

October 28, 2015

MEMORANDUM TO: James Rubenstone, Acting Director
Yucca Mountain Directorate
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

FROM: Christine Pineda, Project Manager /RA/
Yucca Mountain Directorate
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 15 PUBLIC MEETING ON THE NRC
STAFF'S DRAFT SUPPLEMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
ENERGY'S EIS FOR THE PROPOSED REPOSITORY AT YUCCA
MOUNTAIN, NEVADA

On Thursday, October 15, 2015, members of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff held a Category 3 public meeting via teleconference. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an overview of the NRC staff's draft supplement to the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) environmental impact statements for the proposed high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, and to accept public comments on the document. Participants had an opportunity to ask clarifying questions about the NRC's environmental review process.

The public meeting began at 2:00 p.m. Eastern Time and concluded at approximately 4:00 p.m. The meeting began with an introduction of NRC staff and a review of meeting ground rules, followed by a presentation on the draft supplement. Meeting attendees were then given the opportunity to ask clarifying questions and present their comments. The transcript for the meeting is available in ADAMS at Accession No. ML15294A368.

Approximately 37 people attended the meeting, and approximately 16 people gave comments one or more times during the meeting. Meeting attendees included members of the public, members of federal, state and local government organizations, and members of media organizations and public advocacy groups. A list of meeting attendees is attached to this summary.

Questions that were asked included whether the NRC's process allowed for stakeholders to challenge the NRC's decision to supplement the DOE EISs without any updates having been made to the EISs themselves; whether the staff plans to take any steps to further address impacts on cultural and historic resources; whether the NRC staff expects to adjust the schedule or resource estimate for completing the supplement; and how interested stakeholders would be notified if the Yucca Mountain licensing process were to resume.

Topics and concerns that were raised during the comment period included: the scope of the supplement; the accuracy of the supplement given events that have occurred or decisions that have been made since the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) submitted its license application in 2008; the potential for groundwater contamination from the repository; the potential for disproportionate impacts on minority and low-income populations; the length of time

encompassed by the supplement; assumptions in the supplement concerning high-burnup spent fuel; and the potential for failure of spent nuclear fuel storage containers. Commenters also requested more time to review the draft supplement beyond the 31 days' extension to November 20, 2015, already granted.

Some comments expressed general opposition to nuclear power and calls to shut down power plants. Other comments concerned the potential for groundwater in Yucca Mountain to corrode waste packages; the suitability of Yucca Mountain as a site for high-level radioactive waste disposal; alternatives to deep geologic disposal; risks associated with moving spent fuel from pools to dry storage systems; costs associated with storing, transporting and disposing of spent fuel; support for hardened onsite storage; calls to move forward in developing the Yucca Mountain repository; and the potential for the U.S. to become the recipient for disposal of radioactive waste generated around the world.

Comments expressed concern about the risks associated with the continued storage of spent nuclear fuel at sites around the country and support for moving the waste to a repository that is not situated on pristine lands. Other comments related to the potential for accidents and other risks associated with transporting high-burnup and other spent fuel; supported rail transport over truck transport; and criticized the physical conditions of rail lines and how the rail industry is regulated. Another comment called for interested stakeholders to provide information about Yucca Mountain, DOE, or the NRC for an "engineering tribute" to be held after the next presidential inauguration. A commenter expressed concern that the NRC has cancelled a study to determine the long-term cancer risk to people living near nuclear power plants and the implication for potential NRC regulation of a high-level waste repository.

To subscribe to our e-mail updates, send an e-mail with the word "Subscribe" in the subject line to YMEIS_supplement@nrc.gov.

Enclosure: Meeting Attendees List

CONTACT: Christine Pineda, NMSS/YMD
(301) 415-6789

encompassed by the supplement; assumptions in the supplement concerning high-burnup spent fuel; and the potential for failure of spent nuclear fuel storage containers. Commenters also requested more time to review the draft supplement beyond the 31 days' extension to November 20, 2015, already granted.

Some comments expressed general opposition to nuclear power and calls to shut down power plants. Other comments concerned the potential for groundwater in Yucca Mountain to corrode waste packages; the suitability of Yucca Mountain as a site for high-level radioactive waste disposal; alternatives to deep geologic disposal; risks associated with moving spent fuel from pools to dry storage systems; costs associated with storing, transporting and disposing of spent fuel; support for hardened onsite storage; calls to move forward in developing the Yucca Mountain repository; and the potential for the U.S. to become the recipient for disposal of radioactive waste generated around the world.

Comments expressed concern about the risks associated with the continued storage of spent nuclear fuel at sites around the country and support for moving the waste to a repository that is not situated on pristine lands. Other comments related to the potential for accidents and other risks associated with transporting high-burnup and other spent fuel; supported rail transport over truck transport; and criticized the physical conditions of rail lines and how the rail industry is regulated. Another comment called for interested stakeholders to provide information about Yucca Mountain, DOE, or the NRC for an "engineering tribute" to be held after the next presidential inauguration. A commenter expressed concern that the NRC has cancelled a study to determine the long-term cancer risk to people living near nuclear power plants and the implication for potential NRC regulation of a high-level waste repository.

To subscribe to our e-mail updates, send an e-mail with the word "Subscribe" in the subject line to YMEIS_supplement@nrc.gov.

Enclosure: Meeting Attendees List

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC

NMSS/YMD Distribution

CSafford (OGC)

AGendelman (OGC)

Miriam Juckett (mjuckett@swri.org)

ADAMS Accession No.: ML15302A184

OFFICE	NMSS/YMD	OGC	NMSS/YMD
NAME	CPineda	AGendelman via email	JRubenstone via email
DATE	10/21/2015	10/28/2015	10/21/2015

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

List of Attendees
Public Meeting on the NRC Staff's Draft Supplement to the
Department of Energy Environmental Impact Statements for the
Proposed Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada
October 15, 2015; 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

	First Name	Last Name	Organization or Affiliation (if known)
1	RD	Andrews	Citizen
2	Jonathan	Brotzman	National Park Service
3	Susan	Carpenter	Cape Downwinders
4	Patrick	Dostie	State of Maine
5	Sarah	Fields	Uranium Watch
6	Kenneth	Freelain	International Definition
7	Steve	Frishman	State of Nevada
8	Rose	Gardner	Citizen
9	Milton	Gorden	S. Cohen and Associates
10	Paula	Gotsch	Grandmothers, Mothers and More For Energy Safety
11	Ace	Hoffman	Citizen
12	Susu	Jeffrey	Friends of Coldwater
13	Elaine	Kabala	Inyo County, California
14	Kevin	Kamps	Beyond Nuclear
15	Michael	Keegan	Don't Waste Michigan
16	Leonard	Kellum	Citizen
17	Connie	Kline	Citizen
18	Amber	Ladeira	Citizen
19	Marvin	Lewis	Citizen
20	Martin	Malsch	State of Nevada
21	Katrina	McMurrian	Nuclear Waste Strategy Coalition
22	Prasad	Nair	U.S. Department of Energy
23	Mary	Olson	Nuclear Information and Resource Service
24	Jim	Ostroff	Platts
25	Bette	Pierman	Michigan Safe Energy Future
26	Cecile	Pineda	No Nuke Committee San Francisco
27	David	Schonberger	Citizen
28	Dennis	Sewell	Georgia Public Service Commission
29	Bill	Stremmel	Citizen
30	Ruth	Thomas	Environmentalists, Inc.
31	Chip	Cameron	Zero Gravity Group (facilitator)
32	Miriam	Juckett	Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses
33	David	Decker	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
34	Adam	Gendelman	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
35	Dave	McIntyre	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
36	Christine	Pineda	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
37	James	Rubenstein	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission