did get back to the air outside of 15 Residents in the area could also be the plant. affected. 16 The incident was initially caused by human 17 error and escalated. The cleanup took three years. 18 19 There will always be human error. Putting such high, 20 putting this much high radioactive material in one 21 place would be disastrous, and on so many levels. 22 I do not consent to highly radioactive 23 materials being transported through my community. Due

to human error, natural disasters, or any one of many

unforeseen events, rail or truck transport across the

24

1 highway and through our state poses way too many risks 2 to be plausible. I firmly believe each state that has 3 4 nuclear reactors needs to decide how to store it in 5 their state and not transport it for long distances. MR. CAMERON: Marcus Nells. 6 7 NELLS: Hello, my name is Marcus 8 Nells. am one of the Party for Socialism and 9 Liberation. Ι stand here today to denounce 10 transportation and storage of nuclear waste in New I say no to Holtec's plan to endanger my 11 Mexico. 12 people and community. Between 1940 and 1970, New Mexico and 13 14 Arizona have been at the front of nuclear 15 weaponization. From nuclear testing, i.e., 16 Manhattan Project, to uranium extraction, the uranium 17 mining on Native American reservations, the indigenous populations in the Southwest have been at risk for 18 19 contaminations since the beginning of the century. 20 Safety quarantees were raised by the 1940s while 21 extraction companies in the Native 22 Americans suffered at the risk of radiation poisoning. 23 In the past few years, the University of New Mexico 24 has released a study that has shown high levels of

radiation still existing in New Mexico currently.

1 We say no to this project. In the words 2 of the indigenous leader Crazy Horse, one does not 3 sell the Earth upon which the people walk. Thank you. 4 MR. CAMERON: How about Juan Reynoso. Oh, 5 this is Frank? Okay. GILES: Good evening, 6 MR. ladies 7 gentleman, and I thank you for your attendance here 8 and going through the formalities and the procedures 9 to make sure our voice is heard. But where do these 10 voices go after this hearing? You say you wouldn't want to argue to them. Are the plans to have gone to 11 trash can, or are they actually taking 12 reconsideration about some issue that we have. 13 14 This is а very important subject, 15 especially for me and my people. My people come from 16 the Pine Ridge Reservation. I'm Oglala Lakota Sioux. 17 Our people have been poisoned by uranium for decades. Even after the NRC said they were going to enforce 18 19 cleanup and enforce regulation, we're still dying. 20 kidney failure, to arsenic poisoning, to 21 emitters that are in our body. 22 We all have a responsibility for tomorrow, 23 for our children. Our people, yes, we do believe in 24 giving towards the next seven generations. My family,

I am the seventh generation. I stood tall on the

front lines of the Standing Rock for the water. I stood for all of you, all of you out here. I laid my life on the line for you. And once again we still have threat coming to us in corporate form.

We have to make our voices heard not just here, not just in this room, but across the nation, across the world. We have to lift ourselves up in humanity, or we will all perish. We only have one water on this earth. None of us can live without that. Radiation, once in the water, can never be removed.

As a parent myself, I'm very, very concerned about what this be brought here. And I look back on the reservation where I come from and the many lies that were told to us about how they're going to handle this stuff, how they're going to handle the radiation, how they're going to handle the arsenic poisoning. And it hasn't happened yet.

So we need to do everything we can to make our voices heard. Speak to your neighbors, speak to other people who may be on the fence about this. And especially bring it up in intellectual debates, not just emotional rantings. We all are very emotional about this, we all know the dangers that are presented to us through radiation.

1 There are safequards, there are protocols, they are doing nothing. Thank you for your time. 2 This is Juan 3 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. 4 Reynoso. 5 MR. REYNOSO: Good evening, everyone, Juan I'm with the Southwest Organizing Project, 6 7 but I also grew up in Hobbs. I still have my mom, my four sisters, six nephews, and two nieces who live 8 9 there. 10 I'm in extreme opposition to this. Holtec is only trying to paint the picture that everyone 11 involved is super down for this, but I've been 12 conferring with my family and many friends there, and 13 14 they're not. So do not try and beat on us and do not 15 paint that false picture that everyone there is just willing to sacrifice their health for you to gain some 16 17 property. I grew up with asthma. I saw many of the 18 19 community members that I grew up with have cancer. 20 their citizen populations already there. They already 21 have to build water contamination, air quality issues still. 22 23 And while some people may think that 24 URENCO was all right to bring in, it didn't supply

that many jobs. And that's always the false narrative

that jobs are going to pay these people, whether it's to the Navajo Nation with the coal-fired power plants, or in my community around how jobs are more important than people's health issues.

In regards to health issues, I've seen in cancer as, I forget her name, she noted there's many clustered related in my community. Air quality, groundwater issues. And just be sure, this is an environmental injustice for a community that has already been recognized as paying their dues.

And I think it's completely wrong to not store it where you already have it. It's irresponsible. It's all based on greed, which we're all communities waking up to that. That's just not the way we need to live anymore.

I will note that there's many sinkholes in that area. So for folks noting the great geology, there's many sinkholes popping up all around that area. My friend's mom in Carlsbad has a two mile-wide sinkhole right near her home. So that's going to be great for nuclear storage, right, when it all collapses and floods everywhere. Also, tornadoes, a tornado passed right by my house as a kid, how is this kind of reactor going to hold up to that.

So lastly I'm going to say that Holtec is

continuing to disregard environmental justice in New Mexico from the uranium that they mined that to now they're trying to bring it here. And New Mexico is not your dumping grounds. So once again we have white men come into our state trying to inflict violence on our land and our people. And it's enough, thank you. MR. CAMERON: So first I'm going to adjust the speaker, and then we're going to go to Dieter Hanbicki. MS. TESSIER: Hi, my name is Denise I've been a newspaper reporter most of my Tessier. So it's unusual for me to be a speaker at one life. of the hearings. I'm here today because for three years, from 1978 to 1981, I covered the hearings and steps that led to the opening of WIPP, the waste isolation pilot plan. During those three years, Ι was in continuous contact with Sandia scientists, the DOE, environmental scientists at the state level, Mexico's oversight panel, the Environmental Evaluation Group, citizen environmental activists, watchdogs, the Secretary of Energy, and our congressmen. This was a long, multi-step process. Before we get even deeper into this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

process with Holtec, I just want to iterate what Cisco McSorley said and remind the NRC and everyone else that throughout the WIPP steps, throughout the years of discussions, New Mexico was told if we would accept low-level transuranic waste, we would not be asked to take high-level commercial waste in the future.

We do not have this in writing. In January 1981, the DOE announced that it would start shifting the waste to WIPP in 1987, that it did not need to sign an agreement with New Mexico in order to do so. All it needed was cash from Congress, and permission from the BLM, which owned the land. It's its own agency.

But despite this lack of formal agreement,

I submit that there was an understanding, based on
federal promises, that if New Mexico accepted this
waste, it would not be asked or required to accept any
high-level commercial waste. That New Mexico, we were
told, we will have done our part in dealing with the
nation's continued nuclear waste problem.

Years of scientific, political, and public input went into the WIPP process, and we were talking then about low-level transuranic waste, which was gloves, tools, rags and booties contaminated in the research and production of nuclear weapons.

1 But bringing spent fuel rods into New 2 Mexico is, in my view, a violation of the spirit of 3 years of discussions and efforts that went into the 4 opening of WIPP, and that it can and should factor 5 into rejection of Holtec's proposal. MR. CAMERON: Thank you. This is Dieter 6 7 Hanbicki. MR. HANBICKI: Hello, I'm Dieter Hanbicki. 8 9 I'm, in the fall, I'm going to be a senior at the University of New Mexico in nuclear engineering. 10 So currently in the United States we have 11 12 I believe, operational power plants, around 60, nuclear generation stations. In addition to these 60 13 14 plants, we have other decommissioned plants that have 15 been returned to green field. Essentially, it looks 16 like there was never any plant there, with the 17 exception of a pad for spent nuclear fuel. One of Holtec's reasons for creating the 18 19 consolidated interim storage is to get rid of these, what we call orphan sites. They are, there is no more 20 21 generation of the spent nuclear fuel there. 22 And between these sites and all the other 23 dry pack storage systems in America, it costs about 24 \$500 million to keep those secure. And that's from

taxpayer money, due to various laws and lawsuits from

the different generation companies.

As for transportation, I believe that WIPP has never had a transportation issue in the approximately 20 years that it has been moving waste from all over the country to WIPP. And this site is going to be, I believe, 16 miles north of WIPP. So it will be using the same transport corridors. So we can assume that --

It is as close to WIPP, so it will be using the same transportation.

MR. CAMERON: Let's let him finish. You can disagree, but let's let him finish his comment, please. Go ahead.

MR. HANBICKI: Additionally, Bill Gates, who used to be the number one richest man in the world, now number two, has invested in terrapower. He invented a company that will be creating a fast reactor, which will be using this waste to power and create energy. So in some ways, this isn't even waste.

Additionally, this transuranic fuel is a solid, it cannot be, even if there was a breach in the containment, it is a solid fuel, and it is covered in cladding that has been submerged in water for anywhere between five to ten years on average. So there really

1 is no danger to any of the water in New Mexico due to 2 this spent nuclear fuel. 3 I was at, me and four other people from 4 UNM, were at the Roswell meeting earlier or last 5 And we submitted a petition to the NRC with approximately I believe 30 signatures on it. One of 6 7 those signatures was the American Nuclear Society 8 President. Thank you. 9 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Dieter. Next group of speakers, Erica Leashuka, 10 Nick Maxwell. Oh, sorry. Nick Maxwell, then we'll go 11 12 to Don Conklin and Brandan Shaughnessy. This is Nick Maxwell. 13 14 MR. MAXWELL: I had a piece of paper. 15 I come up next? Let me go get a piece of paper, I had 16 it written down. 17 MR. CAMERON: Why do you go do that and we'll go and hear from Don Conklin while you're 18 19 getting that paper. So Nick Maxwell will be back on, 20 but we're going to hear from Don right now. 21 MR. CONKLIN: Thank you. I'm a retired 22 pastoral associate from Our Lady of Most Holy Rosary. 23 And my question is why New Mexico? Why would we dump 24 nuclear waste in New Mexico? Except for those who are 25 benefitting from this, we in New Mexico do not want

1 nuclear waste in our state. 2 New Mexico has paid its price for nuclear, 3 from the uranium miners to the windfall from Trinity 4 sites to the atomic bomb in Los Alamos, enough is 5 enough. They made the decision that they want 6 7 plant to receive the benefits of that 8 electricity, jobs. Those states, I say to you, you 9 take care of your waste. Whether you like it or not, 10 it's your responsibility with the technology from Holtec to help you. 11 12 And now MR. CAMERON: have Nick we Maxwell. 13 Hello, my name is Nick 14 MR. MAXWELL: 15 I'm one of the people of Lea County. Maxwell. traveled here tonight to talk to you all about a 16 couple of concerns of mine. We really don't want it. 17 I'm ashamed of how far this has gone. 18 19 They have actually shamed me. They claimed that they 20 support this project, and I wonder if they only 21 support this project because of the revenue sharing 22 agreement they cut with Holtec requires them to. 23 So the county kingpins over in Lea County 24 decided that we needed this. And so I'm going to

request of the NRC one more time to extend this

deadline beyond July 30 to at least a total of 180 days, 180 days to get information along likely transportation routes including, but not limited to, Dallas, Fort Worth, San Antonio, Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Miami, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Nashville, New York, Newark, Omaha, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and that's just to name a few.

The opposition has been overwhelming, primarily because of the risk of a fuel leak, explosion, criticality, or canister breach in any of these urban areas. And the questions of whether and how much we the people should even bear the risk of this massive scene. This should be decided in a process that's truly national, visible, and far more extensive than the reigning government of New Mexico.

I believe you quite understand what people are capable of, and I keep hearing this thing about security. How much security? I've heard 15 people, I don't know if that's right. But I can tell you this: I hope they're ready to repel anything that comes their way. But let's also talk about security, because it would seem as if security's going to be privately provided to this company.

We have a security business in Hobbs, and

1 unfortunately, that security business has been tied to 2 one of the Board members of Eddy Lea Energy Alliance. I could tell you a lot of things about Eddy Lea Energy 3 4 Alliance. They're all bad, every one of them. You 5 think we support this process, look around you. You Thank you. 6 are outnumbered. 7 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. And before we 8 Brandan Shaughnessy to come up. We're going to 9 put a new mic stand up here that'll make things a 10 little better for anybody. Is Brendan here? Brandan, Brandan. 11 MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Chip thinks he's funny. 12 I do not consent to bringing the nation's 13 14 highest level of nuclear waste to New Mexico. I ask 15 period be extended and that the scoping that 16 additional hearings be added in communities on and 17 around the proposed transport routes. 18 The Environmental Impact Statement needs include maps of all possible transport. 19 20 includes all methods of transport, whether it be on 21 roadways, railways, or waterways. 22 In addition, impacted areas around the 23 transport routes need their environmental impacts 24 studied. We ask to have additional scoping meetings

in areas that will be impacted by transport and extend

1 the scoping period so that transport communities can 2 learn about the project and have time to comment. And we ask you to listen to the people of 3 4 New Mexico and deny Holtec's proposal. In lieu of a ask that our opportunity to voice 5 we 6 concerns at these hearings -- we have used the 7 opportunity to voice our concerns, the only opportunity 8 we have. And letters, electronic 9 comments, and we ask that you take these seriously and in consideration. 10 The people have spoken and overwhelmingly 11 oppose this proposed project. We do not consent to 12 bringing the nation's highest level nuclear waste to 13 14 our state. Thank you. 15 Okay, Rosemary Blanchard, MR. CAMERON: 16 Pat Duncan and Hara Lovato and then Jamie Phillips. 17 This is Rosemary. Okay, am I in the right 18 MS. BLANCHARD: 19 place in relation? Good. Okay, my name's Rosemary 20 Blanchard, I am the Chair of the Albuquerque Chapter 21 of the United Nations Association, USA. 22 And I'm also a resident of Albuquerque, 23 and a mother and grandmother of people who live in 24 Albuquerque. My eleven-year-old grandson came with me 25 last night to the City Council to ask the City Council

to protect kids like him from the transportation of nuclear waste to the city of Albuquerque. The Albuquerque City Council agreed.

Now, I am a retired person now, but prior to my retirement, one of the places I worked was in the Navajo Nation. I had come there having grown up in Connecticut, so it was new territory to me. And one of the significant life events for me took place in 1987, sitting in a meeting representing the Division of Dine Education at a meeting to decide how to provide services to the Navajo people who were being exiled to the New Lands Chapter.

And an official from the federal government, in this case the Indian Health Service, told us that he was digging deep artesian wells for their houses because of the radioactivity in the aquifer that would normally be used for the water for the houses in that area. This is 1987.

And I asked the gentleman, I said, These kids are going to Sanders School. Have you told the school district what you found, because the school district is using that aquifer.

This federal official told me that the federal laws did not require him to guarantee decent, safe, and sanitary education facilities, only decent,

safe, and sanitary housing. And that he had no legal 1 2 obligation to tell the school district. 3 bring this up because we need 4 understand how our federal agencies have $n \circ$ credibility when it comes to dealing honestly with the 5 6 people of the Southwest. And they cannot rebuild a 7 credibility they've never had. The only way they can 8 prove their honesty is to have the courage to store 9 this stuff where they live. Thank you. 10 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Is Pat Duncan here? We're going to go to 11 Rosemary. 12 Pat Duncan, and then we're going to hear from Hara. Hi, my name is Pat Duncan, 13 MS. DUNCAN: 14 and I'm speaking as a citizen. I find it difficult to 15 believe that this is actually illegal why we're going ahead with this. Because technically the Holtec site 16 17 is a private place, private facility. And basically, the spent fuel is supposed 18 19 to be sent to a Department of Energy site, as well as, 20 either that or DOE owns and operate and monitor a 21 retrievable storage facility. And we sit thinking 22 we're actually even here listening to this. 23 I also don't understand why the ER report 24 is not complete. It shouldn't have any copyright 25 restrictions or condoned actions on it as well.

the Environmental Report is also inadequate because they didn't bother to check the impacts of those fuel over time. After all, 40 years is a long time, and most of us in this room will be dead, to be plain.

And then maybe the rest of us that are here, it they extend it to 120, will also be dead. But we don't really particularly want to die of cancer. They should be checking into what happens to a fracking area and earthquakes that go to varying degrees, being caused by fracking as well.

The NRC is breaking its mission statement protecting health and safety risk from the environment going ahead with this project, as far as I'm concerned. I'm definitely against it, and I think we should extend the comment period, as well as go along with all the routes that are brining the fuel.

If you look here on this paper that's been handed out, it's pretty small, but it shows that New Mexico got picked as the prize to send everything here. But all these other states are impacted as well because they bring the fuel from there as well. And as an ex-California resident, I'm sorry, but California can keep its own fuel. If it's so safe then why don't they use it.

I mean, you can take your ceramic little

cask and put it in the other areas as well. And if you notice, when you walk around your kitchen and you drop a ceramic dish, what happens to it? It doesn't really make me feel comfortable. Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Now we'll move on.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I wake up every morning in a cold sweat, you know. And wanted a chance to speak, because 85% of all the audience are going to speak. And it's the correct fact of everything we're doing, everything. Have you done an analysis of that? It's the global warming, it's all the fact that everything human being belongs to this planet.

The nuclear industry has been the most deadly, radioactive and peril-laded for this planet. The reason we created the nuclear also known as the atom bomb. It was hate, it's called Dust of Sin. It's a deep, expertly, deep, spiritual disease that's eaten into you at the molecular level, the chemical level, deeper and deeper, the disease is eating into the whole planet onto the atomic level.

They didn't know it would unravel the whole world and the whole universe, so they stuck methane with an atom, split the atom's heart and created an exploding sun. This stuff is not something

that you control. This stuff is so dangerous and so 1 long-lasting, for a half a million years. Who's going 2 3 to have a cult of generation after generation to 4 recontain and recontain? 5 I've been fighting nuclear, my mother and my father, our whole family, been fighting nuclear 6 7 since I was 15 years old. And now they're saying 8 we're going to make a whole new generation of usable, 9 new, small atom bombs. We already have 10,000, now 10 we're going to make a whole bunch more ways. And this is atomic energy. 11 They knew, they knew that it would destroy 12 the world, and they've been making it. They knew that 13 14 the power plants, they knew. They said it would 15 generate waste that nobody could contain . You know, is there intelligent life on this earth, or are we 16 17 slime mold? 18 You know, disease is wiping а 19 And nuclear, I'm going to just say, we everything. 20 should outlaw everything that can destroy the planet. Nuclear waste can destroy the planet, just as much as 21 22 the nuclear bombs can destroy the planet. 23 And we are in deep trouble. And as human 24 beings, we need to look each other in the eye, and if

there's any nuclear regulatory experts that know how

to contain this stuff, we'd better do it and contain 1 2 it where it is. 3 And don't bring it and contain it for 4 260,000 years. And the cult shifts that are willing 5 to contain it again and again. Because that stuff is strong, it bombards everything. The rain bombards the 6 7 truck drivers and the train drivers and the people 8 passing by. Just the rain. This is the sun, it is 9 very powerful. 10 We created this, you know, and it will destroy us. This will be like Mars, we'll have no 11 12 life, there's no microorganisms. Every inch of this life is covered with blood. And every single life 13 14 organ is dying. What are we going to do? We only 15 have a little bit of time, and then we're going to pay. Guess what? We did this, we're the people right 16 17 here. We couldn't stop ourselves. Okay, thank you. 18 MR. CAMERON: 19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We destroyed the 20 planet, or we destroyed most of life. So how are we going to explain to our kids, if our kids are lucky 21 22 enough to survive. One in every --23 MR. CAMERON: All right. 24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Cancer right now, 25 is already affected.

1 MR. CAMERON: Please, please everyone. 2 Jamie, are ready? You wanted to wait till 8:10, but 3 are you okay? All right, go ahead. 4 MR. PHILIPS: I just got back in here, so 5 I didn't follow what was said earlier. But yeah, WIPP is like, what, 20 years old and it's already had a 6 7 significant spill dealing with high-level waste. 8 And I always, we're looking at a high-9 level waste project that was, from what I've put together, proposed on the basis of bringing more waste 10 here with not really, I guess the plan is to bring 11 energy jobs. I don't really understand how they could 12 be worth it, you know. 13 14 And with what we're talking about with 15 high-level waste. And 20 years, the consequences of that one spill that happened 3 years ago. 16 17 know whether we can assess that yet, but you know, I'm 18 sure that there are numerous consequences that are 19 still yet to come or be detected. 20 I just want to do one quick little thing. 21 If you're listening to me clap once. If you're with, 22 if you're digital listening, can any of us here clap 23 once? Worth a try. 24 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. We're going to

Jim Schippers, Randella Bluehouse, Steven Verchinski,

1 and Lucia Cordova. Jim Schippers. Here's Jim. 2 MR. SCHIPPERS: Hello everyone, I'm Jim 3 Schippers. I'm an old retired geezer. Not a 4 scientist, not an anthropologist. But my stomach 5 hurts, and my stomach's been hurting a lot since I've been hearing about this project. And when the stomach 6 7 hurts, you pay attention. 8 I just want to say that in the old days, 9 I used to be a dreamer, and I dreamt that someday 10 they'd take all this money that they're putting into nuclear energy and waste disposal and buy everyone a 11 12 solar collector for their houses. I don't think that dream's ever going to come true. But there is one 13 14 thing that is making my stomach feel a lot better, and 15 that's you people here tonight. Wow, it really goes 16 to show. 17 I wish I had your knowledge and your information, and you've expressed yourself well, and 18 19 thank you very much. 20 MR. CAMERON: Randella, Randella 21 Bluehouse. 22 MS. BLUEHOUSE: Hello everyone. 23 here with the intention of listening, not speaking, 24 but I think it's important that we all have a voice. 25 concern is that, well, I'm Navajo. (Native

language spoken.)

So I'm Navajo. And I know the devastation of what the uranium mines have done to our community. My father died of cancer. Many of our friends up there died of cancer. You can begin to understand what a horrible effect it would have on our community here in New Mexico if something like that were to happen here.

So I think we have a lot more to lose than those wonderful people who own that little section of land if they sell it, or to charge for it, maybe they can gain something from it, or those industries that are for profit that can profit off of our backs.

I think it's senseless. How can you sell the wind, how can you sell the air and the water? And the earth. You can't sell them. Our people were here far beyond what anybody else is here. Did we sell the land to you? No. It was taken.

And now all of sudden, it's like this is my land, this is my section of land, you can't have it. Law says, law this, law that. Well, the law of nature says all of that doesn't exist. The law of nature says we are to share and protect Mother Earth. That is our nation.

What other people believe and what you

1 should believe is not the divine law and anybody else. 2 It's really, the reality of it is we breathe the air, we drink the water, we live together, we need to 3 4 protect our land. And for those people that are 5 profiting off of our backs, shame on you. MR. CAMERON: Steven Verchinski, and then 6 7 we're going to go to Ray Garduno. Garduno, thank you, 8 thank you very much. 9 **VERCHINSKI:** My is MR. name Steven 10 Verchinski of the Green Party US, member and National Representative for New Mexico, so I may speak to our 11 12 party platform. 13 The Green Party strongly opposes shipment of high-level nuclear waste across the United 14 15 States to the proposed nuclear waste repository Yucca Mountain, or any other centralized facility. 16 Green Party believes that these proposals are part of 17 a move to still and refine a fast track commercial 18 19 nuclear reactor industry, providing decent, 20 disposal. 21 We deny that there is such a thing as safe 22 disposal of nuclear waste. We propose to make spent 23 nuclear fuel and other high-level waste safer by 24 vitrification at the site where it is produced or now

stored.

And as to why should New Mexico be helping Holtec in its destructive industry when the cost of nuclear power is fourteen times higher than it was four decades ago. It's higher than renewables. Westinghouse reactors went into bankruptcy. And my UNM engineer over here, but hey, you can always work at Los Alamos since our concerned politicos want more nuclear weapons made.

Germany is shutting down their nuclear power plants and fully decommissioning for the entire country. This is happening despite being 20 on the list of 100 carbon reduction items in the book of allowances. Of the hundred almost all of them are known to crack once.

However as Paul Hawken the author notes, nuclear is a regrets solution. The regrets are Chernobyl, Three Mile Island, Fukushima, Rocky Flats, Browns Ferry, Windscale, Church Rock.

So what if we close down the facilities, well there's over 2,000 of these thin-walled storage canisters that are a half inch thick across the United States. They can't be inspected inside or out, they can't be repaired or maintained, they cannot be monitored to prevent radiation leaks. The thin wall stainless steel can crack and leak in short-term for

various environmental manufacturer's conditions.

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

They can leak 16 years after the cracks start, and there's no plan in place to deal with this. The NRC said this in 2014. The covert Nuclear Power Plant in South Africa can't account for any container leak in only 17 years.

Now for New Mexico and DOE, there's no plan to prevent leaks in storage and transport, and no plan if it does leak. You don't even have any spent fuel pools here for transferring out the materials if you do have a problem.

The infrastructure problems for still not addressed. transportation is for scoping, this should also include climate impact. Adequate transport and creation of new spent fuel pools for emergencies at the front end and back end of the processes, the transport upgrades and retransporting it to a final repository.

And since the cement proposed, now it's going to be ceramic, this is an additional climate-impacting gas. And for this scoping, you must include full cost accounting and a process for no corporation that's currently operating nuclear power facility to add this waste without including that long-term costing and then their full bonding be made item by

item. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: And Ray Garduno.

MR. GARDUNO: Thank you for correcting that, I couldn't have said it better myself. I'm Ray Garduno. And you know, I'm proud to say that Cisco McSorley, Senator Cisco McSorley, was here, and he's a dear friend of mine. But I ask, where the hell are the rest of the elected officials?

You know, I served for eight years for the City Council in this city. And for many years, we fought all kinds of fights, and it was amazing how a lot of those folks sided with the landowners, the bankers, and all of those folks who I guess butter their bread.

Let me just tell you that, I just want to know, who wants this stuff? Who doesn't want this stuff? Anybody taking notes? I'd like for you to note that.

You know, for many years, we've been following this issue. We've heard about it, what devastation it's created in the state. There's no good that's come of it. And yet, we have plenty of people who want to tell us that we're wrong. Well, let me tell you, this stuff kills. It'll kill every one of us.

And it's interesting to follow all of these acronyms, abbreviations, and assumptions. You know, it's harder than reading a Russian novel, to try and remember all that. I suggest something simple. Instead of going through all this dog and pony stuff, the folks that want this stuff, one of these mornings, take the high-level stuff, sit, and then if nothing happens, we'll go on with the plans that you guys have.

Otherwise, let's just make sure that we follow the money. You know, we've been proudly told by folks that, you know, it's going to be great. It's going to be great for the Southeast. Some of these folks, guess what? Or are landowners, right, or bankers or contractors. Or they are betting on the fact that we're done and we'll accept all this stuff.

And what for? For a hundred jobs. I mean, that's ridiculous. We're supposed to go in there, nonsense. Otra vez, gracias.

MR. CAMERON: For next group, we're going to start with Susan Rodriguez and go to Tom Stark, Kevin Kirby, Anna Maldonado, Susan Tiano, Robin Seydel, and Hope Alvarado. So how about Susan Rodriguez. Tom Stark, and if Susan comes back, we'll put her up. But this is Tom.

1 MR. STARK: Hi, Tom Stark. I'm a retired 2 firefighter here in Albuquerque, NM. Twenty years I 3 was paramedic, 20 out of the 21 years. I've lived 4 pretty much my whole life here in New Mexico, and on 5 our license plate, it says, Land of Enchantment. doesn't say Land of Nuclear Waste. 6 7 And I wonder if, especially amongst the 8 poorest states, that the federal government would be 9 trying to shove this stuff down our throat all the 10 I just get this, I mean it's wrong, I think it's wrong for the people. 11 It's wrong for the We should be growing more towards nuclear 12 economy. energy -- or excuse me, more toward renewable energy. 13 14 Store this waste where it was made, in 15 plants where the nuclear energy is made. Why does it 16 need to be transported? That's just one more way of 17 out getting it out, and then before making bad things happen. Keep it where it's at. I'm tired of having 18 19 New Mexico be the dumping ground for nuclear energy. 20 MR. CAMERON: Kevin, Kevin Kirby. 21 MR. KIRBY: Great idea, Ed Mayer. 22 lend me a few bucks and I'll take your nuclear waste 23 and dump it in New Mexico. 24 Holtec is a really slick idea. Think

Moving nuclear waste may simply be a slick

about it.

and easy way of moving costs and shifting liability 1 2 away from the nuclear power plants that created that 3 waste. And who can stand to create that waste? Does 4 the liability stay with the waste? 5 A couple of other questions. How much 6 insurance will the transportation company carry to 7 move this waste? Is it enough? How much insurance do 8 the container manufacturers carry on their containers? 9 And how much insurance is Holtec Is it enough? 10 carrying on this project and for how long? hundred years? Is it enough? 11 Remember, nuclear power plants don't pay 12 for their own insurance. It's underwritten by the US 13 14 Government. In other words, we pay for nuclear power 15 insurance. Bottom line, moving radioactive waste from 16 17 one place to another doesn't make the waste go away. We're just rearranging the nuclear deck chairs on the 18 19 SS Holtec. MR. CAMERON: Anna Maldonado. 20 This is 21 Anna. 22 MS. MALDONADO: Hi, my name is Anna 23 Maldonado, and I'm here, I'm a UNM alum, 24 representing UNM's Mission Innovation Initiative. 25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you.

MS. MALDONADO: I'm here representing the UNM Mission Innovation Initiative and the Nuclear Study Group. And so basically on why I'm here today is I want to address the issue of transport and toxicity.

On a daily basis, we're faced with so many different toxins in our environment, and you know, basically, you know, GMOs, things like that, just various toxins. And I feel that with transport issues, with transport that, you know, from different, coming from different states and things like that will put our community at risk and other people in other states at risk as well.

And I also represent farmers in the community, and I look to support our farmers. And they're already at risk, they're already facing challenges like climate change and drought, GMOs, pesticides, the large Iowa chemical companies. And just recently, Dupont is buying out Monsanto.

And so basically there's things like that that they face, and that they get, if they get, basically if there's an accident, you know, in the transport process, then they can be faced with a higher level of toxicity with farming. That's going to affect everybody, especially, you know, we support

local farmers.

And so with the radiation and the nuclear waste, it's far-reaching. And I can give an example. My doctor told me, she said that, she diagnosed me with acute and chronic radiation poisoning. And I don't know how that happened. We were trying to figure it out. Basically, my mom, she grew up in the Curro and she's one of the downlanders. And that's how far-reaching radiation can be.

And so we don't need any more of that, we don't any more of this radiation toxicity in our environment.

MR. CAMERON: This is Susan Tiano.

MS. TIANO: Hello, my name is Susan Tiano.

I was a professor of sociology of UNM for 35 years and retired a couple years ago. And I would like to speak a little bit more about the sociology of all of this.

I'll leave it to the technical engineering people to talk about whether these canisters are safe or the transportation issues that are good or bad. But I want us to think a little bit about three sociological points. I could probably talk forever, but I'll try to make this short.

One is that if we sweep away the, I'll call it anti-wealth, or the pollution that these guys

are creating in their own town from the spent fuel.

If we whisk it away and put it into New Mexico, it's
going to keep being generated.

One of the reasons that the nuclear energy industry has slowed down the pace of new factory production is that, or new nuclear site or plans, you know what they call them right now, but nuclear plans being generated was that there was no place to put the spent fuel. If we whisk it away and dump it in New Mexico, they're going to keep generating it over and over.

The second point I want to make is our perception to the rest of the world. I did my, a lot of my studies in the East and I've lived in lots of places, I'm actually from Los Alamos, which may help explain why I'm a little bit anti-nuclear.

But most people, most places look at New Mexico and think we're idiots and that it's very unsafe here. Many people have said, Well, at least I'm not in New Mexico, at least I don't glow in the dark. At least I haven't been exposed to radiation my entire life.

If we do this Holtec activity or initiative, it's going to hurt tourism in the community, especially for parklands, none of these

jobs matters if, for 90 jobs we're going to screw up 1 2 our tourist industry. 3 The third point I want to make is actually 4 the socio-political business about we can't really trust the government. I'm sorry, NRC. You lied to us 5 about WIPP, and I'm afraid you're going to lie to us 6 7 about Holtec. We are seeing deregulation going on all 8 across our Administration right now. 9 There's a final thing I want to make, 10 point I want to make about Holtec. This came up on their website, and it's talking about the meetings 11 that they had in, their open house scoping meetings in 12 Roswell, Hobbs, and Carlsbad. 13 14 And it says, The Agency felt unequivocal 15 local elected officials, community support from 16 leaders. members of the public, and university 17 students. Joining the few local dissenters were activists from Texas and California, whose opposition 18 lacked clarity and specificity. 19 20 In other words, if we object to this, 21 we're activists from out of state? I would suggest to 22 you that the actors from out of state that are the 23 Holtec biggest threats to environment are our 24 International.

MR. CAMERON:

25

Here's Robin Seydel, and

then we're going to hear from Hope Alvarado.

MS. SEYDEL: Hi, folks. I want to thank you all for showing up today because it's really short notice and to see about 200 of you fill all these chairs and speak against the approval of this application. Most heartening and hopeful, and I want to thank you all for being here.

And I also wanted to set the record straight. As the previous speaker noted, Holtec in their press release, after the three meetings done in southern part of the state, said there were very little opposition. And I was there, and 90% or 95% of all the people who spoke were opposed to the Holtec site. And some of those --.

Some were indeed from here in Albuquerque because that was, at the time, the NRC had refused to hold hearings up here, even though we have a great railroad crossroads, and we were going to be part of the transportation issue. And so thank you NRC for, thanks to our two senators for pressuring you for having this hearing. But thank you so much for having this hearing.

And I want to speak just briefly to the health issues that a lot of people have talked about.

And a lot of people are talking about accidents and

how safe this is all going to be, and we know that there are going to be accidents. But even if there are not accidents, the NRC allows routine, permissible, acceptable releases.

And I'll just read for a minute here, NRC regulations allow up to ten million rad per hour of gamma radiation to be emitted, about 62 meters away from a shooting test experienced during the --. That's about one to two test x-rays' worth of gamma radiation per hour of exposure. And that's NRC regulations.

I also want to read, Since the radiation dissipates with the square root of the distance, this means that the NRC regulations allow for up to 200 millirad per hour at the surface of the cask exterior. That's 20 to 40 chest x-rays' worth of gamma radiation per hour which the NRC allows to stream out of the casks' surface.

And I was talking, at the Roswell meeting I believe it was, to John McKirgan from the NRC, right there, right, yeah. And he informed me that there are vents in these casks, because they have to vent some of the gasses that are around. So we know that some of these routine releases are going to occur.

And you know, all of these permissible and

1	acceptable and routine releases are done at cost-
2	benefit analysis. And that cost-benefit analysis
3	weighs public health and human health, thank you, give
4	me one more second, against the profits of the nuclear
5	industry.
6	And I say that there is no safe level
7	radiation, that cost-benefit analysis is not
8	appropriate, and we should not accept your permissible
9	levels of exposure. Thank you all.
10	MR. CAMERON: Thank you.
11	MS. ALVARADO: (Native languages spoken.)
12	My name is Hope Alvarado. I am tribally enrolled in
13	the Diné Nation, but I also belong to the Mescalero
14	Apache and Comanche Nations. And I am tribally
15	enrolled underneath the Navajo Nation and we do not
16	consent.
17	(Applause.)
18	MS. ALVARADO: As a member of the Red
19	Nation my organization does not consent. My
20	organization is an international grassroots
21	organization and we do not consent.
22	I speak for my entire family, who is
23	spread across the entire Navajo Nation, as well as
24	other reservations, as well as other townspeople, and

we do not consent.

	101
1	Our bodies, our Mother Earth, our
2	children, our elders, and all our nonhuman relatives
3	do not consent. We are not a sacrifice zone for toxic
4	waste, nuclear
5	(Applause.)
6	MS. ALVARADO: waste, fracking, and the
7	list goes on. We are concerned about the
8	transportation risks, the permanent contamination.
9	And due to the people have been here since time
10	immemorial, yet there is no prior informed consent.
11	There was no tribal consultation or consent.
12	New Mexico is not only home to the Diné
13	people, but 19 pueblos, the Jicarillo and Mescalero
14	Apache Nations and the Ute Nation. Why has there been
15	no government-to-government consultation? We are
16	sovereign
17	(Applause.)
18	MS. ALVARADO: We are the original
19	caregivers of this land and we care about future
20	generations to come and we will not allow for just
21	greed and money to contaminate our Mother Earth. We
22	do not want radioactive waste, Native and non-Native
23	alike.
24	It is a human right to clean air, land,
25	and water. Reference the United Nation's Declaration

1 of Indigenous Rights. If you bring this here, we will 2 fight it and we will teach our children and our 3 grandchildren to fight your capitalism, environmental 4 racism and injustice. 5 (Applause.) MS. ALVARADO: You don't need to have a 6 7 nuclear engineering or science degree in order to 8 recognize that this is racism. This is environmental injustice. There are over 100 uranium mines and other 9 10 forms of toxic waste spread across New Mexico and we demand, no more. 11 12 (Applause.) MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Hope. 13 14 Okay. Our next group is Jennifer Marley, Michael 15 Pitula, Torqen Johnson, Leona Morqan, and Willard Hunter. Jennifer? 16 17 MS. MARLEY: Good evening. I'd just like to acknowledge that I (unintelligible) was located, 18 19 but hundreds and hundreds of acres of land was stolen 20 from us by the U.S. Government to build the largest 21 nuclear bomb facility in the country, Los Alamos 22 National Labs. This land was blatantly stolen from us to 23 24 be sold for a pitiful price. And to this day, it gets

used to contaminate some of our most sacred sites.

1	you all are familiar with the Bandelier National
2	Monument
3	PARTICIPANT: Can you slow down just a
4	little?
5	MS. MARLEY: Yes.
6	PARTICIPANT: We can't hear you.
7	MS. MARLEY: If you are familiar with the
8	Bandelier National Monument, you should know that
9	there are at least three parts to it that are wholly
10	contaminated, some to the point that we can't even
11	visit our own dwellings without an escort and full
12	protective gear.
13	So, that being said, it's no New Mexico
14	is not new to the dangers of nuclear poison. The
15	nuclear bomb was created here, it was first dropped
16	here, and most of the waste is stored here.
17	New Mexico and the nuclear industry is set
18	up as such that nuclear weapons can be produced and
19	disposed of all within the state. This place is
20	nothing more than a sacrifice zone the U.S. Government
21	and to all these companies.
22	(Applause.)
23	MS. MARLEY: My people, not just the people
24	of Los Alamos, but also the people of Santa Clara, the
25	people of (unintelligible), the people of Cochiti,

have already been suffering for generations from the 1 2 impacts that this has had on us. 3 It's contaminated our groundwater. 4 contaminated our air and soil. It's moved downstream. People here in Albuquerque are still suffering from 5 the effects of Los Alamos National Labs. 6 This stuff 7 is not regulated the way it should be. And if it was, 8 people wouldn't be dying at alarming rates. 9 elders wouldn't have cancer. 10 There wouldn't be inter-generational genetic trauma that's been done to us because of the 11 12 impacts that mothers -- because of the changes that we are -- radiation that mothers pass on to 13 14 children. 15 This stays with us forever and alters our 16 And it targets Native people and poor brown 17 communities disproportionately. 18 (Applause.) 19 MS. MARLEY: That's all I have to say. 20 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Is this Torgen? 21 Torgen, let see, is Michael? Yes. 22 MR. PITULA: So, first, you're welcome, 23 Last month was tax day and you're welcome for NRC. 24 being allowed to have the means to do this with that 25 And, frankly, this is what you decide to do money.

with the money?

I'm here tonight in solidarity with my indigenous sisters, people of color, other siblings who oppose the environmental and economic racism of this plan.

(Applause.)

MR. PITULA: I moved here about four years ago from Illinois, Illinois is one of the leading states that uses nuclear power. I was never taught about any of this.

I was appalled when I came here and was educated by New Mexicans about a debt that we owe. I was totally appalled at everything that people have shared here tonight. And it's clear that my state, where I came from, where I was born, has to share some of this burden. I oppose Holtec's plan.

(Applause.)

MR. PITULA: First of all, the EIS has to include the climate impacts of a two to four degree Celsius increase that administration after administration is locking us into, probably not been factored in.

Second of all, the comment period needs to be extended calendar-wise and geographically. As has been established. And finally, this just shouldn't be

done.

As has been said, New Mexico's a sacrifice zone. And it's really disingenuous of Holtec and the NRC to bring a waste zone and say, to call it economic development.

(Laughter.)

MR. PITULA: This is the second time that I've had to hear, like, we're bringing a dump and it's going to be great. And the first one was defeated. So, you're next.

So, either this is unsafe and, therefore, it should not be done. Or it's safe in that the canisters are safe and shouldn't be moved, right? And in that case, it's a boondoggle, it's a corporate boondoggle.

So, I'll close by saying that, this is not a democracy, this is sham democracy, this is capitalism. And under capitalism, our health, our safety, our equity are not the primary concern.

Maximizing corporate profits to shareholders of companies like Holtec is what is the primary concern. That's usually done by cutting costs. Cutting costs on labor, cutting costs on materials, cutting costs on safety. And this could best be described as privatizing the benefits and

socializing the costs.
(Applause.)
MR. PITULA: Holtec will reap the benefits,
along with the NRC, and the costs will be socialized
to all of us. But we are here to struggle and the
struggle will continue. Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you. And
Torgen?
MR. JOHNSON: I'm Torgen Johnson from San
Diego. I'm a father of four and trained at Harvard as
an urban planner. I also represent the Samuel
Lawrence Foundation tonight.
A few days ago, I was watching a video of
the Roswell NRC hearing. And I couldn't believe it,
I thought, I've got to get on a plane and share some
information with all of you.
We're experiencing the same kind of crisis
in California, San Onofre. For over 40 years, the
communities around San Onofre have had no say in any
of the decisions around the nuclear power plant.
And now, with the waste plan, which has a
short-term plan, which is to leave it down at the

that are susceptible to cracking and hydrogen

1 explosions, we'll give you the technical info on all 2 But it's planned to come here, to New Mexico 3 and from what we've heard, this is a happy community 4 looking forward to receiving it. 5 So, I'm pleased to connect with everybody here and I just want to let you know that we have a 6 7 tremendous amount of research that we've done over the 8 past many years. 9 have a great group of people 10 California and in Japan that we've built coalitions with, including the Prime Minister of Japan who dealt 11 with the Fukushima disaster. 12 I will tell you that he's on your side too. 13 14 We did eight conferences with him, three 15 in the United States and the rest in Japan. We also worked with the former Chairman of the U.S. Nuclear 16 17 Regulatory Commission, who spoke on behalf of the public safety. 18 19 What we found with our experience so far with Holtec is, they've made a lot of promises and 20 21 have not delivered. They've talked about emergency 22 actions that are virtually impossible, 23 because the facilities that they've promised to deal 24 with these leaking canisters, that facility was

demolished in 2007.

1 So, we're listening to things like this, 2 just like you are. And I want to state, these are 3 upscale communities along the beach, that 4 political outreach and connection, and even they're 5 marginalized. This is the intense issues that all of us 6 7 are up against. And what I would encourage is that California and New Mexico join forces and address 8 9 this. 10 (Applause.) 11 MR. JOHNSON: There are a lot of very sharp 12 people digging into NRC documents and pulling out relevant facts. And I'll give you just a few. 13 14 fuel that they're loading in these canisters that 15 they'd like to send your way is called high burnup 16 fuel. 17 It stays in reactors longer and when it's pulled out, the fuel is more damaged. And it gets 18 19 these hydrides that build up on the surface of the 20 fuel. I'll finish right now. I have six bullets 21 22 of -- so, you're being handed a time-bomb. And we'll 23 share more information on that with you. Those all come from the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, 24

the 7/20/17 report.

1	I hope to get the chance to talk with many
2	of you after this, I only have three minutes, like we
3	do in California. Thank you.
4	(Applause.)
5	MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. And
6	Leona? Do you want to bring everybody up?
7	(Laughter.)
8	MS. MORGAN: Good evening. My name is
9	Leona Morgan and I am here with the Nuclear Issues
10	Study Group. We have attended four out of five of
11	these NRC meetings.
12	And just for some of you who were not at
13	any of these other meetings, I just want to say, thank
14	you for being here tonight, especially everyone who is
15	staying around to listen to all the talks, because
16	this is a long process.
17	And I'm really glad that Chip got an
18	official timekeeper, because there's a lot of issues.
19	I think we're going to comment on later, about the
20	process. The issues we've had with these NRC
21	meetings, not just the timekeeping, the facilitation,
22	the locations, and the lack of meetings, and the lack
23	of notice.
24	We only had about ten days to get folks to
25	the meeting in Gallup last night. And we had 100

1 people there talking about impacts from uranium 2 Which will probably be thrown out, because 3 they're not germane to the scope of the EIS for this 4 site. 5 But I want to ask the NRC to consider all of the comments you heard last night, because they're 6 7 very important to hear directly from the people who 8 have been impacted the most. Especially people 9 dealing with uranium mining, because we have already lived with these impacts for decades. 10 We don't know what Holtec is proposing 11 down south, because not all of it is available in the 12 ER that's online. So, some of the issues that we 13 14 have, all need to be included to the public. We need to know all of -- we need to have access to all of the 15 16 pages of all of their applications. And then, there's another issue with the 17 location of the Ogallala Aquifer. I think any tests 18 19 that are done need to be also vetted by a neutral third-party. So, we don't trust Holtec. And I think 20 21 you've heard tonight that we don't --22 (Applause.) 23 MS. MORGAN: And so, we need to do some 24 studies on the actual location of the Ogallala

Aquifer, as well as have third-party investigators and

1 researchers look at all of the impacts the 2 environment, the wild life, and as I keep mentioning, 3 to the sacred places that you'll be passing. 4 We'd like to see all of their transport 5 whether they're on roads, waterways, 6 railways, published, because how can we comment on 7 things that are not publicly noticed? 8 They're not available to us and all of the 9 other people along the transport routes. So, for that 10 reason, we need more meetings in communities along transport routes, as well as an extension to the 11 comment period, so that they have time to learn about 12 this project and the possible transport through their 13 14 communities. 15 Also, I'd like to request that you all do an actual test of the cask, the drop from 30 feet is 16 17 something that is very questionable. We would like to see an actual test of what would happen if one of 18 these casks were dropped from a height of higher than 19 20 30 feet and how much radiation is actually coming out, 21 because we know that we are going to be exposed all 22 along the route. 23 And we do not consent to these exposures,

we do not consent to these additional x-rays, we do

not consent to the project or the transport.

24

1	And I just want to say thank you, because
2	last night, I also said thank you for coming out, and
3	I hope that you continue to do so, because we need a
4	lot more of these meetings.
5	It's ridiculous what we have to go through
6	to get people to these meetings, when you give us such
7	short notice and people don't have time to review the
8	entire application. So, please extend the comment
9	period and have more public meetings. Thank you.
LO	(Applause.)
11	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very
12	much, Leona. And Willard? Mr. Willard Hunter? Thank
L3	you.
L 4	MR. HUNTER: My name is Willard Hunter. I
L 5	am a proud member of Veterans for Peace.
L 6	(Applause.)
L7	MR. HUNTER: When I talk about this issue,
L 8	I always start out with a joke. One day, all the
19	parts of the body were arguing about which was the
20	most important.
21	And the brain said, well, I'm the most
22	important, because I do all the thinking. The heart
23	said, no, I'm the most important, because I pump all
24	the blood.
25	Finally, the asshole chimed up and said,

1	I'm the most important part of the body. All the
2	parts of the body laughed, so the asshole shut down.
3	(Laugher.)
4	MR. HUNTER: So, three or four days later,
5	the brain got really queasy, the heart got very
6	sluggish. Finally, all the parts of the body said,
7	asshole, you are the most important part of the body.
8	And it's a silly joke, but it's a very
9	profound insight. And that is that any living system
10	has to be able to get rid of its waste in order to
11	continue to exist. And that's also true for nuclear
12	power plants.
13	And we know, from the very beginning 72
14	years ago, that that has always been the problem with
15	the nuclear power plants. And it continues in 2018 to
16	be the major problem with anything related to nuclear.
17	So, we know the government and it has
18	deep pockets behind it. It has the federal
19	government. Holtec International, we know is a for-
20	profit company. And, as far as I'm concerned, it will
21	walk away from an accident, just like the uranium
22	mining companies did back in the 1940s and 1950s.
23	(Applause.)
24	MR. HUNTER: The point there is that the
25	NRC needs to require something like a \$2 billion

1	surety bond that the company puts up if it's going to
2	build this facility. And if this project is so good,
3	why doesn't Holtec International just put these
4	canisters at its Camden, New Jersey headquarters?
5	(Applause.)
6	MR. HUNTER: And if a permanent storage
7	facility is developed, how will the spent tube rods be
8	moved? And we know, we know that if it goes into this
9	area, that is going to become the de facto permanent
10	storage area, and it's only designed to be an interim
11	facility.
12	And finally, I say (native language
13	spoken). We lost the fight against WIPP, we cannot
14	afford to lose this fight against Holtec
15	International.
16	(Applause.)
17	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. All right. Next
18	group is Laura Watchempino, Tommi Tejeda. This is
19	here she is.
20	MS. WATCHEMPINO: Thank you to the Nuclear
21	Regulatory Commission and to those of you that are
22	staying with us. I respectfully submit some comments
23	tonight that I will followup with more comments. And
24	I actually wanted to give my time to the gentleman

from California to tell us more, but I do need to get

this on the record.

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

live in the Grants Uranium Mining District in Northwestern New Mexico. And our area, like everywhere else that was talked about that deals with the nuclear fuel chain, whether generation of power, the uranium mining, transportation, or the disposal of waste, we should not have to risk the contamination of our land, our waterways, air, the health of our plants, wildlife, and livestock, from the transport and storage of this highly hazardous material.

It poses a long-term risk to present and future generations and it was very disheartening to hear about the trans-generational impacts. The path — leaving this legacy problem for future generations is also very disturbing, because that's not the kind of legacy that many of us want to leave behind.

(Applause.)

MS. WATCHEMPINO: All spent nuclear fuel storage and interim disposal poses future retrieval risk after a permanent repository is finally opened, because those fragile, thin-walled barrier casks are very likely to be leaking.

And I have been reading about the problems with the same cask at the San Onofre Power Plant in

1 California. The consolidated interim storage is not 2 the solution. 3 Interim transport and storage of dangerous 4 high-level radioactive waste is an illusory solution. 5 It's only going to expose more communities along the transport route to the dangerous radiation. 6 7 Once these casks, if they ever are removed to a permanent repository, it's going to be even more 8 9 dangerous, because it's very likely that those casks will crack and leak. 10 The NRC, it seems, wants to abdicate its 11 responsibility for protecting our human health and the 12 13 environment from the spent nuclear fuel 14 accumulating at nuclear power plants around the 15 country and to relieve itself of liability for failing 16 find permanent homes for this long-lived 17 radioactive waste. It's an environmental injustice to dump it 18 19 on New Mexico when past and present generations are 20 already suffering daily exposures from the 97 legacy 21 uranium mines and uranium mills in the Grants Mining District. 22 23 And several generations of New Mexicans in 24 the Tularosa Basin that were exposed to radioactive

ash and fallout from the atomic bomb tests without

1	their knowledge or consent are also suffering.
2	Workers in the uranium mines and National
3	Labs, members of our Armed Forces, have been exposed
4	to dangerous radioactive material without their
5	consent and continue to suffer health impacts.
6	Holtec International is a Limited
7	Liability Company, and its partner, the Eddy Lea
8	Energy Alliance is also a Limited Liability Company.
9	So
10	MR. CAMERON: Could I get you to finish up,
11	Laura?
12	MS. WATCHEMPINO: Okay, thank you. I do
13	not consent and our communities do not consent to this
14	project. Thank you.
15	(Applause.)
16	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Laura.
17	Tommi? And then, Tsosie next after Tommi. And then,
18	Kevin.
19	MS. TEJEDA: I am speaking against this
20	proposed project. There are numerous reasons why this
21	project should not move forward, but the reason I'd
22	like to speak toward is the nuclear legacy and history
23	of New Mexico and its lack of accountability to the
24	people and environment, who bear the brunt of the
25	unavoidable and inevitable consequences of nuclear

1	activity.
2	We have a deplorable track record when it
3	comes to owning up, to cleaning up, and caring for
4	those who have experienced cross-generational
5	sickness, such as the Tularosa Basin Downwinders and
6	others.
7	There is no reason I see to trust that a
8	private company will fare any better in such matters.
9	Thank you.
10	(Applause.)
11	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. And, Tsosie?
12	MR. TSIHHNAHSINNIE: Over here.
13	MR. CAMERON: There he is.
14	MR. TSIHHNAHSINNIE: My name is Tsosie
15	Tsihhnahsinnie. My comments are going to be pretty
16	brief. I am opposed to the nuclear waste dump site by
17	Holtec. And I think that nuclear energy, the waste,
18	if it was treated as other hazardous waste, such as
19	asbestos, they would have to stop producing it.
20	(Applause.)
21	MR. TSIHHNAHSINNIE: And also, there were
22	some someone was talking about the nuclear plant in
23	Georgia, they had gone into bankruptcy and they had
24	actually lost \$9 billion. And if you think about what

\$9 billion could do for solar or wind projects in the

	120
1	United States
2	(Applause.)
3	MR. TSIHHNAHSINNIE: I also reiterate what
4	a few were saying about states that choose to build
5	nuclear reactors, if they choose to build nuclear
6	reactors, they need to also commit to taking care of
7	their own waste.
8	(Applause.)
9	MR. TSIHHNAHSINNIE: I would like to also
10	firmly ask for the NRC to extend the hearings to other
11	states where the transportation is going to happen and
12	will affect the other populations.
13	When I think about producing energy and
14	the research and the delivery, I want to feel good
15	about it. I don't want to have a lump in my throat or
16	like a tightness in my chest or anything.
17	I want to be able to say, have the same
18	feeling I have with wind and solar and/or geothermal
19	energy. When I think of Iceland and I think of their
20	geothermal activities there, I'm sure some of the
21	innovations, they're from Iceland. This is what I'd
22	like for New Mexico.
23	Also, with the, I guess, with the NRC and

24

1	planning.
2	If you are producing nuclear waste and you
3	haven't thought out the cost and where you're going to
4	put it in the future, this is not only a very flawed
5	way, as it has been in the past, it's in keeping with
6	the future. Thank you very much.
7	(Applause.)
8	MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. Is
9	Kevin Bean?
10	MR. BEAN: All right. I think the Nuclear
11	Regulatory Commission should, as a Commission, for
12	states that have a nuclear facility require that those
13	states make a binding commitment to transitioning to
14	100 percent renewable energy.
15	(Applause.)
16	MR. BEAN: And I think the NRC can do,
17	because the NRC, like every government agency, has
18	authority under the law and under the Constitution, to
19	protect people's health, safety, and welfare.
20	That is the government's primary
21	responsibility. The Department of Energy has not
22	unfortunately taken that responsibility, the federal
23	government has not carried out that responsibility.
24	The Nuclear Regulatory Commission can and

should, as condition of approving this project, make

1	that happen. And you can make that happen, because
2	you're in charge of a serious problem, something has
3	to be done with it, make that a condition that we deal
4	with this problem once and for all.
5	Right now we have to address the real
6	problem and address it in a holistic manner and make
7	that a condition for states that want to participate
8	in this project.
9	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Kevin.
10	(Applause.)
11	MR. CAMERON: All right. The next group is
12	John Comstock, Sarah Kelly, Michael Holland, Melissa
13	Tso, and Noel Marquez. John?
14	MR. COMSTOCK: Okay. Hello, my name is
15	John Comstock, and I'm a former teacher at Highland
16	High School. I'm also a former railway employee. And
17	I worked for the railroad, the Chicago, Milwaukee, St.
18	Paul, and Pacific, for three years.
19	And I witnessed numerous derailments, and
20	that's my contribution tonight. I really appreciate
21	all the comments that have been made, thoughtful
22	comments.
23	I think this planned site is a poor idea
24	and I agree that there should be more discussion in
25	the various places that the nuclear waste would be

1	transported through. Thanks everybody for being here
2	and for caring about this state, for caring about your
3	fellow person.
4	(Applause.)
5	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, John.
6	Sarah? Sarah Kelly? Michael? Michael Holland? And
7	Melissa?
8	MS. KELLY: Did you say Sarah Kelly again?
9	MR. CAMERON: I'm sorry, I can't hear you.
LO	MS. KELLY: I'm sorry, did you say Sarah
11	Kelly again? Maybe I didn't hear you.
12	MR. CAMERON: I just called Sarah Kelly.
L3	MS. KELLY: Ok, I didn't hear if she went
L4	or not.
15	MR. CAMERON: Yes, go ahead. Go ahead.
L 6	MS. KELLY: So, it's wonderful that all of
L7	these speakers have had things with which I strongly
L 8	agree, because I don't speak in front of large crowds
L 9	very well. In fact, even more poorly.
20	But I will say, environmental racism is
21	not exactly what it is, although it's not quite what
22	it is, because New Mexico is too it's not just
23	about someone's race, but whether or not they were so
24	poorly cared for or disorganized that even if they
25	were decently informed, really don't have the time or

1	means to stand up for themselves.
2	But people were not informed, were not
3	informed at all. So, people were not informed, but
4	environmental racism, reiterating all the points that
5	were made that don't all come to mind right now. This
6	is a terrible idea. We are not interested. Send it
7	to, if you have to send it somewhere, Texas.
8	(Laughter.)
9	MS. KELLY: The people who create this
10	waste should be storing it. They make it, they can
11	store it. Thank you.
12	(Applause.)
13	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you. I'll
14	call Michael Holland and Melissa Tso, again, but I
15	don't think they're oh, this is Melissa, okay. And
16	next, we'll go to Noel.
17	MS. TSO: Hi, everybody. My name is
18	Melissa Tso and I am a member of the Navajo Nation,
19	have been for the past three years. I just wanted to
20	come here, I literally just walked through the door,
21	and I wanted to express my opinion as an Indigenous
22	American here in the United States.
23	I want to again, I don't know what
24	comments you're looking for, but I want everybody to

recognize that indigenous communities have been

affected continuously, over and over by environmental 1 2 racism, as a way to further erase our people, to 3 further genocide. 4 We are on the front lines, because we are 5 impacted by uranium mines, we're impacted by -- I don't know if you've been familiar with the different 6 7 abandoned sites on Navajo Nation, but it's 8 national government and it's continuing, sadly. 9 And like someone said earlier, we need to 10 have more meetings like this. And I hate to see that these meetings are not advertised as well as they 11 Like, more members from the community 12 should be. should be here, and not to consult with us, but to ask 13 14 for our permission. 15 Like I said, this is indigenous land and we still, to this day, are under occupation and always 16 17 remember that. Thank you. 18 (Applause.) 19 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. And Noel Marquez? 20 MR. MARQUEZ: I am from Artesia, 21 Mexico, same place as John over there. And I've been 22 to four out of the five NRC meetings. In Roswell, the 23 oil companies came out against the Holtec plan because 24 geology is unsuitable.

Sinking lands as much as four inches due

1 to fracking and then, something they hardly ever speak 2 about is the water flooding of potash mines in Eddy This has caused a lot of 3 County and Lea County. 4 severe sinkholes. Carlsbad is in the middle of a 5 sinkhole problem due to injection wells. The dairies came out against Holtec. 6 7 There's a lot of valuable business, in counties, a prosperous community, 55 jobs. It's madness. And the 8 dairies spoke about contamination of feed, cow milk, 9 10 disease, all caused by radiation. And the worst part is that still 80 11 12 percent of our Southeast communities know nothing of the Holtec plan. They're just not being informed. 13 14 It's something that's being rushed to reach a quick 15 settlement of bringing this poison to our lands. In Gallup last night, I was not there, but 16 17 you can watch it online, Holtec, they had a beautiful livestream, and the community spoke strongly about the 18 19 impact of the uranium mining, contamination on the They have been suffering for over 80 20 Navajo Nation. 21 years from environmental injustice there. 22 And then, in Carlsbad, after the pro-23 business Holtec group spoke, they froze our butts in 24 the garage.

(Laughter.)

1	MR. MARQUEZ: And we will never forget
2	that. They have no idea about how to regulate the air
3	conditioning. They want to be in charge of storing
4	the worst poison in the world, but they can't control
5	the air conditioning.
6	(Laughter.)
7	MR. MARQUEZ: Finally, not only did my 11-
8	year-old daughter spoke in a clear language about the
9	connection in our ecology between all life, she
10	doesn't understand why some of the people in the
11	Carlsbad business community favor poisoning
12	themselves, except that they favor money.
13	And then, she said, some, like the
14	mistreatment of our old who will not be around to
15	suffer the effects like children, mothers, and the
16	unborn.
17	The NRC is a system of power that favors
18	the nuclear industry over communities. For me, the
19	NRC stands for Nuclear Risk for Communities. We don't
20	want it coming. New Mexico people do not give their
21	consent. Thank you.
22	(Applause.)
23	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. All right.
24	Stephen Picha?
25	MR. PICHA: Good evening. And I want to

1 also thank everyone for coming this evening. I would 2 like those from the NRC, if they could just kind of 3 raise their hands, so I know that this is who I'm 4 speaking to. So, just the two of you? Wow, okay. 5 So, the four of you? Okay. I think it's just important 6 7 and a fair questions, because you have come here to listen to the voices of people and you've done that 8 9 now, this is the fifth time. 10 And I was at the first hearing in Roswell, New Mexico, as I know many of you were as well. 11 I do not disbelieve that the people of Holtec think 12 is 13 this good. Ι mean, Ι sat 14 conversations with them. But I think it's very important, and it's 15 16 been brought up on about three occasions tonight, of 17 their statement following that first hearing Roswell, New Mexico, where they basically said there 18 19 was unequivocal support. Joining the few local dissenters were 20 21 activists from Texas and California, whose opposition 22 lacked clarity and specificity. You sat there and you 23 heard those people talk. 24 And I think you know that those cattle

gas and oil people,

ranchers,

the

25

county

the

1 commissioner from Texas, who basically, Texas doesn't 2 want this, because they've already said no, this isn't 3 something we're going to take. 4 I've always been taught, it's how you do 5 the little things is how you do the big things. if this is how Holtec is going to do the little things 6 7 of reporting, what they heard and knew happened that 8 night, what can we expect of the big things? 9 (Applause.) 10 MR. PICHA: People of Holtec, you are a 11 business obligations and you have to your 12 stakeholders. We are citizens and we have obligations to our children and to the people who have suffered 13 14 the most. 15 And I, as a white Anglo male, have to ask forgiveness to my Native brothers and sisters, to my 16 17 Hispanic brothers and sisters, and to my sisters in general, because if you've noticed and are collecting 18 19 the data tonight, where are one them saying, 20 support this? 21 Have you heard one woman who has gotten up 22 here this evening, unless I missed it at the very 23 beginning, in their wisdom, who have said, we support this? 24

So, please pay attention to the data.

1	Don't let the shell game or what is best in the
2	business interest decide the lives of the people here
3	in New Mexico. Thank you.
4	(Applause.)
5	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Let's go to Tina
6	Cordova and Deborah Gaudet and to Janet Greenwald.
7	Tina?
8	MS. CORDOVA: Good evening, ladies and
9	gentleman that are left.
LO	(Laughter.)
11	MS. CORDOVA: My name is Tina Cordova and
12	I'm co-founder of an organization in New Mexico called
L3	the Tularosa Basin Downwinders Consortium.
L 4	(Applause.)
L 5	MS. CORDOVA: And I want to thank all of
L 6	you who tonight mentioned us, because this is where it
L7	all started, with the group that I represent. And I
L 8	want to make sure that you hear what I have to say.
L 9	We had no opportunity to give consent in
20	1945. And representing the people that I represent
21	tonight, I want to say that we do not give consent in
22	2018 either.
23	(Applause.)
24	MS. CORDOVA: I am a cancer survivor. I
25	had thyroid cancer. And the first thing they asked me

1 when they diagnosed me was, when were you exposed to 2 radiation? 3 I buried my father five years ago. 4 never had risk factors for the cancer that he died 5 from. He suffered for over eight years in a way that's hard for me to describe. 6 7 He got oral cancer. He never smoked, he didn't drink, he didn't use chewing tobacco, he didn't 8 9 have viruses. He got two different oral cancers. 10 can't tell you the number of people that I have buried in my extended family, aunts, uncles, grandmothers. 11 I know about the numbers of people who are 12 affected by being exposed to radiation. 13 I buried a 14 friend last week. I have thousands of health surveys I've collected, I've read every single one of them. 15 16 A hundred jobs? When you put 100 jobs up 17 against the tens of thousands of people that we know were affected after the test at Trinity, it doesn't 18 19 And there's no way to make it right. And let me tell you what that means. 20 21 means that I'm fighting right now to be included in a 22 hearing that's scheduled for June 27 in the Seventh 23 Judiciary Committee as they consider the amendments to 24 finally recognize the 73-year injustice that was done

to the people of New Mexico.

1 They have compensated and given people 2 healthcare coverage cards other places. They've given 3 people \$2.2 billion to help them get medical care that 4 they need. They get a healthcare card that entitles 5 them to the best healthcare available any place in the world. And you know what we get in New Mexico? Zero. 6 7 If you think I trust that a private entity 8 is going to come back and take care of people after 9 their health is destroyed, you've got to be kidding 10 yourself, because our own government hasn't done that in 73 years. 11 12 So, I'm here to say, 100 jobs is not worth the thousands of people we could potentially bury. I 13 14 have looked in those people's eyes as they're dying, 15 all across this state. I have heard their stories, I 16 have read their health surveys. 17 And guess what, folks? It doesn't end My genetics are changed now and I passed 18 with us. 19 those genetics on to my children and my grandchildren. 20 The plutonium that went up in that bomb has a half-21 life of 24,000 years. Ten pounds didn't fission, it 22 got joined to our soil and to our water forever more 23 and is now part of our genetics. 24 The indigenous people of this state do not

My family's roots can be traced back for

consent.

1 over five generations, they aren't consenting, I don't 2 And I'm here to tell you all that this is 3 the wrong thing for New Mexico. It was wrong 73 years 4 ago and it's wrong today. 5 (Applause.) MR. CAMERON: Thank you. 6 And now, we're 7 going to go to Deborah Gaudet. And then, Greenwald and next, Barbara Endicott. 8 9 MS. GAUDET: Hello, my name is Deborah 10 Gaudet, and I'm a member of the Red Nation. And I'm an LPCC in New Mexico, I have my master's degree in 11 counseling psychology. 12 And I'm nothing if not a scholar. 13 14 So, I'll start off by mentioning some 15 I think the most important, one of the most books. important books that I've read is -- oh gosh, I'm 16 17 standing up here before you all my mind just went blank, hang on. Yes, one of the most important books 18 19 that I've read is God is Red by Vine Deloria. Another important book that I've read is Ceremony by Leslie 20 Marmon Silko. 21 And it's important for us to understand 22 this settler colonial condition that we're in and how 23 settler colonialism means death and madness for the 24

colonizer.

It's like looking at the land, I grew up 1 2 in North Dakota and I just want to mention something 3 that was recently in the news, the Air Force in North 4 Dakota lost a box of grenades from a military vehicle. 5 They were looking for those grenades and put out a reward. Think they turned up? 6 No. 7 that's the Department of Defense. This is private 8 company. No. 9 It's also very sad for me to see how the land has been wastelanded by USDA policies. And it's 10 important to look around and understand that almost 11 12 everything has been killed off by settlers colonialism and the policies of the United States Government 13 14 already. 15 And it's like, we need to understand and think about the fact that the land would be way more 16 abundant if we let it be what it is here in the West. 17 There would be buffalo. 18 19 In Montana, they made a huge tourist industry out of the buffalo. Here in New Mexico, the 20 21 buffalo are killed off. And they would come back, but 22 they're continually not allowed. They're continually 23 excluded. 24 And I'm bringing this up as a related 25 In New Mexico, we also have tourism. issue. Tourism

1	is our number one industry. And to kind of poison our
2	land, poison our water with fracking and with nuclear
3	waste, and that's our own, by the way, that's our own
4	very lives as well as the tourist industry that we
5	have.
6	So, I echo a lot of things that other
7	people have said and I also don't give my consent.
8	And please reflect on the last two hundred years of
9	U.S. colonial policy.
10	And also reflect on, the current
11	government is at a low point, this is the Trump
12	administration and the NRC represents the Trump
13	administration at this point in time as well. Thank
14	you.
15	(Applause.)
16	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Janet?
17	MS. GREENWALD: I have been following these
18	hearings around the state, as has NRC. And in
19	Roswell, I listened to the dairy farmers, the oil
20	industry, pecan farmers say no. In Hobbs, I listened
21	to educators and mothers. That was the main part of
22	the speakers saying no.
23	In Carlsbad, I listened to the boosters,
24	the same people that have been promoting nuclear

project as economic boons. I listened to them speak

1 for the project, but I also listened to more people 2 than those people speak against it. I wasn't in Gallup, but I've seen some of 3 4 the footage. There was a whole room full of people 5 who spoke against this project. So, I'm going to second the man who asked NRC to please take that press 6 7 release down that said New Mexicans consent to this 8 project. That is a falsity. 9 (Applause.) 10 MS. GREENWALD: You want us to trust you and, yet, you lied to everybody. You lied to the 11 12 whole nation about what is happening here in New Mexico. 13 14 I've also been to a couple of meetings that NRC hasn't been to. 15 One was when I went to 16 Tularosa, where Tina is from. My friend Silviana 17 (phonetic) and I went down there. And Tularosa is a community of several thousand people. 18 And Silviana and I went down there to hear 19 20 people acknowledge who died of cancer in t.hat. 21 community. Guess what? It took hours. It took 22 hours. For each name, they hit a drum and a triangle, and we were there for hours. 23 24 Another meeting that you weren't at was a 25 City Council meeting last night, where the City

	137
1	Council passed a memorial saying that they don't want
2	any transportation of this high-level nuclear waste
3	through Albuquerque.
4	(Applause.)
5	MS. GREENWALD: And I'm sure they'll be
6	sending that memorial in to you. So, what we have
7	here in New Mexico are people that are saying no. And
8	the government has said that they're trying to do this
9	by consent.
10	They spent millions and millions of
11	dollars in Nevada trying to put a waste dump in there
12	that people didn't want. And then, they spent more
13	millions of dollars in Utah, trying to put this waste
14	on the Skull Valley Goshute Reservation, and people
15	said, no.
16	And eventually, Utah and Nevada were able
17	to build a wilderness area around the Skull Valley
18	Goshute Reservation, because NRC had licensed them to
19	take nuclear waste. But because now there's a
20	wilderness area around the Reservation, no one can
21	bring in nuclear waste.
22	(Applause.)
23	MR. CAMERON: And, Janet, can you wrap up
24	for us, please?
25	MS. GREENWALD: I'm sorry?

1	MR. CAMERON: Could you wrap up for us,
2	please?
3	MS. GREENWALD: I just want to thank all of
4	you for resisting, because I think that there's a path
5	forward here. I think we have a path forward. Thank
6	you.
7	(Applause.)
8	MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Janet. Now,
9	Barbara Endicott and then, Judy Kaul and Karen Bohime.
10	MS. BOHIME: Bohime.
11	MR. CAMERON: Yes. And Lauro, Lauro Silva.
12	MS. ENDICOTT: My name is Barbara Endicott.
13	And since I heard about this proposed nuclear waste
14	dump, I've been very frightened.
15	And so glad that I came tonight, because
16	I feel very encouraged by everybody and what everybody
17	has said, hearing that the big majority of the people
18	that came here tonight do not want this waste dump.
19	We do not want it.
20	(Applause.)
21	MS. ENDICOTT: part as human beings and
22	what this could mean to our health. Health is
23	everything. And we all know that. And I just I
24	hope everybody here spreads the word, because it is
25	not being a lot of people don't even know about it.

	139
1	And so, I hope everybody goes home tonight
2	and calls their friends and talks about this to
3	everybody that they meet, because it's important that
4	we defeat this. And we will, we will. Thank you.
5	(Applause.)
6	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Judy Kaul? Oh,
7	Judy? Do you want to use this microphone, is it
8	easier for you?
9	MS. KAUL: Yes, thank you. Thank you. I'm
10	Judy Kaul. I'm a New Mexican. And I want to say,
11	there was a woman who was talking about, is there
12	intelligence on the planet? And I think there is, but
13	we still, as a species, have human error. And this is
14	what the NRC needs to remember, that mistakes do
15	happen.
16	I mean, in New Mexico, we somebody made
17	a mistake between one kind of kitty litter and the
18	other and then caused a fire in WIPP. I mean, this
19	kind of thing does happen. So, we're in there are
20	mistakes and other places can keep their own nuclear
21	waste.
22	(Applause.)
23	MS. KAUL: Contrary to others opinion, New
24	Mexico is not your place. And we want to keep New
25	Mexico clean. And thank you for listening.

1	(Applause.)
2	MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. Karen?
3	Here's Karen.
4	MS. BOHIME: Hello, everybody. My name is
5	Karen Bohime. I'm a retired teacher and I have time
6	to fight this thing. And I hope everyone will take
7	the time to fight this thing. And I welcome the offer
8	of the gentleman from California to collaborate with
9	us and share information to fight this thing.
10	One thing I took away from the Roswell
11	hearing was, not only the presence of the oil and gas
12	people from Midland, Texas, but a woman who is the
13	head for all of Texas of the League of Women Voters.
14	No one, I don't think, has mentioned her yet.
15	She spoke for the women and, actually, for
16	all people of Texas, but especially for the League of
17	Women Voters. They arrive at decisions that are
18	general enough to apply to many situations.
19	They take a long time to arrive at a
20	consensus, but when they do, that is written in stone.
21	And they said, something to the effect of, this is a
22	threat to air, water, and plant and people's health.
23	And I was very grateful that she came all
24	the way from Texas to add her voice and the voices of

the women voters of Texas. Thank you very much. I

1 have her contact information, her name is Susiebell 2 (phonetic) that's her first name, I can't remember her 3 last name. 4 I've been thinking about the 5 transportation risks and it occurs to me, with all those thousands of miles of railroad track, who's 6 7 going to protect thousands of miles of railroad track 8 from sabotage? 9 How hard would it be for some deranged 10 person or terrorist to attach an IED, an improvised 11 explosive device, or perhaps something more 12 sophisticated to the track, so that as the train passes over, it explodes? And maybe it's planted on 13 14 a bridge over a deep canyon? Has Holtec tested their 15 casks for a 200-foot drop from a railroad bridge? doubt it. 16 17 One last thing, I echo the person who said that there's human error in everything. 18 And since 19 there is human error, you can't say anything is risk-20 free, you have to do a risk-benefit analysis. And it 21 just does not add up. 22 There is no benefit to New Mexico, there's 23 a huge threat. The very existence of a national high-24 level nuclear dump in New Mexico will discourage

tourism, our major industry.

1	As the dairy man said, one little leak
2	would be enough to destroy the whole dairy industry of
3	Southeast New Mexico, because people would just say,
4	oh, that's where they had that leak, don't drink that
5	milk, don't eat that cheese.
6	And the pecan farmers, same thing. No one
7	will want some people would probably give up pecans
8	period, because they think they all come from New
9	Mexico or something. People think that way.
10	MR. CAMERON: Karen, I'm going to have to
11	ask you to wrap up, please.
12	MS. BOHIME: Certainly. This is just the
13	beginning, folks. We're going to keep our hearts
14	strong and we're going to fight this thing with every
15	cell in our bodies. Thank you.
16	MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you.
17	(Applause.)
18	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Lauro Silva?
19	Lauro Silva? Here he is. And then, Denise Brown and
20	Athena, if you're here, I apologize that I don't know
21	how to pronounce your last name.
22	MR. SILVA: (Native language spoken.) May
23	the light within you shine ever more brightly, in the
24	language, our ancient language of our ancestors, my
25	family ancestors.

1 May the light shine brightly within you 2 every day. Because as luminous beings on this Earth, we walk and we try to live the best way we can. 3 4 all of you here are those folks that are continuing to 5 shine your light brightly to your families. My name is Lauro Silva. 6 I've been an 7 organizer for many years. I happen to be a lawyer by 8 profession, but I still need to make a living so I can 9 get paid. 10 But the point being that I grew up Southeastern New Mexico, I worked in the fields there, 11 12 in the cotton fields and alfalfa fields. And I worked very diligently on the project. 13 14 I'm one of the founders of the Citizens 15 for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping, CARD, as it's known. It's called Alternatives. For 40 years, since 16 17 1978, we've been working. Forty years later, today, this year, we're still fighting against the national 18 19 sacrifice area that is our community. 20 Corporations like Holtec and others, GE 21 and many others, have contaminated already substantial 22 areas of our communities. The impact that it has on 23 the DNA and the future generations, future generations 24 and the unborn, is something that's incalculable.

I'm a grandfather, I have six children, I

1	have nine grandchildren, and I have 12 great-
2	grandchildren. I'm one of the downwind folks, because
3	I was born in Capitan, New Mexico, Southern New
4	Mexico.
5	The exploitation of Native peoples,
6	Chicano peoples, Mexicanos, is part of the
7	environmental racism that we're dealing with today.
8	I already turned in my comments, my written comments.
9	I have extra copies, if anybody wants to see a copy of
LO	those.
L1	I'm not going to dwell on the point
12	anymore, because I agree with everything you've said.
L3	All of you that have those beautiful spirits that have
L 4	been here all day long, all night long, enduring some
L 5	of our profound knowledge with each others.
16	I hope that Holtec and the companies, the
L7	NRC, that's been promising that they would never take
L 8	high-level radiation or radioactive materials from
L 9	fuel rods, would stand at a 50-yard line in front of
20	one spent nuclear fuel rod for ten minutes before they
21	come and talk to us about what they plan to do.
22	(Applause.)
23	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Ms. Denise?
24	Denise Brown?
25	MS. BROWN: I'm Denise Brown. I'm with the
	1

1	Nuclear Issues Study Group. And first of all, I want
2	thank the NRC for coming out and listening to our
3	comments. And thank you all right, got it.
4	So, thank you, sir, and the NRC for
5	adjusting the Gallup meeting, where there is a
6	pamphlet in Navajo that was incorrect. I will talk to
7	you after to find out more about that.
8	So, first of all, I want to make a comment
9	in regards to the Department of Transportation. And
10	it is the joint responsibility with the NRC and the
11	Department of Transportation for the transportation of
12	the nuclear waste.
13	So, where is the Department of
13 14	So, where is the Department of Transportation at this hearing and the meetings prior
14	Transportation at this hearing and the meetings prior
14 15	Transportation at this hearing and the meetings prior to this? Because clearly, their presence should be
14 15 16	Transportation at this hearing and the meetings prior to this? Because clearly, their presence should be here. As many have said prior, the routes need to be
14 15 16 17	Transportation at this hearing and the meetings prior to this? Because clearly, their presence should be here. As many have said prior, the routes need to be addressed. So, how can we comment without those
14 15 16 17	Transportation at this hearing and the meetings prior to this? Because clearly, their presence should be here. As many have said prior, the routes need to be addressed. So, how can we comment without those routes?
14 15 16 17 18	Transportation at this hearing and the meetings prior to this? Because clearly, their presence should be here. As many have said prior, the routes need to be addressed. So, how can we comment without those routes? (Applause.)
14 15 16 17 18 19	Transportation at this hearing and the meetings prior to this? Because clearly, their presence should be here. As many have said prior, the routes need to be addressed. So, how can we comment without those routes? (Applause.) MS. BROWN: People are talking about the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Transportation at this hearing and the meetings prior to this? Because clearly, their presence should be here. As many have said prior, the routes need to be addressed. So, how can we comment without those routes? (Applause.) MS. BROWN: People are talking about the reactor facilities across the country. Where's the

(Applause.)

1 MS. BROWN: As he had mentioned, and has 2 informed us that there is a miscommunication between New Mexico and the waste that is being stored at 3 4 reactor communities across the country. 5 Somebody else mentioned Plant Vogtle, which the NRC is also in charge of, and the licensee, 6 7 and how the bankruptcy of private corporations, such 8 as Westinghouse, has done. But also, the situation 9 with Holtec and Eddy Lea Energy Alliance, as private 10 corporations in that community as well. So, the company and Georgia Power have 11 done a great injustice to the people of color in those 12 communities that are affected, because that is a black 13 14 community and houses the -- where Plant Vogtle is 15 situated. So, this is clearly environmental racism 16 17 at its core. Indigenous communities and nations in New Mexico and across the country, including black 18 communities, such as the Shell Bluff Community in 19 20 Georgia, and the brown communities in Southeastern New 21 Mexico, do not want this. Under the Clinton administration, there 22 was Executive Order 12898 that states that federal 23 shall 24 actions address environmental iustice in

minority populations and low-income populations.

1	I think the NRC needs to address those questions.
2	Thank you so much.
3	(Applause.)
4	MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Denise. And
5	Athena? Is Athena here? There she is. And then,
6	we'll go on to Susan Schuuman.
7	MS. CHRISTDOULOU: New Mexicans keep
8	fighting against becoming more of a sacrifice zone.
9	NRC failed the New Mexicans, and especially the people
LO	who spread the word to bring the regular people like
L1	myself here.
12	My first job, I was actually interviewed
13	at the NRC. I taught nuclear power. It was awesome.
L 4	But when I taught reactor power principles, any
L 5	changes in lessons, any notes that were changed along
L 6	the way, were written in blood.
L7	And then, when I finished teaching for the
L 8	Navy, I learned environmental engineering. Wow. That
L 9	nuclear power needs to be safely nine million miles
20	away in the sun.
21	(Laughter.)
22	MS. CHRISTDOULOU: Not in my backyard.
23	That's a favorite term in environmental engineering,
24	NIMBY, not in my backyard. Because this is going to
25	be so out of sight and out of mind for the rest of the
	•

1 nation, that they will consider nuclear power as a 2 possible source to continue on making electricity. 3 And yes, this is part of a bigger issue, 4 actually, the future. Because climate change is 5 happening, so say the scientists and I believe them over our wonderful fossil fuel people. 6 7 From what? From fossil fuel burning. need to ditch those fossil fuels. We need to stop 8 9 burning our future. I myself am going fossil fuel free by 2023. 10 11 But neither should we continue with 12 nuclear power. End this, for the sake of clean air, water, and soil. So, let's keep it in everybody's 13 14 backyard and in their minds. There's even been talk 15 of putting nuclear in Four Corners. And human memory is too short, making this 16 17 plan too much of a risk. No, Holtec, don't even consider it. 18 Keep resisting, my friends. Keep 19 fighting against becoming more of a sacrifice. 20 you. 21 (Applause.) 22 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very 23 much. And, Cody will be next, and then we're going to go to Ace and Sharon Hoffman. 24 25 MS. SCHUUMAN: Thanks, everybody who is

1	still here. I've spoken at three previous meetings,
2	but I do have some new comments that I want to share
3	with the NRC Commissioners. Welcome to Albuquerque.
4	We too have a high nuclear IQ, especially when it
5	comes to our experience with WIPP, as you heard
6	tonight.
7	I do have three points I want to make.
8	And one is health studies, two is employee concerns,
9	and three is about consent. Number one, please look
10	at two documents when you do your draft EIS.
11	One is the Navajo Birth Cohorts Study.
12	The Navajo Birth Cohorts Study, you can find it via
13	the Southwest Research and Information Center website,
14	that's SRIC.org.
15	They've studied, they've taken a lot of
16	blood samples from pregnant moms and fathers and
17	infants, and they've been tracking it for years.
18	There's a lot of data that I think would be very
19	helpful to you when you're deciding what kind of
20	impact this project could have.
21	The second document I want to share, this
22	is to followup on the comments that Tina Cordova made
23	from the Tularosa Basin DownWinders Consortium, they
24	put a lot of effort into a health impact assessment.

A health impact assessment by the Tularosa $\,$

1 Basin DownWinders Consortium, it's entitled, this came 2 out in February of 2017, and the title is Unknowing, Unwilling, and Uncompensated: the Effects of 3 4 Trinity Test on New Mexicans and the Potential 5 Benefits of Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (RECA) Amendments. 6 7 So, I urge you, when you're assessing your impacts, to include both of those in your research and 8 9 the record. So, that's the health studies. And then, there was a lot of correlation between the Trinity 10 Test and health issues that are experienced by people 11 12 living downwind and their descendants. Number two, employee concerns. 13 14 doing a little bit of research on Holtec International 15 and I was surprised how quickly I found this, and the 16 source is, Working at Holtec International: Employee 17 Reviews. And you can find that at indeed.com. 18 that. Working Holtec International: repeat at 19 Employee Reviews. 20 I'm going to quote from three different And anyone can find this, you can research 21 reviews. 22 vourself. But to me, there's some safety 23 concerns with this company and their application. 24 Number one, quote, one employee said, "you

get in trouble for asking questions." This is from a

1 former Holtec employee. Number two, many injuries and 2 accidents and safety does not fix the safety issues. 3 I assume they mean the safety department. 4 And the third quote alarmed me from a 5 Holtec employee, they have a questioning attitude policy. Like they have a policy that's, it's 6 7 called questioning attitude. And that is part of 8 their culture, supposedly. It's supposedly encouraging workers 9 10 things that they feel are But if you practice this policy, you 11 inefficient. will soon be labeled as a troublemaker that 12 is unwilling to conform to the company's culture. 13 14 So, I invite you to go to that site, 15 Working at Holtec International: Employee Reviews. 16 was really astonished at the negative reviews by 17 former Holtec employees. And finally, about consent. 18 I noticed your motto, I never noticed it before, your motto is 19 protecting people and the environment. And one of 20 21 your slides had environmental justice listed. 22 And yet, I also hear, in the introduction, 23 that you don't need to obtain our consent. And I just 24 don't know how you can jive those two things. If you

do believe in environmental justice and that's one of

1	your factors, you have to seek our consent.
2	And I want to rebut the Holtec press
3	release that said there was overwhelming support in
4	Southeast New Mexico. I've got the numbers right
5	here, numbers are really important to our group. And
6	I forgot to identify myself, I'm with the Nuclear
7	Issues Study Group.
8	MR. CAMERON: Could you just
9	MS. SCHUUMAN: I'm summing up.
10	MR. CAMERON: sum up?
11	MS. SCHUUMAN: Yes, I'm summing up.
12	MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you.
13	MS. SCHUUMAN: I'm also the Outreach
14	Coordinator for the Albuquerque Center for Peace and
15	Justice.
16	At the Maryland National Call, it was 23
17	against, zero for. At the Roswell NRC meeting, it was
18	45 against, seven for. At the Hobbs NRC meeting, it
19	was 33 against, 14 for. At the Carlsbad NRC meeting,
20	it was 32 against, 28 for.
21	At the Gallup NRC meeting, it was 36
22	against, one for. Tonight, so far, we're at, 59
23	against and six for. So, anyway, I think it's pretty
24	obvious, we do not consent. Thank you very much.
25	MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

1	(Applause.)
2	MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Cody? This is
3	Cody, Cody Sloma.
4	MR. SLOMA: All right. Hello, everyone.
5	Thanks for hanging in there, it's been a long night.
6	How many people are left? Can we get a number?
7	MR. CAMERON: We've got two more.
8	MR. SLOMA: Cool. Good to know. All
9	right.
10	MR. CAMERON: Carlsbad and
11	MR. SLOMA: All right. So, we've got
12	Carlsbad.
13	MR. CAMERON: And California.
14	MR. SLOMA: Cool, there's California, okay.
15	Carlsbad, California, cool. Okay. So, anyway, thank
16	you all. Thank you NRC for coming out here and coming
17	to Albuquerque, I know that was a request of mine and
18	many others, too. So, thank you for doing that.
19	One thing I want to request is that you
20	all go into other communities along the transport
21	routes, other communities in New Mexico. There is a
22	lot of places you could go here, perhaps Santa Fe
23	would be a good place. Yes, so, think about that.
24	I want the staff to be considerate to go
25	into the Environmental Impact Statement, and that is

1 that we don't want this waste. So, yes, consider 2 including that in there. 3 There's a few other things I would like 4 you to include in your Environmental Impact Statement, 5 but I'll get to those in a second. One thing I'm requesting is that you add additional days to the 6 7 scoping comment period. 8 One of these reasons is that 9 regulations.gov hasn't worked in the last four days. 10 I'm not sure if you all are aware of this, but, yes, your website hasn't worked in the last four days. So, 11 at least an additional four days, or however long it 12 hasn't worked, needs to definitely be added. 13 14 And then, one thing I want to bring up is 15 that, Albuquerque, here in have rich we environmental justice community. And that means that 16 17 there's a lot of organizations here working environmental justice, as well as throughout 18 19 Mexico, because we deal with a lot of environmental 20 injustice. 21 So, we're not -- in your Environmental 22 Impact Statement, of course, you all have to include 23 a section on comments, make sure to include a lot of 24 that, because environmental problems go deep.

With that, there's a lot of organizations

1 here, if you care to reach out to. They help find or 2 found the key principles, so that's something to 3 definitely look at. 4 I'm not sure how, like, familiar you all 5 are with environmental justice. There's the Southwest Organizing Project, the Albuquerque Center for Peace 6 7 and Justice, Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive 8 Dumping, Red Water Pond Road Community Association, 9 the Alliance for Environmental Strategies, and of course, the Nuclear Issue Study Group. 10 And I'm sure any of these groups would be 11 glad to talk with you all, but maybe try reaching out 12 to us, because you all haven't reached out to us at 13 14 all. 15 So, yes, I'll actually provide quick contact info and we'd be glad to hear from you all and 16 17 help you out with getting the Environmental Impact Statement. 18 19 Another thing that you should include in 20 your Environmental Impact Statement, and I'm asking 21 you to take this very, very serious, that being, 22 consent. 23 You started this meeting saying 24 Regulatory Commission doesn't deal with 25 consent. There's a big problem with that, you should

1 really look that over and try to figure out how you 2 can include consent. Without consent, you've got 3 nothing. 4 MR. CAMERON: Cody, could you wrap up for 5 us, please? MR. SLOMA: Yes. And this would help, this 6 7 would definitely help, because it would give a more 8 ethical approach to this. A lot of what you all are 9 doing is based on science, which is fine, we need to 10 be sure that whatever you all are regulating is based off good physics, but you also need to include ethics, 11 12 right? You need to have the moral stance figured 13 14 out of what you all are doing. I would strongly 15 recommend including that in your Environmental Impact Statement and really considering whether this is good 16 17 or bad. And then, my last thing I would like to 18 19 say is, there needs to be more time for this. As many 20 people have said, this issue has been going on for a 21 long time, this waste stays dangerous for a very, very 22 long time. 23 So, don't rush the process, take it slow, 24 extend the comment period. There's no reason why you

all can't extend the comment period, why not, right?

1	We'll
2	MR. CAMERON: And Cody, I'm going to have
3	to ask you to wrap up.
4	MR. SLOMA: Yes, so, we'll continue helping

MR. SLOMA: Yes, so, we'll continue helping you all get comments, because, yes, I know you all don't do too much outreach.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMERON: We'll go to Judy Smith. And then, we'll go on to Ace Hoffman and Sharon Hoffman.

MS. SMITH: Can you hear me? Okay. My name is Judy Smith and I've lived in New Mexico since 1979. I love this state. I'm a retired teacher, after 29.75 years. And that gives me some sense of the passage of time. I'm also a mother and grandmother of a darling three and a half year old grandson.

I would like to make three comments. The most disturbing to me is one that came to light when I read the Holtec review of Roswell, because I was there, you may remember me. And it wasn't what they said.

I don't want to name-call, but to have a company -- I really approach this project, trying to have an open mind. I studied about nuclear energy and I know the dangers, but I know we have a problem in

1 this country, we need to find something to do with 2 this waste that we've created. 3 So, I came with an open mind. But to have 4 the company try to explain to me how safe and how 5 reasonable and how wonderful their engineering and their project is, to deceive the state through their 6 7 report, does not encourage me to feel comfortable in 8 trusting --9 (Applause.) 10 MS. SMITH: The reason that I'm here tonight again is because of that particular incident. 11 12 I wanted to be sure to address that, because I consider misrepresentation at this stage to be a big 13 14 red flag. 15 But in addition to that, I'm coming back again because of my Jewish faith. I was taught as a 16 17 child and lived my life looking toward the future 18 generations. 19 Our faith has been living our traditions 20 for 5,775 years. So, that puts things in a long-term perspective. So, it encouraged me to take a look at 21 22 this issue through the long view. 23 And when I think about a waste facility 24 that's supposed to be interim, but interim could be 25 years, I wonder, in 120 years, who will

1 responsible for that site? Who will be responsible to 2 take care of it? I also wonder how an interim site might 3 4 become permanent, which other people have addressed, 5 and we're ending up with a permanent site that was only meant to be interim. 6 7 Why not identify a permanent site, a 8 permanent plan based on the science and based on input 9 from the entire country that's affected, and then, 10 maybe build an interim site while you're creating the permanent site? And I also wanted to --11 12 (Applause.) MS. SMITH: One other issue that I hope 13 14 you'll address, because we've heard misinformation at 15 these hearings that I've been to, is the geology 16 underneath the site. There was a geologist in Roswell who said 17 that there was sandstone and limestone, I believe he 18 19 said, that the earth under there is moving. 20 course, we know geology, the earth moves and changes. 21 And that there's an aquifer running through there. 22 Others have said it's the perfect, ideal 23 geology. And I'd really like to know more about that, 24 what makes it so perfect, and is it perfect, and how

long will it be perfect?

1 MR. CAMERON: Judy, could you wrap up for 2 us? MS. SMITH: Yes. 3 4 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. 5 MS. SMITH: Thank you very much. 6 (Applause.) 7 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. Hoffman? 8 9 MR. HOFFMAN: I never thought I'd be saying 10 this, but Holtec was very honest today, they said they didn't have any safety issues. Let me explain why 11 they didn't have safety issues. 12 To give you an example, when San Onofre 13 14 was shut down in 2011, it was because tubes about the 15 size my pinky finger vibrated badly and one of them 16 got a little crack in it and started spewing coolant 17 into the secondary system. And then, they noticed the radiation and they shut it down, and they never 18 19 restarted it, because those tubes were vibrating so 20 much. As a lot have said, two of those tubes, 21 22 not just one, maybe even one, but certainly if two of 23 those tubes had broken out completely, there would be 24 four jets of water coming out. And that could have

been a meltdown, could easily have been a meltdown.

1 The NRC referred to that as a non-safety 2 issue, that lack of a -- that vibrating problem they 3 had was not a safety issue. That is how come Holtec 4 hasn't had any safety issues. 5 Four of those casks that broke in shins are in use and they're going to get shipped here 6 7 eventually, if you let them. That's not a safety 8 issue either, I quarantee it. So, when Holtec says 9 they don't have any safety issues, you can thank the NRC for that. That's how that works. 10 A nuclear reactor, when it's operating, is 11 12 allowed to release about a thirtieth of a teaspoon of And you guys don't have to worry too much 13 14 about tritium, because it's created in the reactor, as 15 far as I know, there's not really any of it in the 16 spent fuel. 17 But a thirtieth of a teaspoon is all they're allowed to release in an entire year, with 18 19 probably -- so-called low-level radiation, it's the same deadly stuff that is going to get shipped here. 20 I would bet that it's entire load is less 21 22 than maybe one cask of what is in a dry cask. how much lower low-level radiation is. What they want 23 24 to ship here is extremely deadly.

And something like 30 percent of the casks

1 are going to have damaged cladding. One of the people got up and -- one of the six, got up and said that 2 3 there's three elements of protection. 4 There's the cladding, there's the casing 5 of the canister, and then, there's the cement. the cement is nothing, because there's four vents and 6 7 they're each about a square-foot. 8 Ι talking to the Holtec people 9 yesterday, and I have a lot of problems with what they 10 They said if a jet were to crash into the thing and fuel spilled down the sides, it would go 11 out, because there was no way for the air to get in. 12 Well, that's how the thing cools, 13 14 there's convection, the air comes in, the hot air goes 15 out. You start a fire there and the hot air can't go 16 out any faster and the cool air's going to come in. And the National Academy designs this study and said 17 that they could last about 20 minutes. 18 19 One last thing, I see my time is up. went to the Los Alamos today, my wife and I. And they 20 21 had a pill-shaped container about this big, which was 22 used for testing some sort of explosive. So, they put 23 explosives in there and it just tore the half-inch 24 thick steel completely apart.

You can expect, if there was a terrorism

1	attack, they're going to have no problem tearing that
2	half-inch steel completely apart. There's plenty of
3	explosives that can do that and planes can do that
4	too.
5	MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Ace.
6	(Applause.)
7	MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. And
8	Sharon Hoffman?
9	MS. HOFFMAN: You guys are a tough act to
LO	follow. You are so awesome. New Mexico is awesome.
L1	I had never been to New Mexico until we came for the
12	Carlsbad hearing. I've had a wonderful time, I've met
L3	wonderful people.
L 4	And I hope the NRC is listening, because
15	I heard a lot of environmental impact issues tonight.
L 6	Everything from geology to environmental justice, and
L7	lots of things in-between.
L 8	So, if you think that you can look at this
L 9	project and say, there are no environmental impacts,
20	then you haven't been listening. And that's a real
21	shame. You've spent a lot of time, you've spent a lot
22	of money, you're supposed to be listening. I hope you
23	really were listening.
24	And the thing that I want to say to all of
2.5	us is, the NRC has control. They're the group that

can say whether or not this can happen. They control whether we can continue to make nuclear waste. And that, as several people have mentioned, is the biggest problem here.

As long as we're making it, then we cannot solve the problem. And I'm from California and I agree with you completely, this should not be, the places where it's coming from shipping it away and then allowing more to get created.

But as long as it's being created, people are going to try to do that. And it's not really the people that live there. It's the nuclear power companies, it's the NRC, it's Holtec, it's everybody who profits from this. So, we need to work together, we need to stop making more nuclear waste. It's the most important thing we can do.

And the final thing that I want to say is, and I have this t-shirt that says, danger, radioactive material, we all know that, everybody in this room knows, like everybody in New Mexico knows that.

Everybody all over the country needs to know that and needs to pay attention to this problem. This is all of our problem. The radiation is not going to stop at state lines, it's not going to stop being a problem unless we stop creating it.

	165
1	And then, we still have a really big
2	problem. If they had thought of this 72 years ago, we
3	would not be in the problem we are now. Thank you
4	very much.
5	(Applause.)
6	MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Sharon. And thank
7	all of you for your patience tonight and comments.
8	And before I turn it over to Brian Smith to close the
9	meeting out for us, I just want to thank our
10	stenographer, Bruce Carlton.
11	(Applause.)
12	MR. CAMERON: And also, I want to thank the
13	gentleman in the back of the room, who helped out with
14	the microphones. So, thank you back there.
15	(Applause.)
16	MR. CAMERON: Brian?
17	MR. SMITH: Well, thank you once again for
18	coming out tonight and for sticking with us to the
19	end, for all of you that stayed with us. And to some
20	of you that came to all of our meetings, we appreciate
21	that.
22	Just like the first five meetings, we did
23	receive a lot of good comments tonight. We will take
24	those into consideration as we prepare our draft
25	Environmental Impact Statement.

Environmental Impact Statement.

1	We have plans to issue that next summer,
2	in that general time frame. And it will be out for
3	public comment, we will do additional meetings around
4	that same time to get public comment on that draft
5	document, and we will then consider any comments for
6	the final draft.
7	So, earlier tonight, there were a couple
8	of commenters who suggested consultation with the
9	tribes. I just want to let you know that we have
10	initiated that process, we're in the early stages of
11	that. There will be a lot more of that to come in the
12	near future.
13	So, once again, thank you very much, we
14	appreciate your comments. Have a good evening.
15	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
16	off the record at 10:15 p.m.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	