Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Online Webinar for the Draft

Environmental Impact Statement for

the Proposed Holtec Hi-store

Consolidated Interim Storage Facility

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: teleconference

Date: Tuesday, June 23, 2020

Work Order No.: NRC-0932 Pages 1-202

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC ONLINE WEBINAR FOR THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE PROPOSED HOLTEC HI-STORE

CONSOLIDATED INTERIM STORAGE FACILITY

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,

JUNE 23, 2020

+ + + + +

The Meeting convened via Webinar, at 5:00

p.m. EDT, Chip Cameron, Facilitator, presiding.

PRESENT:

CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator

JOSE R. CUADRADO-CARABALLO, NMSS/DFM/STLB

JILL S. CAVERLY, MMSS/REFS/ERMB

DIANA B. DIAZ-TORO, NMSS/REFS/ERMB

STACEY F. IMBODEN, NMSS/REFS/ERMB

KELLEE L. JAMERSON, NMSS/MSST/MSEB

DAVID T. MCINTYRE, OPA

JOHN B. MCKIRGAN, NMSS/DFM/STLB

JOHN R. TAPPERT, MMSS/REFS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction and Directio	ns3
Opening Remarks	11
Draft Environment	al Impact Overview Presentation13
Procedural Questi	ons30
Government Commen	ters32
Registered Commen	ters68
Adiourn	202

P|ROCEEDINGS

5:04 p.m.

OPERATOR: Welcome and thank you for standing by. At this time all participants are in a listen only mode until the question and answer session of today's conference.

At that time, you may press *0 on your phone to ask a question. I would now like to turn the conference over to Chip Cameron. Thank you, you may begin.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Lorraine. Hello, everyone, out there. Welcome to the NRC public comment meeting. And my name is Chip Cameron, and I'm going to serve as your facilitator for today's meeting. And I want to quickly go over some basics about today's meeting so that you know what to expect today.

First of all, we're going to try to avoid the use of acronyms, but there are a few that you are going to hear. One is NRC; I just used that and that's for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, who is holding this meeting. You might also hear EIS; that stands for Environmental Impact Statement. And you might also hear NEPA, N-E-P-A; that stands for National Environmental Policy Act.

And the subject of today's meeting is the Draft EIS that the NRC has prepared. It's one part of its evaluation of a license application to build and operate an interim storage facility for spent nuclear fuel in Southeastern New Mexico. And this application to build and operate the facility was submitted by the Holtec Corporation.

The NRC staff is here today to listen to your concerns and recommendations. We will be taking a transcript of all of the comments today. And that transcript will be available to you before the next virtual meeting that we're going to do on this Draft EIS, and that will be on July 9th. And Jill Caverly, the senior project manager on this Draft EIS, will explain all of that to you when she gives her presentation.

Our court reporter today is Toby Walter.

And he will be taking of your comments down and that transcript will be available to you.

Now we're in a virtual setting, as almost everything is these days because of the pandemic. So we are taking your comments over the phone, but we also have a Webex connection. I think most people are on that WebEx connection so that you can see Jill Caverly's slide presentation.

There is something called a chat box.

You will see it on the right of the WebEx screen. If

you're having any difficulties, technical

difficulties with sound or whatever, you can post

something on that chat line, and we'll try to fix it

for you.

We're also going to take questions about the EIS process on the chat line. If you have a question, for example: well, when is the final EIS going to be ready?

Post those on the chat line. We are going to take a break at 7:30 tonight, 7:30 Eastern Time, and we'll take a look at the questions there. And we'll see which ones we can answer before we go on. So use the chat line for that.

And I want to emphasize the word draft in Draft EIS. This EIS won't be finalized and used in the NRC decision-making process until after the NRC has considered your comments and the comments from other public meetings, comments submitted in writing and, again, Jill is going to tell you all about how you submit those comments.

The NRC won't be responding to your comments tonight, or any questions that people sometimes ask in their comments, but the NRC staff

will carefully consider those and will address those comments when they prepare the final EIS.

We have over 80 people on the phone who wish to speak tonight. And so the time limit for each speaker is going to be three minutes. At three minutes, I'm going to ask you to sum up. And you can sum up and use some of that time, between three and four minutes, for that summary.

But when we get to four minutes, because we want to hear everybody, I'm going to ask Lorraine to mute your line and then we're going to go on to the next person.

We know the meeting was scheduled from 5:00 until 9:00 today, but we're going to try to stay until 11:00. We know we can stay until 10:00, but we don't know whether security will allow us to be in this WebEx conference room here at NRC headquarters in Rockville.

If we don't get to everybody who is signed up to speak tonight, those people will get first preference when we go to the meeting on July 9th.

And you can always, as usual, you can expand comments, if during your -- expand those to written comments to the NRC. And I'm sorry that we can't give more time, but I want to try and get

everybody on.

And even the short amount of time, I found in three minutes you can express your basic ideas. And that accomplishes three things. First of all, it gives you an opportunity to directly address the NRC staff, even though you can't see them here in the room.

Secondly, it gives the NRC staff advance notice about a concern that you might have so they can start looking at that.

And the third thing it does, it gives the wider community, all of the people that are on the phone, it gives them notice of concerns that might be out there.

So our phone operator is Lorraine. And when we get to -- after Jill Caverly's presentation, when we get to the speaking time, I'm going to call the names of the speakers.

We're going to start out with the elected officials in New Mexico and governmental officials from the Governor's cabinet. We're going to let them go first so that you know how your elected officials feel about this Draft EIS. So, we're going to go to them first. And I'll call five names in a row so that you know when you're coming up next. Again,

7:30 break, and then we'll reconvene.

And I would just thank all of you for taking the time to attend the meeting tonight. And you can see there's a lot of interest, with 80 people on the phone.

And let me introduce all of the NRC staff that are either here in the room with me, or on the phone. And John Tappert is the Director, Rulemaking, Environmental, and Financial Support Division here at the NRC. He's going to give you a welcome.

We have Diana Diaz-Toro. She's the Acting Branch Chief of the Environmental Review Materials Branch in John's Division.

We have Jill Caverly, the Senior Project
Manager for this Holtec Draft EIS. And also we have
Stacey Imboden. She's the Co-Environmental Project
Manager.

Even though this is on the environmental review, that's one important of the NRC evaluation, we do have two staff here from the technical review -- the public health and safety review as we call it. That's the second important part of the evaluation of the Holtec license application.

So we have John McKirgan, who is the Chief of the Strategic Storage and Transportation Branch.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And we have Jose Cuadrado, who is the Technical Project Manager. He works for John.

And we also have Dave McIntyre, who is our Public Affairs Officer here at NRC headquarters. And we do have a slide with his email on it, so that any of you who are in the media, you can contact him directly if you have questions.

And the staffer who is helping us with WebEx and all the technology is Kellee Jamerson.

And with that, John, are you ready to do your welcome?

MS. CAVERLY: We just have one slide, the troubleshooting slide.

MR. CAMERON: Are we going to do -- oh, the troubleshooting slide?

MS. CAVERLY: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MS. CAVERLY: Kellee, if you would advance the slide to the next one, please? Okay. Thank you, Kellee.

So I just wanted to point out, if you are having any trouble with WebEx and if you're just listening in on the telephone line, feel free to navigate to the NRC's meeting Web page.

If you go to https://www.nrc.gov/pmns/mtg

or you can get just go to the NRC's website and click on public meetings. If you scroll down to the meetings that are listed for tonight, the 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. meeting, and you click on the more, you will find the slides there, in a PDF form, in both English and Spanish.

So that's one way if you don't want to follow along with WebEx and you would like to just stay on the line, the telephone line, you can follow along separately with the slides that are available on the web.

So I think that's all I wanted to share.

And then next slide, Kellee. Okay. And so here
we're -- I'm going to pass it back to Chip. And so,
Chip, here is Dave's information.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And as I mentioned,
Dave McIntyre is our Public Affairs Officer for this
project. And I know there is some media people on
the phone.

(Telephonic interference.)

MS. CAVERLY: I'm sorry. Could you mute your lines, please? Go ahead. Sorry about that. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Media please contact NRC's Public Affairs Officer David McIntyre, and you can

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

see his address there. I'll spell it out just in case some people can't see it.

But it's david.mcintyre@nrc.gov, David McIntyre.

Are we ready for John Tappert?

MS. CAVERLY: Kellee, next slide, please.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MS. CAVERLY: Hello? You're on the line. Would you please mute your phone? Please mute your phone.

Lorraine, could you check and see whose line is open and mute that line for us? Okay. I think we're good to go.

MR. CUADRADO-CARABALLO: All right. Thank you very much. Welcome. My name is, as Chip said, Jose Cuadrado, and before we get started I wanted to read a brief statement in Spanish in case we have any members of the public that would like to hear this and understand the subject of this meeting so.

(Foreign language spoken.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

MS. CAVERLY: Kellee, next slide, please.

MR. TAPPERT: Okay. Good afternoon. My

name is John Tappert. I'm the Director for the

Division of Rulemaking, Environmental, and Financial Support, which is the group responsible for the development of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS, that is the subject of today's meeting.

I just wanted to welcome and thank you for attending this webinar. The Draft EIS is the result of the NRC's staff's evaluation of the environmental impact associated with Holtec International's proposal to construct and operate the Consolidated Interim Storage Facility. Tonight we are asking for your comments on that report.

The initial public comment period for the Draft EIS was scheduled to end on May 22nd. It was subsequently extended to July 22nd, in response to the COVID-19 situation.

Due to the current conditions of the public health emergency, and in an effort to hold local in-person meetings, the NRC has decided to further extend the comment period to September 22nd. An announcement of the comment period extension will be published within the coming days.

As Chip mentioned, my staff is planning for a second webinar to be held in a few weeks on Thursday, July 9th. We are also continuing to

monitor the COVID-19 public health emergency conditions and will evaluate whether in-person public meetings can be held safely.

If the conditions allow for safe inperson meetings in the State of New Mexico, the staff
will announce those meetings in August. If not,
additional webinars will be scheduled.

It is important to note that any comments received in this webinar forum are handled in the same manner as those comments received at in-person meetings.

The domments presented here tonight are recorded and transcribed. The staff will review and analyze them, and will update the Final EIS report as appropriate.

Comments received during this webinar will be made available in a transcript of tonight's meeting that will be posted to the NRC Holtec review website shortly after this meeting.

Again, thank you for your time this evening. And I'll turn it over to Jill to present the NRC staff Draft EIS results.

MS. CAVERLY: Okay. Thanks, John. Kellee, next slide please. For everyone, we should be on slide 6 if you're following along with the PDF

file on the website; it's the meeting overview.

So, well, thank you all for signing up, and thank you all again for joining us.

Today we're here to receive your comments on the NRC's Draft Environmental Impact Statement. So the majority of the evening is going to be dedicated to that activity. And as Chip mentioned, I have a short presentation, and I will try and go quickly to allow for more time for comments.

But I m going to begin with an overview of the application process, including the differences between the environmental review and the safety review.

Next I'm going to move on to an overview of the application submitted to NRC, and then I'm going to summarize results of the NRC staff analysis.

I'll then cover the public comments, procedure, and scoping process, and the NRC's environmental evaluation and results.

And finally I will end with information on how you can access the report and make comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

As we go through the presentation, I will use the term facility and proposed project interchangeably. And the abbreviation, CISF stands

NEAL R. GROSS

for Consolidated Interim Storage Facility.

I may also interchange the word Applicant with Holtec. And Holtec is short for Holtec International, the company that has applied for a license.

The Environmental Impact Statement will be abbreviated to EIS. And when I refer to staff or NRC staff, that's referring to the staff that works for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

All right. Next slide, please, page 7. The purpose of the meeting tonight is to receive your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS, for a Consolidated Interim Storage Facility.

The NRC is requesting that you review the Draft EIS document and provide comments that are pertinent to the current licensing action and the Draft EIS report.

You have access to that report on the NRC's website, and it can be downloaded and read. There are three ways to comment: either by email, website, or regular mail. Information and methods on how to comment will be summarized at the end of my presentation.

Any comments you make in this forum as well, as through the three other methods identified,

will be recorded and entered into the public domain.

Next slide, please. So I'm going to start with the process for an application review.

And I'm going to move on to slide 9, please.

Okay. So I'd like to clarify, before we get into the details of the application, the NRC's role in this process. The NRC is an independent regulator. The NRC determines whether it is safe to build and operate a storage facility at the proposed site in Lea County, New Mexico.

The NRC evaluates an application for a facility and determines if a license can be issued. The NRC does not promote or build nuclear facilities. Also the NRC doesn't own or operate nuclear facilities. Again, our mission and our regulations are designed to protect the public workers and the environment.

Holter International, or the Applicant, has proposed the location for the Interim Storage Facility. Staff will perform both a safety evaluation and an environmental review on the application. And I'm going to talk about those two activities a little bit more.

Next slide. So we should be on slide 10.

If you were in attendance at our scoping meetings in

2018, this slide will look very familiar to you. It's a schematic of NRC's licensing decision process.

It's here to show you that the NRC has concurrent reviews occurring during its evaluation process. And you can see from the slides, that the process of licensing is based on three foundational activities: an environmental review, a safety review and the adjudicatory process.

If you look at the safety review on the left there, the safety review results in a safety evaluation report and is based on the Atomic Energy Act and regulations that are codified in the Code of Federal Regulations. These regulations must be met in order for the license to be granted.

On the other side, the environmental review, that results in an Environmental Impact Statement. The action is taken because issuing a license is considered a federal action under NEPA. And NEPA stands for the National Environmental Policy Act.

NEPA requires federal agencies to evaluate and disclose environmental impacts of federal actions. And in the middle you will see that you have the adjudication process and that can be used for disputes.

Okay. I'll move on the to the next slide, please, Kellee. So we should be on slide 11.

And so we'll just delve into the safety review a little bit more.

This slide shows you many of the areas of the safety review, which are required by NRC to assure that the design can be constructed and operated, while protecting human health.

The safety review will evaluate the design of the CISF and the characteristics of the construction site to ensure that it is built and operated safely, that it will be protected from manmade and natural hazards, and that it will protect public health and safety.

The NRC staff evaluates physical security practices to assure that a facility is protected from intrusion, theft, and sabotage.

The design and structure of the facility is also evaluated to verify its integrity and ability to withstand accidents.

Other areas, such as financial qualifications, are reviewed to ensure it meets NRC standards before a facility can be licensed. So in addition, the staff will evaluate that the facility is capable of withstanding external hazards, which

include temperature extremes, floods, tornados, and earthquakes.

Safety evaluations determine whether the facility can be constructed and operated to protect human health. You could say that the safety review, in part, evaluates how the environment will impact the design and whether the design is capable of providing the protections for safely storing spent fuel.

All right. We'll move on to the next slide, please, Kellee.

On the other hand, we have the environmental review. And the parallel environmental review evaluates what the project will do to the environment. So the environmental review starts with the current environmental conditions at its phase 1.

In the EIS, we call this the affected environment and that's chapter 3. Each of the resources you see listed here on this slide will be evaluated for the impact to the baseline. Using the baseline data, the staff will evaluate the changes for impact to each of the listed resource areas should the facility be constructed and operated.

That delta, or that change to the resource, is evaluated and that change is what we

call the impact to the resource. And that's the information that is specifically disclosed in the Environmental Impact Statement.

All right, next slide, please, Kellee, 13. So here we have listed the impact significance levels, the definitions. And in order to quantify the impact, the NRC uses these definitions, small, moderate, and large.

And you will see from these definitions that the scale rises based on the destabilizing influence to the resource. You can find these definitions in NRC's standard review plan for environmental reviews.

Next slide, please. Okay. So now we're going to move into a summary Holtec's application, at least from the environmental perspective. So we will move on to slide 15, okay, Kellee?

Okay. So the proposed project is located halfway between the towns of Carlsbad and Hobbs, New Mexico. Holtec's proposed project will include the storage facility, related buildings, and a rail line. So on the right side of this slide, you'll see a diagram. And that little sort of curly section is part of the rail line.

The rail line as it is sited here will

continue to move south off of this diagram and then move to the west, for approximately 5 miles, to tie into an existing rail line.

The area of the rail line, the five miles to the tie-in, will be on land managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

Holtec is seeking a permit from BLM, the Bureau of Land Management. So because they also have a federal action associated with this project, they're acting as a cooperating agency with the NRC on the development of the EIS.

Next slide, please. Go on to slide 16.

So on this slide, on the left there is an artist's rendering of the proposed action. And, again, we have the diagram of the project on the right.

The picture on the left and the little area circled in red on the right -- in the diagram on the right, represent where the current licensing action is, which is what built phase 1 of the spent fuel storage facility.

So if licensed, Holtec would be granted a license to build and store 500 canisters of spent fuel. The additional support buildings, transfer facilities, and rail line are included in the phase 1 impact analysis.

Holtec included its intention to apply for amendments to the license for up to 20 phases. This is represented by the rectangles in black on the diagram. So all of this black diagram represents a full build-out.

We call it full build-out, or we sometimes refer to it as all 20 phases. So that area would cover 330 acres. NRC would perform both a safety and environmental review on any additional limits.

Okay. Slide 17. As I mentioned, the proposed project would be an in-ground low profile design. So on the right is a similar design for you to get some perspective of what is proposed out of the Holtec study.

The proposed CISF would use the HI-STORM UMAX system for storage of spent fuel. So that's the canister that would go inside. The HI-STORM UMAX stands for Holtec International Storage Module Underground Maximum Capacity. Each of the modules holds one canister of spent fuel.

Slide 18, please. This slide is here to give you some perspective. We are looking, again, at the artist's rendering of phase 1, on the right, for the proposed licensing action.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This would include the 500 canisters of spent fuel stored in an underground system using the UMAX canisters.

So what's underneath that concrete basin that you see there? So you see that on the left you have sort of a cut out of what will be proposed to be the CISF facility.

So the UMAX canister is the canister proposed to be used in this facility. The UMAX canister is an engineered canister, and it's designed to passively cool and store spent fuel for long periods of time. It's constructed from stainless steel, and it's certified by the NRC to store the spent fuel at power reactor sites.

That means that the manufacturing and design of the canister is engineered to meet NRC requirements for safety. Those include structural integrity, material integrity, and longevity.

So inside this canister is spent fuel. There is no liquid inside the canister that could leak into the environment. The thickness and internal characteristics are designed to prevent radioactive material from escaping under normal and accident conditions.

That ||is achieved by using redundant

welded seals and robust structural design. The HI-STORM design, within the CISF, which is being proposed in the current license application, will store the UMAX canisters for a license term of 40 years.

That means the NRC is currently evaluating the design of the facility to ensure the facility meets these requirements.

Okay. Moving on. So we're on the slide that says, phases and stages. And that is the slide that helps clarify with the report a little bit.

So as I mentioned earlier the proposed action is for phase 1, or 500 canisters of spent fuel to be stored in a facility.

And as I stated earlier, the applicant has made known its intention to request up to 19 additional phases in licensing amendments. So those are referred to in the EIS as full build-out, or phases 2 through 20.

The staff, in its discretion, evaluated all 20 phases of the project in its Environmental Impact Statement. It is important to understand that the NRC has not licensed all 20 phases. The decision to evaluate all 20 phases was made by the NRC staff to provide additional perspective of the environmental impact.

Finally, the staff evaluated the project in phases. Phases are construction, operation and decommissioning. Because each of these phases has a unique environmental impact, so the staff evaluated the maximum impact for combined phases of different phases of a process. So that's kind of a lot to hear.

For an example, the staff may have evaluated the construction stage for phase 2 in conjunction with the operation stage of phase 1 because, that would represent a peak impact to the environmental resources.

Okay. The next slide is 20, please. And we're going to talk a little bit about some of the public scoping comments that we received.

Moving on to Slide 21, Kellee. So most of you are probably aware that we had a scoping period in 2018, and we held five in-person meetings and one webinar.

We received almost 6,665 pieces of correspondence and nearly 4,000 unique comments. In that report, all of that information is tabulated in a report that is listed at the website.

Next slide, please. So this certainly doesn't cover all of the comments, but I just wanted

to pull out some of the more popular ones for your information.

So obviously transportation, safety and accidents were a concern to the public, radiation doses to citizens near the rail, location and land use, sink holes. It was noted there were sink holes near the area. There was some confusion on the volume of materials. Is it going to be 500 casks or 10,000 casks?

Water resources, how is the contamination to the playa may be affected and down to groundwater aquifer. There were comments on the small number of jobs. And there were many comments on concerns about fire and flood.

As we leap over to the right side of this slide, you might understand that from my discussion of what the safety review is, why these were considered out of scope.

It wasn't that we weren't considering the comments on these issues. It's just that they're covered in the safety review. So that's partially why I wanted to go over the safety review details a little bit in this presentation.

And you can see the potential for flooding and external hazards is a safety issue.

Sink holes, compatibility with the UMAX system, integrity, financial insurance, accident conditions and failure of transport casks are all covered in the safety video.

Okay. Kellee, Slide Number 23, please.

Okay. So finally we're getting down to the meat here of the review, the environmental review. So the next few slides we're going to detail the staff's impact evaluations.

For all of the very deep down details, please read the Draft EIS. But I'm going to summarize some more general ones here.

Kellee, please, Slide 24. So the staff evaluated a 40 year licensing term. And the spent fuel will be removed before any decommissioning stage would begin. The staff impact evaluation characterized the groundwater of the facility and evaluated the stormwater overflow and runoff to the nearby playa or lake. The overflow was not contaminated.

Let's move to 25, please. So another comment that we thought a lot about was the transportation and accidents and land use. So for transportation and accidents, the staff evaluated traffic and road degradation.

NEAL R. GROSS

NRC staff also evaluated radiological impacts from transportation to both workers and the public. And it was based on prior NRC transportation risk estimates.

Those estimates were scaled using a representative transportation route that is longer than the distance from most of the reactor sites to the CISF.

The radiological impact to workers from incident-free transportation for spent nuclear fuel to and from the CISF for all phases, so Phases 1 through 20, were found to be below NRC standard dose limits.

So for impacts associated with accidents, the NRC's rules require that spent fuel transportation comtainers withstand severe accidents without release of radiological material, and this gets factored into the impact analysis.

The location of the facility was proposed by the applicant. But the NRC staff did evaluate the applicant's site selection process. Land use was evaluated for a six mile radius from the facility.

Okay. Next slide, please, Kellee, 26. Socioeconomic impacts were evaluated based on workers, tax revenues and resource availability for

the community.

Tax revenues and economic growth for the proposed project and from the additional workers in the area were evaluated for impact, including the use of public services, schools, housing demand, and this was all due to the increased population in the region.

The staff also evaluated the human health and environmental impacts on low income and minority populations using Census block groups, which is a method used by the U.S. Census to identify attributes of the residents.

There are 115 block groups that fall completely or partially within the 50 mile radius of the proposed CISF project. And that information was used to evaluate whether there were disproportional and adverse effects to minority and low income populations.

Okay. Next slide, please, 27. So here you have tabulated the results of the environmental review. It summarizes the proposed action you'll see, and it also has Phase 1 with the 500 canisters and Phases 2 through 20.

Next slide, please, Kellee. This is again the tabulation of the results of the draft impact and this is for your -- you can go back to

these slides if you would like to see the tabulated results. I added those there for that.

Kellee, we're going to move on to Slide 29. And this is information resources. So, you know, we're here so you get your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. On the slide is the address for that.

I'd also like to point you to a reader's guide that my colleague Stacey Imboden put together. It's a really nice 20 page summary of the project. It's also available in Spanish. So both of those web links are available there for you.

And if you would like more information on the application, you can go to the NRC's project website.

Coming down to the end here. I've got a slide here on how to comment. So as we have mentioned several times, we've got the rulemaking website, which is at regulations.gov. And please make sure you search for the Docket ID NRC-2018-0052.

You can also mail comments to the NRC, and we have the address there. You can email comments to the email address, holtec-cisfeis@nrc.gov. And, of course, today we are taking your oral comments, and we will add those to the docket.

So I think that's about it. That's it for me, Chip. So thank you all for your time and allowing me to make a presentation. I'm going to turn it back over to Chip.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Jill. We're going to go out to all of you on the phones now, and we're only going to be able to take the people who have signed up in advance because of the large amount of commenters we already have. We're not going to have time to open it up to those who have not signed up. So I would say look to the July 9th meeting to sign up.

And as I said before, the NRC staff is going to be here listening carefully. They're not going to be responding.

So we re going to go to local government first. And I'm going to start out with Carlsbad. And I'm going to read a sequence of names here and then we're going to go to the first one, Mayor Dale Janway, Mark Walterscheid, Lisa Anaya-Flores, Leo Estrada and Edward Rodriguez, John Lowe, and Mr. K.C. Cass.

So we're going to see how this works.

We're going to go to Mayor Janway. Mayor Janway, can
you press *0, and Lorraine will open your line for

you?

Rodriquez.

OPERATOR: The line is currently open.

MR. CUADRADO-CARABALLO: -- in about two minutes, can we move to the second person and then go back?

MR. CAMERON: Let's go to Edward

MR. CUADRADO-CARABALLO: Mayor Janway is here now. Give him about 30 seconds.

MR. CAMERON: All right.

MAYOR JANWAY: Good afternoon.

MR. CAMERON: Hello, Mayor.

MAYOR JANWAY: Thank you for the opportunity to comment. My name is Dale Janway, and I'm the Mayor of the City of Carlsbad. I'm currently in my third four-year term.

We've all learned a lot of lessons from 2020. And one of those lessons was that you always need to have a diverse economy to prepare for whatever is going to happen.

Carls and has benefitted from such a diverse economy over the years. But it's clear that we'll need to continue to push for those alternatives. It's also clear that our state must diversify its economy as well.

I spoke in favor of this project at the scoping meeting in 2018, and I'm here to speak in favor of this project today.

The NRC's Environmental Impact conclusions found that impacts were small in a wide range of the evaluated categories as well as the rail access impact.

We appreciate your extremely thorough evaluation on this project and your focus on the science and data not on fear or political gaze.

The Albuquerque Journal said the NRC is right to put science before politics. As the Mayor of a community known for its diverse economy, I strongly believe that this proposed project will not harm any of our area's other industries, including oil and gas production, quarrying, and agriculture.

Furthermore, I believe the proposed transportation system is the safest there is. The NRC's Environmental Impact Statement supports these beliefs.

Carlsbad as well as Hobbs, Eddy County and Lea County have all passed resolutions in support of this Interim Storage Facility because we know there is a tremendous need for these facilities.

And because we're in the ideal site for

Holtec's subsurface system, I support the NRC's Environmental Impact Statement and believe we should keep moving forward. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mayor.

And is Councilman Rodriguez with us? If he could hit

*0.

MR. CUADRADO-CARABALLO: He was going to call in from his office.

MR. CAMERON: While we're waiting for Councilman Rodriguez, let's see if Mark Walterscheid is there. If you could press star *0, we'll go to you, Mark.

Let's try Lisa Anaya-Flores, and we'll come back to the ones we called to see if they're still available.

MR. CUADRADO-CARABALLO: We got Mark Walterscheid here. There's about a 30 second delay after pressing the *0. So I think that's what's happening.

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MR. CUADRADO-CARABALLO: Okay?

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MS. CAVERLY: Lorraine, is there any way that you can change the delay?

COUNCIL MEMBER WALTERSCHEID: Good

NEAL R. GROSS

enough. Okay. My name is Mark Walterscheid. I'm a member of Carlsbad City Council Ward 4. I've been in business for 35 years here. My family has been a pioneer family through the years. And we've been here a long time.

I am in full support of the project as I was in the scoping meeting two years ago. The science backs it up. The local government backs it up. Even the NRC in their Praft EIS backs the project.

We understand in Carlsbad that there are people from other parts of the country who are opposed to the project, that are opposed to it out of fear of nuclear in general and that this is misguided.

I am in full support of a Holtec Consolidation Interim Storage Facility Project. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mark.

And let's see if Ed Rodriguez is with us. Ed, are you there?

OPERATOR: Mr. Rodriguez, if you are on line, please press *0. At this time, I'm showing no signal.

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MR. CUADRADO-CARABALLO: He just texted me that he is here. So I believe he's trying to get

NEAL R. GROSS

in. He said the *0 doesn't appear to be working for him.

OPERATOR: Is he on a speakerphone?

MR. CUADRADO-CARABALLO: He is not with us. He's calling from his office. So I'm not sure.

OPERATOR: Okay. Sir, if you are on a speakerphone, please lift the handset -- pick up the handset. One moment. The line is currently open.

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Can you hear me now?

MR. CAMERON: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Okay. This is Edward T. Rodriguez. And once again thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak. There are a couple of points I would just like to reiterate here. Your presentation was very thorough and very well prepared and presented.

The first of which would be the use of the Regulatory Commission's Environmental Impact Statement which was issued in March. It did use science. It did to robust studies and made sure that all of the different issues that we've been discussing through this meeting were looked at, evaluated, and deemed to be safe.

So minimal impact for this project would

be felt by anyone in the area were it built or operated.

You also pointed out that rail travel is ΙĦ is a safe means of travel, of transportation. And the fact that the casks have to pass such daunting destructive tests and have come through it with #lying colors, I think, speaks very highly of the safety aspect and the fact that the rad release, the potential for radioactive release or radiation ambient in its passing through neighborhood were also discredited.

Carls ad, our area here, as Mayor Janway pointed out, our little slice of heaven, is the energy corridor.

We are the home of the Waste Isolation
Pilot Plant. We have science offices like Los
Alamos. We have Urenco not too far away from us in
Eunice. This is a nuclear corridor, not to mention
the oil and gas industry.

So our economy is diverse. It's robust.

And our population is made up of people who pulled themselves up by their bootstraps and get things done.

We don't talk about it. We buckle down and do it.

And I would like for those who are opposed to this to have the opportunity to speak. I am all

for that. But I believe that minority report should be granted, but majority rules.

And with that I would just remind everyone that the Department of Energy's duty and responsibility is to protect the American people from all the radioactive materials that are stored all across the United States.

And I believe that we, in our willingness, are working with DOE, with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in order to make America a safer place for all of ws. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Councilman Rodriguez. And we're going to see if Anaya-Flores, Lisa Anaya-Flores, if you're on, could you press *0, please?

OPERATOR: At this time, sir, no one has pressed *0.

MR. CAMERON: Why don't we try Councillor Estrada, and then we'll come back and see if Lisa is available?

Councillor Estrada, could you hit star zero and we'll put you on?

OPERATOR: Once again, Mr. Estrada, if you are online, please press star, then zero. If you're on a speakerphone, please lift up the handset

and please check your mute button.

One moment.

MR. CAMERON: Are you getting any action there, Lorraine, with Councillor Estrada?

OPERATOR: At this time, I'm showing that no one has signaled to have an open line, sir.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. And can you have an open line for Lisa Anaya-Flores?

OPERATOR: Ms. Flores, if you are online, please press star, then zero, at this time.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Lorraine, I'm going to give you six or seven names, and if you could ask them -- we'll ask them to press star zero, and then they'll all be on the line waiting, and we'll take them one by one.

OPERATOR: Okay.

MR. CAMERON: And John Lowe, K.C. Cass, Jonathan Sena, Ernie Carlson, and Barry Foster. And let's see if we get John Lowe on the phone.

(Pause.)

MR. CAMERON: Anything for K.C. Cass or Jonathan Sena?

(Pause.)

MR. CAMERON: Sam Cobb?

OPERATOR: We do have Ernie Carlson

NEAL R. GROSS

online. Would you like to open that line?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, please.

OPERATOR: Thank you. The line is open.

COMMISSIONER CARLSON: Okay. This is

Ernie Carlson. I'm Commissioner of Eddy County,

District 1.

Eddy and Lea Counties have been partnering up in an effort to bring economic diversity to Southeast New Mexico. It is our belief that the diversity between the nuclear mining and oil and gas will bring our counties a stronger economic outlook during these times of turmoil.

The proposed Holtec project is a joint venture between our counties and will bring jobs and economic growth and diversity to our region that I spoke of earlier. Not only does this growth help our two counties but the state of New Mexico as a whole. Let's not forget that the strong economic diversity of our two counties form the majority of New Mexico's state budget.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement given by experts in their fields looks hard at the diverse environmental and economical impact of the proposed project and what impact it would have on our industries and environment.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

That study has determined that the impact is minimal. I understand people have concerns, but the experts have already addressed these concerns, and we need to move forward and let this project proceed. We already have two major nuclear projects in Southeast New Mexico, and they're operated fine and a real asset to our economies. The regulation and oversight already in place are working to protect the people and the communities in the region.

I am here today to request that the NRC Commissioners grant a license for Holtec to operate the facility. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Ernie.

And do we understand that there are several people with Carlsbad Council who may be in the same room and they're having trouble getting in hitting star zero? Now, as Lorraine told us, if you have a speakerphore operating, you're not going to be able to get in with star zero. So what you're going to have to do is get off the speakerphone, and then one at a time, you can pass that phone around.

So I want to give Councilman Rodriguez and John Lowe, maybe K.C. Cass, give you an opportunity to try to get us your comments by taking

it off of the speakerphone.

And, Lorraine, I'm assuming you still have Anaya-Flores, Rodriguez, Lowe, and Cass -- you have their lines open so that they can get in?

OPERATOR: That's correct. Are you ready for the next, sir?

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Well, I've already spoken, but he said that you were still trying to get ahold of me. This is Councillor Eddie Rodriguez, Edward Rodriguez.

OPERATOR: Your line will remain open, sir.

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Okay.

OPERATOR: Sir, are you ready for your next comment?

made my comment. I was just responding to the fact that the facilitator said that you were waiting for me. I made my comment.

OPERATOR: Thank you, sir. That's correct. Your lime will remain open.

The line for Jonathan Sena and Mayor Sam Cobb is now open.

COMMISSIONER SENA: Excellent. This is Jonathan Sena. May I proceed?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Go ahead, Jonathan. CAMERON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SENA: All right. Thank you very much.

Again, my name is Jonathan Sena. Му family has lived in New Mexico for about 400 years. I am a native New Mexican. New Mexico is my home. My family is here. My life is here in New Mexico.

I live in Hobbs, New Mexico, and I am a County Commissioner here. I live in Lea County, where Holtec is trying to obtain licensing to build their interim storage facility. Because of my close proximity to the project, I'm pretty well informed in all the happenings surrounding it. I've heard both sides of the argument for and even against the project.

That being said, I give my full support What has been communicated to me to this project. from the Draft Environmental Impact Statement encourages me in my support for the project with the reassurance that both the construction and day-to-day operations of the project will be safe.

This project should be allowed to happen. We need an interim storage facility in Southeastern Again, as I've said before, I am a New Mexico. resident of Lea County. I've lived in Lea County for

many years. I've seen our part of New Mexico benefit from the oil and gas industries, and I've watched families in Hobbs directly grow because of it.

But we all know that the oil industry is cyclical, and a town can't be solely reliant on one industry. That's why I believe in economic diversity, especially as it relates to the energy industry. That is also why I've been glad to know that our community leaders have worked together to diversify our economy with this Holtec project.

This project is estimated to have 3 billion dollars in capital investment and 15 million dollars to 25 million dollars per year in revenue. That will be shared with the state. In light of state budget challenges with the COVID-19 pandemic, we see the importance for more consistent revenue for roads and education.

Again, something that has encouraged me is that the Draft EIS specifically stated that oil and gas -- they can coexist with this project. There would be no conflict. I do believe in the Holtec project. It will be a positive addition to our community and to our state.

Thank you. (Telephonic interference.)

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 Commissioner Sena

(Telephonic interference.)

MR. IOWE: Good evening. Thank you for putting this event together and allowing Carlsbad/Hobbs residents in particular the opportunity to speak. My name is John Lowe, and I'm the City Administrator in Carlsbad. We have a Council meeting shortly, so I'll keep my remarks brief.

I have reviewed the Draft EIS by the NRC and appreciate the NRC's extensive efforts. I understand the impacts will be very small, and construction itself will have no impact on the oil and gas industry, which have been our concern.

I personally wanted to support this project and hope to see it move forward. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mr. Lowe.

Mr. Cass or Anaya-Flores? Anybody on?

MR. CASS: Good afternoon. My name is

K.C. Cass. I'm the Deputy City Administrator for the

City of Carlsbad.

After reviewing the Draft EIS statement,

I am fully behind the Holtec project. Additionally,
the EIS reaffirms what Holtec has been saying all

NEAL R. GROSS

along, that oil and gas and other industries can operate and coexist with the Holtec proposed site.

The Holtec project also brings revenue into the state, and I believe it is estimated that the project will bring 3 billion dollars in capital investment, 25 million dollars per year in operating costs, and 15 million to 25 million dollars per year in revenue sharing with the state.

Of course, it all boils down to safety, and through your review, and though you concluded that the project has been done safely and the project is good for the region and good for the state of New Mexico. And we'd like to say that we fully support the project.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.

And we're going to go to Wes Carter.

COUNCIL MEMBER CARTER: Thank you.

Thank you for having this this afternoon. My name is Wes Carter. I m a Carlsbad native and a Carlsbad City Councillor.

We see articles in the newspaper and on the news of people opposed to the Holtec, and most of them we see are from out of town and it often sounds like they're fighting just for the sake of fighting without looking at all the facts.

I run my business in Carlsbad, so I know the risk assessment. The information we have on transporting spent fuel to the Carlsbad area indicates that it is incredibly safe. In fact, 25,000 transports have been done with no accidents or leaked radiation.

We need to make decisions based on facts, not fear. And I think your own detailed Environmental Impact Statement, which you spent several years working on, tells the right story. The EIS says the impact of this project would be minimal across the board, and we think it would be a good fit for this community.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Wes. We have Mayor Sam Cobb from Hobbs.

MAYOR COBB: Good afternoon, members of the Commission, NRC staff, and members of the public.

My name is Sam Cobb. I'm in my third term as Mayor of Hobbs, and I have been involved in the Lea Project for the last nine years.

I'm very familiar with the recommendations from the Blue Ribbon Commission regarding interim storage and was part of the group

of individuals from the four governmental entities that determined that Holtec had the best overall solution in both cask design and operational expertise in the world.

I like what the project can do for our local community in terms of job creation, economic diversification, and revenue generation for both the local government and state government.

I've heard a lot of criticism surrounding the transportation of used nuclear fuel and how it should be left just where it is. I understand that fear, where it comes from, but it's not factually based. I'm sure they're not aware that this process already happens nationally without anyone knowing about it, that more than 1300 used fuel shipments have been completed safely over the last 35 years with no accidents.

On top of all of that, the cask designs are robust and safe with the public's safety in mind and are specifically tested and designed to not release any radiation to the general public. All of the waste is stored within multiple layers of steel, lead, and other materials that have already been approved by the NRC.

The Draft EIS reaffirms what I've always

accepted, that this is a safe project being proposed by a reliable and trustworthy company. I urge the NRC Commissioners to approve the license to operate the storage facility here in Lea County.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mayor.

We're going to shift gears, and we're going to go to some state senators now. And I'm going to call all of their names, and if we can get their star-zero lines open.

Senator Papen, Senator Munoz, Senator Kernan, Senator Fulfer, Senator Ramos, Senator Smith, Senator Martinez, and Senator Jeff Steinborn. Let's see if we get Senator Papen on.

It's star zero to unmute your phone, and Lorraine will put you on.

OPERATOR: Ma'am, your line is currently open.

SENATOR PAPEN: Thank you. Shall I go ahead?

OPERATOR: Yes, ma'am.

MR. CAMERON: Please.

SENATOR PAPEN: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much for having me today and being able to speak. And I just am calling because I support the

NEAL R. GROSS

Holtec International proposed project for Lea County in Southeast New Mexico.

The NRC application process will put Holtec through a vigorous review, and if the license is approved, I hope people who have concerns will accept those findings. It's a good project, I believe, for our state and for the nuclear industry. A solution is needed for storing spent nuclear fuel, and the southwest region of our state understands the nuclear industry. It is home to WIPP and Urenco, and I've been to both of those places as well as Urenco in the Netherlands.

And so I feel like I am somewhat involved understanding in the project. And the communities, I believe, down there -- well, all the communities in the east part of the state -- I think they're very well prepared for this. The Environmental Draft Impact Statement says the impact to our environment will be minimal, and I appreciate those conclusions

So I wrge the NRC to approve this license, and I appreciate them applying for it. Thank you so very much.

MR. CAMERON: Is that it, Senator Papen?

SENATOR Papen: That's it. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. CAMERON: Okay. All right. Do we have Senator Munoz?

OPERATOR: Senator, if you're online, please press star, then zero. Once again, if you're on a speakerphone, please lift up the handset before pressing star and zero.

One moment.

At this time, sir, I'm showing no response.

MR. CAMERON: From either Senator Munoz,
Senator Kernan, Senator Fulfer, Senator Ramos,
Senator Smith, Senator Martinez, or Senator
Steinborn? We dom't have any of those?

OPERATOR: I show no one signaling.

At this time, if you are any of the previously spoken speakers, please press star, then zero, at this time. If you're on a speakerphone, please lift up the handset before pressing star and zero.

One moment.

Senator Steinborn's line is open.

SENATOR STEINBORN: Okay. Hello? Can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, Senator.

SENATOR STEINBORN: All right. Thank

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 you. Welcome. Well, it's good to be with everybody, and I want to say at the outset I certainly support economic development in our state and economic diversification im our state. But I think this is a legacy consideration of which, quite frankly, the Draft EIS fundamentally cannot extrapolate the impact to the state of New Mexico.

Number one, I think the Draft EIS cannot adequately analyze the long-term impact of the project given that there is no permanent repository of waste in the United States, and even the license period of the waste itself, of the dry cask storage, greatly exceeds the country's experience, technical actual experience of dry cask technology.

think the facility itself, while licensed for 40 years, clearly -- and acknowledges itself -- could be there much longer. And there's no permanent designated repository as federal required under law. So think, fundamentally, the Draft EIS and the conclusion of the NRC itself is a breach of federal law as I understand it, with there being no designation of sites.

I have to take some exception when it's categorized that, quote, outsiders' opinions are

invalidated or not relevant to this session when the waste will be traveling not only through all parts of New Mexico by rai □ -- all parts of New Mexico, and if were to happen, would impact communities, so all New Mexicans truly have a legitimate voice in this discussion -- but it, in fact, will travel through all parts of the country as a part of this decision.

And the unfortunate aspect of this decision is that it's largely an economic-driven opportunity being sought by the community and by Holtec. But what's lost on that is the national policy consideration of, is this the right policy? And, of course, the NRC doesn't make that policy call. They just evaluate the proposal itself.

I want to -- and I probably can't ask a question. Is that correct? I can just make a comment?

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. CAMERON: That'll be on the NRC's --

MS. CAVERLY: Could you start again? You

were on mute. Could you start again?

MR. CAMERON: Oh. Okay.

Yes, Senator, you can ask a question.

NRC is not going to be responding, but please --

NEAL R. GROSS

SENATOR STEINBORN: I see.

MR. CAMERON: -- question on the record

- -

SENATOR STEINBORN: Sure.

MR. CAMERON: -- so they can evaluate it later.

SENATOR STEINBORN: Absolutely. Okay. Well, you had talked in your presentation about environmental justice and that somehow you extrapolated the environmental justice, or potential lack of environmental justice, by virtue of looking at data.

And I guess the question I have for the NRC is, did you interview anyone in those demographic groups? That's the question. Did you actually interview anyone from different socio-groups within proximity to this proposed facility, let alone anyone along the transportation route? I think that's the only way to really accurately get a gauge of whether or not people feel like those legacy costs, those legacy risks, are just to them, being in proximity to it.

I would note that the company, Holtec -none of them actually live in New Mexico, and many of
the proprietors live in Miami. So we could talk

about how outsiders feel about it and its impact, but

-- so just -- I am very concerned about the
environmental justice aspect. I'm concerned about
the legacy aspect, and there's just a fundamental
inadequacy of doing modeling.

And finally, I just want to say in terms of transportation, in terms of risks, what is being talked about in terms of transportation to this facility and in the construction and the amount of casks, it only takes one bad accident to be a billion-dollar event.

And of course, according to Holtec, if there were to be an accident in transport, that risk would fall to local communities. So I don't know if the Draft EIS adequately assesses the risk to New Mexico communities or the state of New Mexico and whether or not the financial ability is there by those local communities to mitigate those risks, to deal with any harm that may come, and whether there's any compensation for insurance from Holtec to the state of New Mexico and to our communities should something unfortunate happen, which according to the NRC is not a matter of if; it's a matter of when. And have we accounted for that?

So, with that, I've used my more than

ample time for now, and I appreciate you letting me comment. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much, Senator Steinborn, and the staff did note your question. Okay?

SENATOR STEINBORN: Thank you. And, by the way, my first name is Jeff, not Jack.

MR. CAMERON: I'm sorry.

SENATOR STEINBORN: No, you're good.

I've been called worse things. Thank you.

(Laughter.)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much. SENATOR STEINBORN: Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Do we have any others of the State Senators that we called on the line? We've only heard from Senator Jeff Steinborn and from Senator Mary Kay Papen. If we don't have any more of the State Senators who have signed up, we have a few State Representatives, and we have two Cabinet Secretaries.

So I'm just going to wait a minute to see -- Lorraine, did any of those State Senators hit their star zero --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

OPERATOR: They did not, sir. They did

NEAL R. GROSS

not, sir.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Lorraine. Thank you.

Okay. I'm going to read off some five names here, and one is Representative Cathrynn Brown. There's Representative Jim Townsend. There's Representative Larry Scott. Then there's Secretary Cottrell Propst. I'm not I'm sorry if pronouncing that correctly. And there's Cabinet Secretary James Kenney from New Mexico Environmental Department, and \$ecretary Propst is from the New Minerals, and Natural Resources Mexico Energy, Department.

So let's see if we can get some of the representatives on to talk to us.

OPERATOR: Excuse me. Mr. Munoz, your line is open.

SENATOR MUNOZ: Hey. This is Senator Munoz, and I'm sorry I was -- it's Monday and I'm dealing with employees. Sorry for the late call. I did hear Senator Steinborn mention his comments.

As the Vice Chair of Senate Finance, anything we can add to our economy, especially what's happening now -- I have read part of the comments, and I don't see a problem with what's going to happen.

We know we need diversity in the area. It'll bring jobs, and it's a long-standing process.

It's a big investment for New Mexico, and you guys will have very rigorous oversight and be on top of anything that could happen with an accident. So I want to make those comments. I think that people need to be aware of that. Secretary Propst and I may be on opposite sides of the fence, but I appreciate you guys looking at New Mexico to do this.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Senator.

And let's see if we have any of the Representatives that I called: Brown, Townsend, Scott, or Secretary Propst or Secretary Kenney?

REPRESENTATIVE SCOTT: Larry Scott's on the line.

MR. CAMERON: Oh. Hi. Let's go with Representative Scott.

REPRESENTATIVE SCOTT: Good afternoon, folks. I am State Representative Larry Scott, District 62, which is Hobbs and Lea County. And I am going to start with an old quote, that perception is often reality.

And my constituents have a perception that this is going to be viewed as a dumping ground

for nuclear material from around the country. Now,
New Mexico has a bit of a checkered history with the
nuclear industry, the Trinity Downwinders, the Native
Americans that feel like they were abused with uranium
mining, some accidents at Los Alamos National Labs.

But I hope and as a consequence of this draft review that we've learned something about handling these materials since 1945. I believe that the ultimate judgment on whether this material, the storage processes and transportation, should be allowed to go forward should be based completely on the best available science that we can muster, and that a thorough and objective evaluation with respect to not only the storage but the transportation and public safety be in effect before final approval is granted.

If that review occurs and is supported by science, then I believe I could support the project moving forward.

That's all I have this afternoon. Thank you all very much for the opportunity to speak.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Representative Scott, for those comments.

And do we have Representative Brown or Representative Townsend ready to talk to us? What

about either of the Cabinet Secretaries: Secretary

Propst or Secretary Kenney? Are you on the phone
with us?

SECRETARY KENNEY: Secretary Kenney is here, and I believe Secretary Propst is also on the line. Can you hear me okay?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. Is that Secretary Kenney?

SECRETARY KENNEY: That's correct.
Secretary Kenney.

MR. CAMERON: Oh. Good. Thank you for being with us. Go ahead.

SECRETARY KENNEY: Okay. So thank you for hosting this public meeting and listening to New Mexicans, our tribes and pueblos and other interested stakeholders.

So, as you indicated, my name is James Kenney, and I'm the Secretary for the New Mexico Environment Department. And regarding environmental matters in our state, my Department has both the authority and is also the expertise when it comes to these matters. We take our mission seriously, and that mission is to protect public health and the environment for all New Mexicans for all generations.

And the Holtec project will result in

over 8,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste stored indefinitely for multiple generations to come. New Mexicans, as has been pointed out on this call, have shouldered a disproportionate burden of the waste associated with the country's nuclear weapons programs for over 70 years, and with this project, Holtec is asking NRC's permission to have New Mexico shoulder the risk for storing spent nuclear fuel from the nation's nuclear power plants.

And I want to emphasize that, that Holtec is asking NRC, not New Mexicans. And last year, the Governor, Governor Lujan Grisham, wrote the DOE Secretary and NRC Chairman and made it clear that New Mexico is opposed to the interim storage of high-level waste.

And with that, the waste would be stored in an area where the population relies on groundwater as its drinking water supply, in an area where there's well-documented karst features that would serve as underground conduits for contaminants released at the site, and all that's within the heart of the Permian Basin.

In development of the EIS, NMED worked with NRC to share -- the New Mexico Environment Department, sorry -- worked with the NRC to share

expertise regarding the regional impact, regional environmental impacts and regional permitting aspects of the proposed project. We shared that information in our December 16th, 2019, letter to you all.

In that letter, we identified a number of shortcomings. Those included groundwater characterization, analysis of pathways from the site, detection surface the groundwater, of waters, applicability of relevant New Mexico groundwater and surface water standards, which we are very proud to protect, and as | well as long-term monitoring of environmental impacts from the site.

In the current Draft EIS, we feel as though the NRC missed its mark, and I want to point out a few grave concerns that we have. I just have four to go through, so I'll be quick.

There's an inadequate conceptualization of the geologically unsuitable site. There's a preclusion of a thorough evaluation due to vast technical deficiencies. There's a lack of inclusion of all applicable state environmental regulations and controls. And there's an omission of a full assessment of environmental justice concerns.

So as presented, the Draft EIS negligently fails to address the fundamental

requirements of NEPA, and we are putting this together in a very thoughtful, detailed letter to present to NRC before the comment period closes.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's see if we have Secretary -- Secretary Propst, are you on?

SECRETARY COTTRELL PROPST: Hi. Yes.
This is Sarah Cottrell Propst. Can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Hi. Go ahead.

SECRETARY COTTRELL PROPST: Thank you.

So --

MR. CAMERON: Thank you for being with us.

SECRETARY COTTRELL PROPST: Thank you My name is Sarah Cottrell Propst. very much. Cabinet Secretary of the New Mexico Energy, the Minerals, and National Resources Department. And our department is the lead agency for the Radioactive Waste Consultation Task Force, a collaboration of secretaries from six different state agencies, and is authorized by statute to represent the state's interest regarding the safe and uneventful transportation of nuclear waste in and through the state.

We have grave concerns about the

inadequacy of the technical analysis conducted thus Draft EIS for the Holtec proposed the consolidated interim storage facility. First, the NRC and license applicant continuously state that the is just | like the Waste Isolation Pilot Project, or WIPP. But this facility is really different in some significant ways, including that the state has legal authority under RCRA to regulate WIPP, and the WIPP program is funded by the federal And the program manager and a team of government. program coordinators engage in community training programs for preparedness to a response to a hazardous materials incident.

The Holtec proposed facility is privately owned and managed. The state of New Mexico and the communities along the shipping corridor have no financial assistance in preparing communities for a response to an accident.

Second, there's no discussion as to how long the waste will stay in New Mexico, making the proposed site a de facto permanent storage site.

Third, the NRC neglected to include a thorough discussion of transportation of spent nuclear fuel and its analysis based on the bounding analysis authority it invoked. Further, there are

many deficiencies in the Draft EIS regarding transportation to and from the facility.

The application states that the DOE would be responsible for transporting approximately 2,000 canisters over 40 years. But in the Draft EIS, the NRC analyzed full build-out of 10,000 canisters. There's no discussion of the process and complexity in loading and unloading canisters at the existing locations, inspection protocols, transportation and routing requirements, unloading at the facility, and challenges of removing the waste to an ultimate repository.

And, finally, the NRC did not demonstrate how the proposed action will achieve environmental justice for the high percentage of minority and low-income populations of the state and across the shipping corridors of the US as required by NRC policy.

Thanks so much for the opportunity to comment, and our Agency will also be submitting detailed comments as part of this topic.

MR. CAMERON: That's great. Thank you very much, Secretary. And that was the end of the -

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Oh, this is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 Representative Brown.

MR. CAMERON: Oh. Good, good. Now, Representative Brown, go ahead.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Yes. Hello to everyone. My name is Cathrynn Brown. I'm the State Representative for District 55, which is wholly inside Eddy County.

The Holtec project would have a regional impact and certainly affect and perhaps even employ some of my constituents. So I do want to let you know, though, that I am commenting with no connection to the Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance. I have not served with that organization, so I'm coming at this as a State Representative who cares deeply about her district and the health and safety of the people here.

And so the bottom line is I would never even support a project if I thought it could not be done well and safely. I consider myself a fairly engaged legislator on nuclear issues. I've been for ten years now a member of the New Mexico legislature's Radioactive Hazardous Materials Committee and did actually chair that for two years. And I also heavily participate with the National Council of State Legislatures, Legislative Nuclear Working Group.

And I've also had the privilege of

touring nuclear facilities in probably, I think, seven states and overseas, and also have been a part of interim committees regarding the Holtec project and Waste Control Specialists in Texas. And so I think that through the years I've gained a lot of knowledge.

There's been a shift in the political winds in New Mexico the last two years. Not too long ago, the New Mexico House of Representatives passed a resolution supporting the Holtec project at least in concept, and now we've heard from two Cabinet Secretaries that there's some opposition. And that's to be expected.

But I have full faith and confidence in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. From the time I spent in a national laboratory in Washington state, I know the NRC, the work it does. I know its reputation, and I know that the reviews you do are very rigorous and very thorough.

So, through the years, as I've learned more about the Holtec project -- I was actually at the first public meeting in Carlsbad when it was just get together and let's talk about this idea. And I went because I was interested in the topic.

I think that I can say that my district,

by and large, supports the Holtec project. There are a few detractors, and I've spoken with many of them. But I think the community generally supports the project, as it did the WIPP project some years ago.

And the linchpin for it all was we acknowledge that whatever could be done would be done safely, and the community wanted to be convinced. It was open to the economic benefits of WIPP and of Holtec but wants to know with a high level of assurance that things can be done safely for people and the environment.

So, at this point in time, I appreciate the NRC's work on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I think it's a document we can look to for being rigorous, and the conclusion of it today is, I think, very commendable regarding the project.

So, at this point in time, I know there's going to be more public comments and NRC will take all of that into consideration. But just letting you know that I believe my district supports the project, and until I hear otherwise about the safety of the project, I support it as well.

And I do appreciate you all allowing me the opportunity to comment. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. And

NEAL R. GROSS

we're now going to go to the citizens from New Mexico and other places in the country to comment. And Secretary Kenney mentioned tribal, and I know we have at least two tribal representatives who are going to be talking to us.

And I'm going to call some names. One is Rebecca Summer. I know that Rebecca has to speak soon. And then there's Rebecca Ramsay, Wendy Austin, Michel Lee, and Camilla Feibelman. And if you can get star zero on your phone, we'll see if we can get you on.

And Rebecca, are you on? Rebecca Summer, that is?

Hello? Hello?

SENATOR FULFER: This is State Senator Greg Fulfer. I'd like to talk if I could.

MS. SUMMER: Go ahead. It's Rebecca Summer.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Go ahead, Senator Fulfer.

SENATOR FULFER: Yes. I just -- I'm sorry I'm late getting on here, last minute here. But I just wanted to talk a little bit. I was one of the first ones when I was a County Commissioner in Lea County and worked with Eddy County and Lea County

putting this project together. And we had a real thorough look-over of the land that we purchased to start this project, and through the characterization and working with the oil and gas industry and all the different industries putting this project together, we see it as one of the things that will diversify our economy in Eddy and Lea County.

And we are fully in support. As a State Senator now, we see the importance of this project moving forward, and definitely in this economy that we're in right now that it could -- even more than back when we started it, that this is invaluable and can lead us to the future.

We see this as one thing that could provide the future reserves of energy and that could be worked on as science and engineering careers up where we have technology of the nuclear cycle. And this has been one of the most benign parts of the cycles of nuclear energy. We feel like it will fit perfect, then, with all the nuclear WIPP and Urenco and all the other things that we have here. And people in Lea and Eddy County have become very comfortable with dealing with this part of the cycle.

The land characterization that was done in the past we feel like will be very beneficial to

the federal government, to the state, and we know that NRC must do some more engineering and science to make sure that everybody's comfortable with this. But we're very confident of NRC of providing that science and making sure that the people are safe in Lea and Eddy County. So we're very comfortable with that.

But the oil and gas industry realizes that we deal in this type of environment every day that has H2S gas and has lots of risk. And so does nuclear energy, but they have become very comfortable with this, with Urenco, with WIPP, and we deal with it on a daily basis. We understand energy. We think energy is a strong point of Lea and Eddy County, and it definitely will be in the 30-, 40-, 50-year range down the road that we know that this will be probably one of the game-changers in keeping our energy solid in Lea and Eddy County. But -- and in the state of New Mexico.

The state of New Mexico needs to be a participant. They need to be involved in the game. They need to be talked to and become a partner in this so that they understand it and feel like they are a partner and they are at the table and that they will grow along with this project. And I think that

is critical to this project moving forward.

But I just wanted to throw those few notes in there, and I appreciate you letting me have a few minutes here. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Senator.

And is Rebecca Summer on? Rebecca, if you could hit star zero if you haven't already.

OPERATOR: Rebecca Ramsey's line is open.

MS. RAMSEY: Okay. Should I push star and zero?

OPERATOR: Rebecca, your line is open.

MS. RAMSEY: So I should press star zero, or am I on?

MR. CAMERON: I think -- we can hear you, so I don't think you need to do anything else except just talk with us.

MS. RAMSEY: Thank you.

So I'm a resident of Massachusetts. My name is Rebecca Ramsey, and I'm a retiree in my 70s. For over half of my life, I've been opposed to nuclear energy and have found great hope in solar energy. It is not dangerous in any way and way less expensive.

The following is a short summary of my comments for this Environmental Impact Statement

review. I understand the purpose of an Environmental Impact Statement is to determine the consequences of the project to our natural environment and to those who depend upon it for their livelihood.

If there is one storage of 400 canisters of high-level radioactive spent fuel at Carlsbad, New Mexico, you'd imperil the population of the entire southwestern United States. Many of the people living in this part of the USA are descendants of the original inhabitants. The valleys, mountains, rivers, lakes, trees, grasses, wildflowers, and fauna are extraordinarily sacred to them.

Part of the heritage shared with their ancestors for centuries, these lands signify their very identity and presence here on earth. So there's just some other parts of the country with armored trucks and armored planes. The possibility of an accident is a threat to the many natural areas and inhabitants along the way.

What would remain after an accident would be total devastation of sacred homeland, some rendered uninhabitable forever.

Thank you, and I look forward to listening to other people who are concerned and who are interested in hearing from others. Thank you.

CAMERON: Thank you very

Rebecca Ramsey.

Do we have Rebecca Summer?

Wendy Austin?

MS. AUSTIN: Hi. Wendy Austin is on the line.

MR. CAMERON: Oh, good, good.

MS. AUSTIN: Great. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak. Again, my name is Wendy Austin, and I'm the Deputy City Administrator for the City of Carlsbad. And I know that there is huge support for the Holtec project in and around Carlsbad.

I have personally followed the project closely, attended meetings, and have discussed it at length with technical members of our community. addition, I support this project. I have high in the confidence NRC's Environmental Statement, which doncluded that this project is safe, has a small environmental impact, and should be licensed.

me personally, understanding the transportation aspect of this project was very Through my studies, I learned that the important. casks are specifically designed for transporting used nuclear fuel and have been previously licensed and deemed safe by the NRC.

Sandia National Laboratory included driving locomotives into the casks without any of the casks being compromised. In addition, I learned that the casks must demonstrate four successive accident conditions before they are considered safe for transportation. And these four conditions include a free drop, a puncture, a fire, and a submersion into water.

So what makes these casks so strong is that they are designed and fabricated with multiple layers of steel, lead, and other strong materials. This heavy-duty construction safely confines the fuel and shields workers and the public from any hazards. In addition, what I learned is that the fuel being transported is in a solid form and not a liquid, and this also limits the potential for matter to escape into the environment.

Therefore, based on all this evidence, I'm not worried about transporting this material to Southeast New Mexico. And because of this, I support the project.

Thank you again for allowing me the

NEAL R. GROSS

opportunity to speak today.

MR. CAMERON: Good. Well, thank you for giving us those comments. And we'll see if we can get Rebecca Summer on, give her another chance.

Star zero, Rebecca.

How about Michel Lee or Camilla Feibelman? If you're trying to get on, hit star zero.

Okay. Well, I think we can tune back in with them later. But the next group, Baca, Bobby Baudillo, Eileen O'Shaughnessy, Scott Kovac, Susan Schuurman, Teresa Seamster, and Ian Zabarte.

Bobby, are you out there? If people could just hit their star zero.

MS. FEIBELMAN: This is Camilla Feibelman. I'm sorry. It just took a moment with the operator.

MR. CAMERON: Well, that's okay, Camilla.

It's nice to have you on. Go ahead.

MS. FEIBELMAN: Thank you very much for the opportunity. And thanks, everyone else who's commented.

My name is Camilla Feibelman. I'm the Director of the Rio Grande Chapter of the Sierra Club. We represent over 35,000 members and supporters. I

NEAL R. GROSS

was born and raised in Albuquerque and live here with my husband, my three-year-old son, and my seven-year-old stepdaughter.

This is not just an issue for Southeast

New Mexico, but it's an issue for the entire state,
especially given the means for the transportation of
this material across and through our communities.

One issue of concern of ours has to do with insurance and bonding. The Draft fails to provide the process or insurance for reimbursement for the state of New Mexico for loss of revenue, jobs, or personal injury because of the storage site and related activities.

Holtec should be required to provide financial assurances that cover losses to the state of New Mexico from construction of the facility as well as restoration of the site for -- or for any regional site or local site for which storage is administered. Only the federal government is in a position to indemnify the citizens of New Mexico for such an event occurring for any nuclear facility.

Also, the NRC has limited the environmental analysis of this planned project to 40 years, so the agency knows that it's not a reasonable time period. Holtec itself says that the site needs

to operate for 120 years, and without a repository, the site would operate forever.

But in sum, we believe that this waste should be stored as close to its original site as possible and that the citizens of New Mexico should not be put at risk for any sum of money.

Thank you for your attention.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you,

Michel Lee?

MS. LEE: Yes. Hi there. It's Michel Lee, but that's okay.

MR. CAMERON: Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. Lee: Actually --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. CAMERON: Misread it.

MS. IEE: Yeah. I guess I have to confess I'm a bit stunned listening to this at the level to which federal and state and local actors are willing to sacrifice your populations.

This report was, ran close to 500 pages.

I'm guessing not too many of the officials who spoke today, including some of the NRC staff, actually have gone through the whole report or specialize in environmental science.

Camilla.

What I note particularly is that in the bios that are attached to the document, you do not have a single physician. You do not have biologists. You do not have environmental justice experts. You do not have people who have expertise in water. And you don't have climate scientists.

Your evaluation of the impact of the climate in New Mexico is absolutely nonexistent. You recite the fact that there's going to be drought and more wildfires and potentially increase one-off events, but you don't do any kind of analysis whatsoever, none, zero, not one single paragraph of analysis of what the impact of the coming climate -- your state is -- and this is pretty much in line with the consensus at this point -- is going to be within a megadrought, a megadrought that has not hit the western United States in modern civilization, the time of modern civilization, not in this epoch that we're currently in.

We're running out of water. The analysis done by the NRC staff that somehow determined the impact of this nuclear waste dump is going to be, quote-unquote, small, had the audacity to compare it to the level of pollution and toxicity imposed in that region from fracking, mining, and other

industrial actions, including other nuclear facilities.

So you're not really looking at the actual impact on the population. You're looking at the additional incremental poisoning. And I really hope that something in the last months of this nation's history can really get some of the people at the NRC and other officials to rethink the approach to your populace.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Michel.

Bobby Baudilio?

MR. BACA: Yes.

MR. CAMERON: Hi. We can hear you. Go ahead.

MR. BACA: Hello. My name is Baudilio Baca. I'm a Business Manager with the IBEW, and we represent over 3,000 electrical professionals in the electrical industry.

I believe that the Holtec project would serve as a well-needed economic boost for the state, especially in the perspective of labor. I think it'll help our labor unions and the members who live and work in that region. It'll give them an opportunity to sustain a living wage with jobs right

here in our home state.

I believe Holtec has been very transparent and has done its due diligence in cooperating with the EIS report. And I also feel that with our skilled, qualified workforce that we have in IBEW, we will help Holtec complete this project with the highest safety standards possible.

I support the Holtec project, and thank you for your time.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Baudilio.

And let's see if Eileen O'Shaugnessy is with us.

Eileem? Star zero.

We're always giving a little bit of time after we call someone's name because there has been this 30-second delay that we didn't anticipate.

Eileen, are you on?

Let's see if Scott -- Scott Kovac, star zero.

How about Susan Schuurman from the Nuclear Issues Study Group? Susan, are you with us? Can you hit star zero, and you can join us?

MS. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Hello, this is Eileen O'Shaughnessy.

MR. CAMERON: Oh, hi, Eileen. Go ahead.

MS. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, thank you. Well, first I just want to say I'm concerned with how many technical issues have been on this phone call and how many voices we're missing out on hearing on, and the online access was not easy to navigate, so I want to encourage the NRC to make this smoother so that we can hear from everyone.

My name is Eileen O'Shaughnessy and I'm an educator living in Albuquerque, New Mexico. I'm with the Nuclear Issues Study Group which is a grassroots, multiracial, women-led, all volunteer group that challenges nuclear colonialism and environmental racism.

The violent history of colonialism is not a thing of the past in New Mexico. Instead, it has taken a newer form in the form of nuclear colonialism. You heard some people on this call proudly proclaim that New Mexico is, quote, "a nuclear state," or that southeastern New Mexico is, quote, "a nuclear corridor." This is nothing to be proud of.

From abandoned uranium mines on Dine and Pueblo lands, to radionuclide contaminated water, soil, and air, to devastating health impacts, nuclear technologies have left a horrendous legacy in New

Mexico.

The draft environment impact statement released by the NRC concludes that Holtec's plan to do something that has never been done before, transport all of the commercial high level nuclear waste in the country on a rickety rail line through the southwest and concentrate it all there, has essentially no to low impact. That's what the DEIS has concluded.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission's stated mission is to protect public health and safety, and yet by essentially claiming that this project will have no impact, they are doing exactly the opposite. They are putting the health and safety of the entire public -- they are threatening the safety of the public.

The NRC is supposed to be neutral and objective, and yet I have observed on this very phone call that our host, Chip, prioritized the few voices in favor of this project by stacking them first, and then he introduced them by saying, quote, "We want you to see how your elected officials in New Mexico feel about this project," end quote.

This is false and misleading. New Mexico's Governor, Michelle Lujan Grisham, New

Mexico's Land Commissioner, Stephanie Garcia Richard, the All Pueblo Council of Governors, Congresswoman Deb Haaland, and many, many more have all voiced strong opposition to this project. That's how our public officials feel about this project.

In addition, 18 resolutions in Texas and New Mexico have been passed banning the transportation of high-level nuclear waste.

This webinar and the draft environmental impact statement would have us all believe that there's nothing to worry about and that the impacts of this project are small, and yet I ask you who will step in if there is a radiological accident? The answer in all likelihood is local first responders, and it is likely that taxpayers will foot the bill.

Two years ago in public scoping meetings held across the state of New Mexico, I and hundreds of others spoke our concerns about this project, and this DEIS document is completely inadequate in terms of addressing our concerns.

As has been spoken by the New Mexico Environment Department and others, this document, this draft environmental impact statement fails spectacularly to address environmental justice and environmental racism concerns, as well as impacts to

the local lagunas and surrounding water.

Being in New Mexico, I'm going to thank the NRC for one thing. I appreciate you extending the comment period to September. However, I want to strongly state that it is irresponsible and dangerous during a global pandemic to move forward with inperson public meetings unless the COVID-19 pandemic is fully under comtrol and a vaccine is found.

Therefore, I request that the NRC delay this entire licensing process and stop it from moving forward any further until public in-person meetings can be held safely. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Eileen, and we will make an effort to make sure that the access goes more smoothly on the July 9 meeting. Thank you.

Scott Kovac or Susan Schuurman? Is
Teresa Seamster there? Star, zero, Teresa? Let's
go to Ian Zabarte. Ian, can you join us on the phone?
Scott Kovac or Susan Schuurman?

MS. SCHUURMAN: This is Susan Schuurman.

MR. CAMERON: Hi, Susan. Go ahead. We're ready to listen.

MS. SCHUURMAN: Thank you. Again, my name is Susan Schuurman and I'm in Albuquerque. I want to acknowledge I'm making this comment while

living on stolen indigenous land, the territory of the Tiwa people, and that NRC staff in the D.C. office wrote the draft EIS on stolen indigenous land, the ancestral territory of the Anacostan people, and that the Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance has invited Holtec to bring high-level nuclear waste to property between Carlsbad and Hobbs, New Mexico, the Laguna Gatuna site, which is land stolen from the Mescalero Apache people and is ancestral lands of the Hopi Tribe.

I want to recognize today's public meeting is taking place in the context of the current resurgent Black Lives Matter movement, as well as efforts to defund police and invest those monies into healthy communities across the U.S.

There is a national conversation happening right now about institutionalized and structural systemic racism. We must place the draft EIS with Holtec and this proposed project in this context.

This project, which would bring highlevel radioactive waste to one of the poorest states in the nation and the only majority minority state, is clearly environmental racism in action.

Therefore, the draft EIS is grossly inadequate when it determines that, quote, "There

would be disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations," unquote.

Regarding cumulative impacts, the NRC draft EIS is grossly inadequate in its assessment of cumulative impacts. I was just down there, and again, how heavy a price southeast New Mexico has paid from oil and gas drilling and potash mining, plus the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Urenco.

The area is devastated environmentally and the air quality is poor in rural areas, and New Mexico has suffered from the nuclear industry more than any other between uranium mining, the Trinity tests, the Manhattan Project, the West Lake Landfill, and nuclear warheads at Kirtland Air Force Base.

Taken together, the cumulative impacts of adding high-level radioactive waste to New Mexico are extremely large. For the NRC to determine they would be small is frankly ludicrous and ignores the history of this state and of this country.

Holtec's reputation in New Jersey, I want to bring to the NRC's attention that Holtec International is based in Camden, New Jersey. I grew up in New Jersey and I still have family there.

We know that Holtec's CEO Kris Singh has been widely criticized for accepting generous tax

breaks while disparaging Camden workers. We know that Camden residents and workers, the majority African American, have organized multiple protests against Holtec as a bad neighbor.

Also, if you look up employee reviews of Holtec on indeed. com, you will see dozens of comments from current and former employees who complain about an overbearing culture that minimizes safety and minimizes adequate training.

Holtec is not equipped to safely handle such deadly radioactive waste, and it would ignore and not preserve the environment or protect the people.

We also know that Holtec lied on a federal application, failing to reveal it had been banned from federal contracts. Holtec's track record is not a trustworthy one.

Regarding the NRC's impact significance levels, NRC defines large impact as, quote, "clearly noticeable and are sufficient to destabilize important attributes in the resource," unquote.

The impacts from high-level radioactive waste should trigger the NRC to create a new category called EXTRA-LARGE in all uppercase letters because the impacts will be so significant. The waste will

be deadly for up to millions of years.

The NRC calls the Holtec proposal, proposed project benign. If it's so benign, why move the waste from where it is currently held? We know it's not benign, but rather it is extremely deadly to life, air, land, water, and future generations.

The NRC failed in its mandate and did not adequately assess the environmental impact this project would have. The NRC motto is Protecting People and the Environment. The NRC failed to do either with this 488-page waste of taxpayer funds.

The NRC assumes in the case of any accident that there would be no radioactive release, deliberately putting their heads in the sand.

Historic and cultural resources, there is ample evidence of hundreds of archeological --

(Telephonic interference.)

MS. SCHUURMAN: -- in the immediate project area that which would be permanently harmed by the Holtec project.

MR. CAMERON: I'm going to have to ask you to stop because you're at the five-minute level, and you're raising important issues, and I certainly hope that you will submit those issues in writing to the NRC, but thank you for spending the time. And

now we're going to see if we have Scott Kovac, Ian Zabarte, or Teresa Seamster on the phone.

MR. KOVAC: Yes, Scott Kovac here.

MR. CAMERON: Oh, great.

MR. KOVAC: Thank you, members of the NRC. My name is Scott Kovac with Nuclear Watch New Mexico. First off, I'd like to say that this whole idea is just a regional development scheme, and I'm all for jobs in our region and for developing, you know, futures.

You know, the Eddy-Lea Alliance are putting a quite heavy burden on the back of the people of New Mexico. You know, we're collecting spent nuclear fuel from around the country and bringing it to New Mexico, and, you know, there's got to be a better way for regional development in this area because we certainly need it.

And I might just add that the current plan is illegal without a permit repository in place. You know, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act states that, you know, the permanent repository must be in place before any consolidated interim source sites are approved, and so, you know, we need to know how the NRC is going to deal with that question.

Also, transportation issues must be

NEAL R. GROSS

covered more thoroughly, and we need to have additional hearings in transportation centers around the country. Thank you. I appreciate that.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much, Scott, for those comments, and let me see if either Teresa Seamster or Ian Zabarte have been able to get on. Ian, are you out there?

Okay, we're going to go to the next group and we'll see if we can catch up with some of the people who did not get on later.

Our next group is Kevin Kamps from Beyond Nuclear, Diane D'Arrigo, Nuclear Information Resource Service, Leona Morgan, Nuclear Issues Study Group, John Heaton from the Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance, and Karen Hadden from the SEED Coalition.

So, if you can use star, zero, we're going to try to get you all on, and we're going to begin with Kevin. Kevin, have you been able -- are you able to join us?

MR. ZABARTE: This is Ian Zabarte.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, we'll get to you later, Kevin. Let's hear Ian. Go ahead, Ian.

MR. ZABARTE: Yes, this is Ian Zabarte.

I'm the Principal Man of the Western Bands of the
Shoshone Nation of Indians and the Secretary of the

Native Community Action Council, a party with standing in the NRC Yucca Mountain licensing proceedings.

The Western Bands of the Shoshone Nation of Indians support the no action alternative. Shoshone are Comanche. You might be familiar with the region you're in, which my family and people have been there for thousands of years.

Nuclear waste at the proposed Holtec site will remain there permanently. Exposure and risk benefit must be made based upon that eventuality. No one should be burdened with radiation exposure without first knowing what their past exposure from nuclear testing nearby is, including releases from the WIPP site in the accident a couple of years ago.

In the DEIS 3.3.2, transportation from nuclear power plants, the ISFSI, to a permanent repository, the DEIS 3.1 and 3.2 solid waste, the DEIS 4.3.1.2.5 refueling, the DEIS 8.3.2.1 economic and other costs, these will apply to those.

In the DEIS, the nature of this facility is misrepresented as interim. That is false. With no other repository, the Holtec site will be a permanent repository tied to the Yucca Mountain proposed site as -- in the Western Bands of the

Shoshone Nation of Indians.

This means the master title plots of the Bureau of Land Management -- record of the United States. The Department of Energy cannot prove ownership of the Yucca Mountain site --

(Telephonic interference.)

MR. ZABARTE: The Holtec site should be called the consolidated permanent stage facility throughout the DEIS, disrupting the legal status of the Yucca Mountain ownership by the Western Bands of the Shoshone Nation of Indians.

Yucca Mountain is unconstitutional because the Treaty of Ruby Valley trumps statute 689 to 692 as controlling under the treaty Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution, Title VI, Section 2.

The NRC admitted that the DOE has not met the requirements of 10 CFR 62.121, ownership, in the NRC Yucca Mountain safety evaluation report four.

New Mexico should, if at all, receive funds --

(Telephonic interference.)

MR. ZABARTE: -- long term. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Ian.

Kevin, Kevin, are you -- can you join us?

MR. KAMPS: Yeah, can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah, yeah, we got you. Go

NEAL R. GROSS

ahead.

MR. KAMPS: Excellent, thank you. My name is Kevin Kamps. I serve as a radioactive waste specialist at Beyond Nuclear. I'm also on the board of directors at Don't Waste Michigan.

My first comment I would like to make is that I had tremendous difficulty and was never able to get onto the webinar, so I have to wonder how many others have had that problem, and as Eileen O'Shaughnessy mentioned, there have been plenty of problems with the phone connection as well, unfortunately, so I hope July 9 goes better than this.

So, my first comment has to do with transportation. I protest NRC's woefully inadequate and nearly nonexistent treatment of highly radioactive waste transportation risks.

This violates the long-established legal requirement under the National Environmental Policy Act that NRC take a hard look at the Holtec CISF proposal, including its inexplicably linked high-risk transportation component impacting most states in the lower 48.

The maps that the NRC cites in its DEIS done by the Department of Energy in 2008, the final supplemental EIS on the Yucca Mountain scheme

targeting western Shoshone lands are extensive, and the state of Nevada has made them much more user friendly, and the NRC has completely failed to make this transparent to the public.

Also, for its part, Holtec's environmental report accounts only for routes from four of 131 reactors in this country, three in San Onofre, California and one at Maine Yankee. That's not acceptable that NRC's DEIS did not even include this sole inadequate map.

NRC's DEIS and Holtec's ER essentially excluding the high risks of transportation and not even being transparent about the transportation routes represents segmentation, the dividing up of a major federal action into smaller parts so that the proposal doesn't seem so significant or impactful after all.

This is a violation of NEPA as long ruled by the federal courts. There is no magic wand to simply teleport the wastes out to New Mexico.

My next comment has to do with whistleblower revelations about the Holtec containers. Whistleblowers, namely Oscar Shirani at Commonwealth Edison Exelon, and Dr. Ross Landsman at NRC Region III first revealed widespread quality

assurance violations by Holtec in the design and fabrication of its containers in the early 2000s.

Neither Holtec nor NRC have rectified this problem much or at all ever since. Thus, Shirani questions the integrity of the Holtec containers sitting still going zero miles per hour, let alone going 60 miles per hour or faster down the railroad tracks and subject to the extreme forces of severe accidents.

Dr. Landsman compared NRC's decision making to that of NASA's which led to space shuttles hitting the ground.

Holtec's CEO, Krishna Singh, also attempted to bribe Shirani and Landsman into silence about these quality assurance violations. They refused and rejected his bribe offer, and continued to blow the whistle.

And I have to point out that NRC, during the environmental scoping phase, treated my raising this comment as an allegation. They took four months to investigate it, they said. They came back with a single sheet with prompts that essentially said, "Bribery is not our department. We suggest you take it up with the Department of Justice." That is not an acceptable response from the NRC.

And my final area of comment has to do with environmental justice, and I would like to highlight a really terrific map done by Deborah Reed, a photographer based in Santa Fe.

And I am looking at it right now, and its title is Water, Air, and Land: A Sacred Trust. It's a map of New Mexico showing the nuclear, and fossil fuel, and other hazardous industries, and it is nightmarish.

And other speakers before me have done a terrific job of describing the nuclear history of New Mexico, the disproportionate burden to the majority minority state that New Mexico is.

That was a trick that NRC played to find no environmental justice impacts was to compare southeastern New Mexico to the rest of New Mexico as a whole, and that, of course, is trickery.

The high percentage of Native Americans and Latino population in the state should be compared to the rest of the country is but one example that uses Holtec containers that could be shipped out to New Mexico, the state of Vermont at Vermont Yankee. Those are the kind of comparisons for an environmental justice comparison that need to be done.

MR. CAMERON: Kevin, I'm going to have

to ask you to stop now at five minutes, and I hope that that map -- that map may be helpful to the NRC, but thank you for bringing all of that to their attention. Thank you very much.

And Diane, Diane D'Arrigo, Diane, are you on the phone? Hit star, zero if you're trying to get to us. Well, we'll go back and see if Diane can join us, but let's see if Leona Morgan can join us. Leona, can you get on the line?

MS. D ARRIGO: Hello?

MR. CAMERON: Hi, is that Leona or Diane?

MS. D ARRIGO: This is Diane D'Arrigo.

MR. CAMERON: Hi, Diane. We can hear

you. Go ahead.

MS. D ARRIGO: Do I need to speak really loudly? I can't tell whether the connection is happening.

MR. CAMERON: We can hear you.

MS. D|ARRIGO: Is it my turn?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, it is.

MS. D'ARRIGO: This is Diane D'Arrigo.

I'm with the Nuclear Information and Resource

Service. I am a chemist and environmental scientist

who has been tracking the nuclear waste issue since

the late 1970s, including centralized interim storage

by its various other names over the decades, and the consequences to communities that have brought in high-level radioactive waste.

New Mexico does have a significant amount of nuclear industry, weapons and the enrichment facility. However, the amount of radioactivity that would be coming into Holtec would be over 90 percent of all of the radioactivity in the entire nuclear power and weapons fuel chain.

It would be waste from the core of nuclear reactors, which is the very hottest part of the fuel chain, and it's much hotter from reactor cores because the fuel is kept in the cores for a longer amount of time than it is in a weapons reactor.

So, the commercial nuclear waste that would be coming to New Mexico is over 90 percent of all of the radioactivity in the entire power and weapons fuel chain, and I think that's really important when one considers that the state already has nuclear industries and nuclear knowledge.

What we're talking about is moving all of this material, vast, exponentially more radioactivity, long-lasting some, they are biologically active coming over roads and rails for potentially 40 or more years to get it all there, and

it will be coming in containers, although they have been touted to be robust, are actually not even designed to meet the real road and rail conditions.

And this was agreed to by the lawyers for these CIS projects in the hearings that took place, that the conditions that the canisters are designed to meet are less than they will encounter on the roads, rails, and waterways. So, the transport issue does need to be fully considered.

The environmental impact statement draft is illegal in several ways. One is that the entire consolidated interim storage concept is not legal under federal law under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

But with regard to the National Environmental Policy Act, there was supposed to be a full consideration of the options for the irradiated fuel for the project, and the NRC in the DEIS did not look at the possibility of not having a CIS, a Consolidated Interim Storage Facility.

They only looked at various locations for consolidated interim storage facility, but not at not having them, which is a bit ironic because it's not even legal to have them anyway. So, it's a violation of NEPA to have ignored the other alternatives and to have segmented the environmental impact statement.

It's wrong for the environmental impact statement, although it was stated earlier that the NRC looked at including all of the phases, but the project is only being licensed for 40 years without the review, a full review of the likely possibility that the waste will be there beyond 40 years and assuming that there will be funding from somewhere to take care of it when in fact there is no guarantee for that.

So, bringing in waste that's hazardous literally into the millions of years for which there is no permanent location, and claiming that it's temporary and only looking at 40 years is irresponsible.

We also would request -- thank you for the extension on comments thus far, the extra time, but during the COVID crisis, we do need to -- we're calling for a suspension on all of the activities that are involving public participation until the cessation of this crisis, and an additional six months is what we've asked for with the entire Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

And the NRC said the response they got from the Commission was that this should be considered on a case by case basis, so this is the case by case

request to this particular activity that the extension on comments until the end of COVID crisis.

And as I believe was asked for by others, additional public meetings regard this draft environmental impact statement in communities through which the waste would travel.

You can't segment the transport from the rest of the environmental impact statement and claim it was covered under other NRC processes when in fact this is in and of itself the cause for the transport.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Diane. I'm going to just have to ask you to stop right now, but thank you for those comments. Thank you very much. And let's see if -- Leona, are you there, Leona Morgan?

MS. MORGAN: Yes, can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can. Go ahead.

MS. MORGAN: Thanks, Chip. So, just to continue in the same vein as Diane, I'd like to start with some comments about this meeting and additional hearings.

The hearings that have been scheduled so far are those webinars that have been plagued with a lot of technical issues and are also not accessible to the public.

In order to make comments, you have to have both a working computer to follow the slides, as well as a working phone line as opposed to attending in-person meetings.

We know that the NRC had five meetings in New Mexico during the last comment period, and we request that you hold these same five meetings at least six months after there has been a proven vaccine for the COVID-19 sickness.

And in addition to the five hearings in New Mexico to be scheduled in person as soon as it's safe to gather in the future, we also ask also six months after there is a vaccine available, that the NRC schedule meetings in transportation hubs that would be impacted by the transport either by rail or areas near ports that might be used for barges.

In addition to the five hearings in New Mexico and other hearings around the country, I think the NRC needs to schedule maybe a few more webinars that will be more technically available, as well as without any of the issues that we've had here today.

Okay, so going into my comments about the actual DEIS, the DEIS has many false statements regarding the impacts to various resources. It categorizes all of the impacts as small or moderate,

and I don't think that the NRC has looked at any third-party information or really studied some of the impacts to cultural resources, historical and archaeological resources, because if you had done proper studies, you would know that the impacts are large, and as we heard earlier, even extra large.

So, I would like to say that most of the comments, I would like to reiterate the comments about the Governor, our State Lane Commissioner, and other elected officials who have voiced concern about the project. That needs to be included in the statements on the draft environmental impact statement.

In addition, our area in New Mexico that we're looking at is being considered. As you heard earlier, people were talking about this as an energy sector.

To build a brand-new nuclear waste dump is not economic diversity. This is actually causing increasing cumulative impacts from the nuclear industry that have not been considered in the draft environmental impact statement.

The DEIS should consider the cumulative impacts of not just the levels of radiation, but the transport and use of the area currently with ongoing oil and gas development and potash mining, as well as

other nuclear facilities, including the WIPP site,
Urenco, and a possible new consolidated interim
storage facility in Andrews, Texas County.

We in the Nuclear Issues Study Group will submit written comments and attach these statements from the Governor and other elected officials as were mentioned.

Lastly, I just want to conclude that this is an example, a morrendous example of environmental racism. I think all of you are well aware that the United States is stolen land.

And as an indigenous person, I come from the Navajo Nation which has passed a law in 2012 called the Radioactive Materials and Transportation Act which prohibits the transport of any radioactive materials, except for cleanup, going across the Navajo Nation, and this includes any transport by rail of waste and other radioactive materials.

And so for the transport to occur, this would violate the Navajo Nation's sovereignty to protect its people, and its land, and its resources against any more further radioactive contamination that was caused by uranium mining, processing, and other nuclear facilities and activities.

So, I want to say thank you to the NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

for hearing the comments, but it is a very inadequate process that you've created here to hear the comments online, as well as limiting the voice of the people who are really going to be affected, not just the people in New Mexico, but nationwide along the railroad route.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

MS. MORGAN: Yes, thank you.

MR. CAMERON: We said we were going to take a break at 7:30. We're a little bit past then, but I think we need to take a break for 15 minutes and come back at five minutes to 8:00, and when we do come back, we're going to go to John Heaton, Karen Hadden, Rod McCullum, and Sister Rose Marie Cecchini.

So, we'll start off with those four people, but thank all of you who have comments so far, and we'll just keep going, but let's come back here at five minutes to 8:00, five minutes to 6:00 Mountain Time, sorry. Okay, let's take a break.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 7:39 p.m. and resumed at 7:55 p.m.)

MR. CAMERON: Hello, everyone. We're ready to get started again, and I think we have a mind on how to make things smoother the next time

when we get together on July 9 because we all won't have to go through the delays, so that's good.

Right now, we're going to go to several people, and we're going to start with Dave McCoy, and then we'll go to John Heaton, Karen Hadden, Rob McCullum, and Sister Rose Marie Cecchini, and we're still going to use the star, zero to get on, and I wonder, Dave McCoy, are you there? We got an indication that Dave McCoy --

MR. MCCOY: Yes, hello?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, is this Dave?

MR. MCCOY: Yes, it is. I'm Dave McCoy. I'm a Director for Citizen Action New Mexico. Our organization has dealt with issues of nuclear waste for some 20 years now in the state of New Mexico. We're Albuquerque based.

The problem with the DEIS is that it is a 40-year analysis when the actual time period, at least by the application from Holtec, could run 120 years, and so that's an inadequate analysis to begin with for the environmental impacts.

The storage of spent fuel in the facility will likely force New Mexico to provide for its permanent disposal. There is no repository that's been selected or even a valid selection process that's

ongoing. Yucca Mountain is not in the cards right now. So, once this waste gets here, it won't leave, and there is major problems with the temporary storage of spent nuclear fuel here.

First of all, the half-inch thick canisters used for dry storage are subject to various failures, including chloride-induced stress corrosion cracking that can create a leak in as little as 16 years.

So far, there is inadequate analysis to have any confidence that permanent isolation can be provided over a million years and more that the fuel is going to be radiotoxic.

There is no backup plan for what happens to this waste after it is stored in New Mexico. There is no backup for how containers that are damaged by gamma radiation with leaking fuel elements can be moved.

The review of criticality risks, I think I found one reference that used the word criticality. That hasn't been analyzed at all adequately. The subject of hydrogen gas explosions that can occur from water entering into damaged spent fuel containment has not been adequately addressed.

The selection criteria for this location

was completely bogus. It was private land. The presence of utilities, the rail spur, and other government land around the area that were the selection criteria.

The choice was not environmentally based.

It was based on developers that want to make some money and who don't represent the New Mexico public to the extent that they claim they do.

There is a conflict of resource lands in this area, especially with respect to oil, gas, and potash mining, which is one the world's richest potash sites and provides 80 percent of the agricultural needs to the U.S.

But the plan here is really to get the federal government out of having to make payments to the utility companies of some \$500 a year for onsite storage, so we want to leave New Mexico holding the bag of risks as a permanent repository and being a national sacrifice zone.

There are several technical issues that have not been resolved at all. The high burn-up of fuel acceptance by Holtec is extremely problematic from the standpoint of the containment.

There's an issue of whether the concrete containers would be acceptable for their current size

from Holtec to any kind of deeper geological repository that might be open in the future.

There's an issue of economic costs of continued dry storage at reactor sites versus the transportation and storage costs at Holtec, and then there's runaway deterioration of spent fuel cladding.

There is the past history of accidents that have occurred in New Mexico, the WIPP fire explosions. There are transportation infrastructure issues that have not been resolved at all from the standpoint of the rails particularly.

And I know you never will discuss it publicly, but we're living in an unstable society right now. There are riots going on all around the country. There could be terrorist attacks on the transportation of spent fuel. The rails, for example, all it takes is a blowtorch to warp the rails so that a train could be derailed.

And whether or not there would be a release of radiation is beside the point. It would such up so much police power and military power that you could have all kinds of problems continuing within the city where --

MR. CAMERON: And I'm going to have to ask you to stop. Thank you though for the comments,

NEAL R. GROSS

good comments, and we're going to go on now. Thank you very much.

MR. MCCOY: Okay.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, good.

John Heaton? Is John Heaton on? I think that was

John Heaton.

MR. HEATON: Am I online?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, you are.

MR. HEATON: Can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes.

MR. HEATON: Okay, again, I thank the NRC for having these public hearings and public comments.

My name --

MR. CAMERON: John, are you okay? John, we're not able to hear you. John, are you still there? You were coming in very loud and clear, and then all of a sudden, you disappeared. So, Ryan, do you have any idea what happened?

Well, I'll tell you what, he'll be back on, of course, so let's see if we can get Karen Hadden on. Karen?

MS. HADDEN: Hello, can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes.

MS. HADDEN: Great, okay, I would like to say that if the Holtec license is approved, people

NEAL R. GROSS

throughout the U.S. are going to be impacted by unnecessary dangerous transport of the nation's most deadly nuclear reactor waste. The lives of 218 million people living within 50 miles of commercial rail lines would be put at risk.

The DEIS fails to address this risk. In fact, many of the concerns raised by thousands of people in scoping comments to the NRC have been ignored.

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board judges have ignored over 100 detailed health and safety concerns backed up by experts, and there is still no plan for a hot cell at the Holtec site, a facility to repackage damaged caps or canisters.

So, the concerns raised about waste remaining at the site forever are very real. The Holtec site is not designed for long-term disposal, but could become a de facto site with massive contamination and canisters that cannot be moved to a permanent repository.

This waste is supposed to get isolated from living things, all living things for a million years, but the DEIS takes no further steps toward analyzing the risk of a de facto permanent dump site being created. In fact, it equates to putting on

blinders, which does not solve the problem or eliminate risk.

The NRC claims to be neutral and not a proponent of consolidated interim storage projects, but that's not what it looks like when you read the documents.

The DEIS provides lots of data points, but doesn't do real analysis, and comes to false conclusions proclaiming risks to be SMALL, all in capital letters. This is pseudoscience. We need real numbers, not a categorization, and we can determine for ourselves what that level of risk means.

Others have suggested the risks are extra large and that's what it looks like to me. Studies done for Yucca Mountain showed that an accident could cost up to \$9 billion for contamination remediation for a single square mile of a downtown area if there was a transportation accident, and they calculated that to be one in 10,000 trips.

Who would do the cleanup and who would pay? Who would reimburse homeowners if they lost their homes if insurance doesn't cover radioactive contamination?

The NRC is basically waving a magic wand to make very real health, safety, and security risks

appear to be nothing, but catches the deep risks and costs are real.

Local officials said they want economic development. A 100-megawatt solar facility was completed just this year in Andrews County, and it's going to bring im \$20 million in revenues to this county over the life of the project. This kind of development makes more sense than burdening the region with more muclear facilities.

Urenco and WIPP have not been good for the region or state. Somehow people have forgotten the fire at the WIPP in February 2014, followed nine days later by a radiation release on Valentine's Day.

Workers suffered smoke inhalation.

Other workers suffered radiation exposure. The cumulative impact analysis seems to ignore the fact that there was a \$2 billion price tag for remediation and delays in getting the WIPP site open again.

The DEIS is inadequate. It should be reworked, and this license should be halted until real meetings are held with the public in person after the COVID risks are over after a vaccine is in place, and the Agency should not be moving forward at all while this facility is still illegal under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. Thank you.

MR. CMERON: Thank you very much, Karen.

Thank you. Let's see if -- John Heaton, did you get back on with us? Is that you, John?

MS. ALLEN: I'm Catherine Allen. Can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: And who do we have on? Who is on, Catherine Allen?

MS. ALLEN: Catherine Allen.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, go ahead, Catherine.

MS. ALLEN: Okay, I've had a very hard time hearing anyone speak this whole time, and so I would also echo comments that have been made to wait on all of this until in-person meetings can be held. Six months after a vaccine for COVID sounds great, because I haven't been able to hear very much of what's gone on in the last three hours.

I would like to say that anything that takes 40 years to transport to us in West Texas or southeastern New Mexico is not going anywhere anytime soon, and to call this facility an interim storage facility is, as other commenters have already said, dishonest at best.

To have only looked at things 40 years into the future is incredibly shortsighted, and this is a violation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act that

says that to store this waste temporarily, a permanent repository has to be in place.

And I would just kind of shame the local representatives who are so in favor of this in the name of economic diversification. If you're that bad at your job that this is your idea of economic diversification, shame on you.

You should seek employment elsewhere.

There are life-affirming ways to diversify an economy. This is bringing death to our doorstep.

And with that, I'll turn it back over to you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Catherine.

I'd still like to see if we could get Heaton back on.

He was talking to us, and John? How about Rodney

McCullum?

MR. MCCULLUM: Chip, can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Rodney, are you there?

MR. MCCULLUM: Chip? Chip, can you hear

me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes.

MR. MCCULLUM: Hey, Chip. Thank you very much for, you know, trying to power through the challenges this pandemic has given us and holding this meeting, and I also want to thank all of the previous commenters.

I know there have been divergent views and views that are diametrically opposed, but I think they've all been stated in a thoughtful and respectful manner, and I appreciate that.

I am sure that NRC will consider all of these comments and add to what is already a very thorough record of evaluating the environmental impacts in this EIS.

It is a very impressive EIS from the standpoint of the nuclear industry, which I represent. I am from the Nuclear Energy Institute. We consider this project to be an important part of the nation's carbon-free energy infrastructure.

Nuclear provides more than 50 percent of the nation's carbon-free energy, and as climate change has already been mentioned, we believe we're a part of the solution.

One of the reasons we're clean is because we safely manage the byproducts of nuclear fission. What is in these casks are the byproducts of 60 years of carbon-free energy generation.

We have been managing them with a perfect safety record, no releases, no harm to the environment or the public for these 60 years. In the last 35 years, we've been managing them in dry cask storage

facilities very similar to the one proposed at the Holtec facility in New Mexico.

We are at a point in our industry's history where it makes sense to consolidate these materials for improved efficiency, security, and to allow the sites that have shut down their reactors to be repurposed and given back to those communities and perhaps given back to nature.

The purposes and need for this project are straightforward. It provides safe retrievable storage where nuclear material stored at these sites can be consolidated prior to a relocation to a repository. Repositories are being developed in many nations around the world. Someday that will happen in the United States.

We, as has been noted, we believe this EIS is based on sound science, and that the agencies involved have satisfied their obligations under NEPA. The recommendations both for a license and for a rail spur are sound.

Particularly notable or the most significant impact in this is the moderate impact of local finance, which was termed beneficial. So, of all of the impacts, the most significant one is beneficial. That is, I think, why it has garnered

so much support in the local community. I noticed so many of the Carlsbad and Lea and Eddy County officials were clearly familiar with this EIS.

I also appreciate the no-action alternative which has demonstrated the need for this facility in terms of the costs of doing it are less than the costs of not doing it and leaving it at many locations.

I'll close by saying the purpose of NEPA is to, you know, create considerations and deliberations that strike a balance of enjoyable harmony between man and his environment. That was actually in the NEPA Act.

And when you look at providing for carbon-free electricity and managing the byproducts of that safely and efficiently, I believe this action is all about enjoyable harmony between man and his environment.

I'm glad to be a part of the process, and
I thank all of the NRC folks there for also being a
part of the process. Thanks.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Rod. I believe John Heaton is going to be calling back in if he hasn't already. There he is.

MS. BOUDART: I'm ready with a comment

if you could give me about four minutes.

MR. HEATON: This is John Heaton.

MS. BOUDART: Oh, okay.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's hear from John, and then I think that was Sister Rose Marie?

MS. BOUDART: No, no, it was Jan. It was Jan Boudart. I'm not on the present list, but I'm thinking if I could fill in some time. Let me stop

now and listen to John.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, go ahead, John. John, are you still with us?

MR. HEATON: I don't know, am I? I'm supposed to be.

MR. CAMERON: Yes, you are. We can hear you. Go ahead.

MR. HEATON: Okay, so the GNEP Project was stopped and then the Blue Ribbon Commission met and it was -- I think that they made it clear that consolidated interim storage was a necessity in the country.

The Alliance Board, having the property in place and seeing what the BRC had done, we decided that we needed to do a serious safety investigation to assure ourselves of the safety of such a project for our area since we knew we had a great site.

We visited ISFSIs at power plants. We were given canister filling and cask transfer demonstrations. We visited canister and cask manufacturing companies and had discussions with the NRC.

We already knew a significant amount about transportation safety and transport container licensing because of WIPP, and in fact, that rail transportation is significantly safer than highway transportation.

We were convinced that the safety of the transportation system with the four layers of confinement with the cask system that's used, and combined with the NRC's own statement of a transport cask breach being one in a billion. They couldn't say zero, but it's about as close to zero as you can get.

The design of the Holtec facility is what the Alliance believes is the safest and most robust in the world. It is a subgrade impenetrable concrete fortress resistant to seismic events and attacks by military hardware or plane crashes.

Furthermore, in our four-year association with Holtec, we have found them to be absolutely ethical, honest, and they have never failed to meet

a commitment.

It's interesting that somebody brought up the New Jersey issue. You know, we do the same in the state of New Mexico. When companies want to come here, we offer them money as well to bring their company and their employment here, I think no more than what happened in New Jersey. It's exactly the same thing.

So, and people have commented about this being an illegal facility. I want to remind people that the private fuel storage facility which was all private was granted a license to act in license, I mean act in Utah, so there's a precedent already set for this.

The geology of the site is well known from the WIPP geology investigation and drilling logs in the area, and also the GNEP characterization process we went through.

The site exists in the potash preservation area which only allows horizontal drilling from very specific drill islands that everybody has agreed to, BLM and the industries, as well as Sandia National Labs.

There is a 1,500 hundred foot layer of salt under the site and a 1,500 hundred foot

overburden over the salt. The first oil zone is at about 4,000 feet, and horizontal or fracking below 3,000 feet has zero impact on the surface, and there is no impact on the oil and gas industry or on ranching.

Finally, a limited environmental conflict analysis was done by Eddy-Lea early to discover any obvious environmental conflicts with the site. The analysis resulted in the same conclusion as did the NRC's much more sophisticated analysis in the draft EIS.

We think this is a great project and we strongly agree and support the conclusions of the draft environmental impact statement of a small impact, and that there are no reasons for the NRC to not issue the license, and we also agree with the BLM's small impact on the four-mile rail spur that is included in this analysis. Thank you very much for letting me comment.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, John.

And I know we had Jan on, but I just want to make sure that Sister Rose Marie Cecchini gets her chance to talk. Sister, are you on? Sister Rose Marie?

Jan, are you still with us?

MS. BOUDART: Yes, I am.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. CAMERON: Well, why don't we -- go ahead.

MS. BOUDART: I am Jan Boudart, and I am a board member of the Nuclear Energy Information Service in Chicago. I want to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DEI statement prepared for the Eddy-Lea CIS in New Mexico.

My comments are confined to Section 3.12.3 of the EIS titled Radiation Protection Standards. It is very hard to convert the sterile language of this paragraph into terms that apply to human beings.

In fact, there seems to be no particular human situation to which it does apply. No subject recipient of radiation is mentioned. So it is -- so in its absence I am assuming reference man from the oxfordreference.com.

Thus, you are, one, referring to the cancer rate for a man between 20 and 24, five feet eight inches tall, weighing 154 pounds, who has been shown to be at the stage in the human life cycle that is least susceptible to radiation.

Two, you are ignoring all illnesses in addition to cancer caused by background, plus the small increase you claim, and three, you are not

counting the rest of the human, animal, and plant life cycles that are affected by radiation at least as much as this healthy human male. And even more affected than reference man will be the rest of all creatures' life cycles.

You don't mention that for two reference men who get cancer, three reference women, 10 little boys -- that's five per reference man -- and 20 little girls will get cancer over their lifetime. This is according to the life span study done on survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. You say nothing of the effect of radiation on the fetus of all animal species.

In addition, plants and the progeny of all biota will exhibit the effects, and you are ignoring the diaspora of radiation effects through transportation of radioactive packages through towns and cities like Chicago, where I live.

The paragraphs in Section 3.12.3 are opaque on how the biota surrounding the Holtec CIS in New Mexico will be protected on the theory that the radiation will be too small for the surrounds to need protection.

But why subject the biosphere to more radiation in the sensitive and beautiful New Mexico

countryside? As Ian Zabarte says in yesterday's letter to the Las Vegas Review-Journal, radioactive fallout destroyed the delicate high desert flora and fauna, creating huge vulnerabilities where noxious and invasive plant species took hold.

This ends my comment on Section 3.12.3, Radiation Protection Standards. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Jan. Thank you for that.

I am going to see if we could get Sister Rose Marie on.

SISTER CECCHINI: Yes, this is Sister Rose Marie.

MR. CAMERON: Hey, Great Sister.

SISTER CECCHINI: Can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: We can hear you. Go ahead.

SISTER CECCHINI: Can you --

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can.

SISTER CECCHINI: Okay. Well, good evening, everyone. Thank you, NRC, for this opportunity to make comments on the environmental impact statement.

I am Sister Rose Cecchini, Director of the Office of Life, Peace, Justice, and Creation with Catholic Charities in Gallup Diocese, and I am

speaking on behalf of concerned people of faith in McKinley, communities San Juan, and Cibola in Counties who are very concerned and strongly opposed to Holtec's plan to transport 100,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste from nuclear reactors across the country, and 10,000 railway shipments through 44 states to be deposited in a proposed consolidated temporary facility storage in southeastern New Mexico.

Now, the proposed nuclear fuel casks will be traveling through the center of Gallup as well as many of the communities in the counties I have listed.

As people of faith we're committed to promoting and safeguarding the well-being of all people, communities, wildlife, water, land, air, and the natural environment. Our religious traditions teach us that creation is God-given, it's sacred, intended for the well-being and flourishing of all human and planetary life.

Consequently the proposed Holtec project really needs to be critiqued within a much larger context of our current reality. We are in the midst of a national and global coronavirus pandemic while witnessing increasing evidence of the climate crisis as never before. We are faced with the glaring

reality that we as humans at every level are dependent for our lives on the larger biological ecological community of life.

Human health, well-being, and economic development are all interrelated and cannot possibly continue apart from the health of all other organic forms of life that we humans depend on for our very existence.

Without moral, ethical, and environmental accountability, justice NRC regulations will adversely impact the lives, health, and well-being of millions of people, thousands of communities as well as actually permitting the irreversible radioactive contamination οĒ land, water, air, and environment contributing to worsening climate change.

We have grave concerns and really fact-based reasons for our position to the proposed Holtec interim project, which are not addressed adequately at the EIS.

Holtec's thin-walled canisters containing high-level radioactive waste have serious engineering design flaws. These stainless steel thin-walled canisters are only one-half to five-eights inch thick and have defective flaws.

The thin-walled canisters are welded

shut, cannot be imspected, maintained, monitored, or repaired as NRC regulations require. They are vulnerable to short-term cracking and major radioactive leaks. At the Koeberg Nuclear Plant in South Africa, Holtec's thin-walled canisters cracked and leaked in 17 years.

Secondly, overweight nuclear fuel casks transported by rail, as has been stated, pose serious threats to millions of people, thousands of communities along railway lines and the natural environment.

Holtec's transport cask is heavier than all other cask systems with bounding loaded weight of 225 U.S. tons, making it 40 percent heavier than a loaded railway car's maximum weight in the U.S., which is 140 U.S. tons.

So given the poor conditions of road, rail, and bridge infrastructure, the national transportation risks endangering every community along the route, posing threats to millions of people, thousands of communities, scores of major cities along the railways in 44 states.

For example, on May 19th, 2018, in Alexandria, Virginia, 30 freight cars of the CSX train came off the tracks and crashed to the ground below

after a partial bridge collapse.

routine radioactive Also, shine, deliberate accidents, attacks would or disproportionately impact poor minority communities.

The Holtec Eddy-Lea Counties area largely Hispanic, and these communities will impacted significantly. This raises our concerns about environmental racism.

assured (phonetic) of Holtec's Next, HI-STORM CIS storage systems' flawed design is not safe in New Mexico environment. This above-ground concrete lid requires air vents for convection cooling of the nuclear fuel waste.

particles, Water. corrosive creatures can enter through air vents and initiate microscopic cracks in the canisters. These particles continue to build up, increasing corrosion cracking risks, and the concrete structure cannot be adequately inspected for structure problems yet is subject to higher corrosion.

There are no drains in the bottoms of the concrete holes. Water, soil, other materials can build up, block the air vent pipe opening near the bottom of the concrete hole, and if this opening is blocked, canisters of nuclear fuel can overheat, and even the Nuclear Regulatory Commission admits that if water enters the canister a nuclear chain reaction can occur.

We have many other concerns, and thank you for this opportunity.

MR. CAMERON: Great. Thank you, Sister.

Okay. Now I have four more names for next speakers. Ome is Cindy Wheeler, Carol Merrill, Steve Nesbit, and David Kraft.

If you could do the *0 and see if you can get in the queue, we would love to hear from you, and I'll check to see if Cindy is on.

And while we are waiting for Cindy, let me see if Carol Merrill has joined us. *0.

(Pause.)

MR. CAMERON: Is someone on the line?
How about Steve Nesbit?

MS. WHEELER: Hello, can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes. Are you Cindy?

MS. WHEELER: Yes. Hello. I am Cynthia Wheeler. I live in Santa Fe, New Mexico. I grew up in Roswell.

I appreciate the extra time the NRC is giving the public to submit concerns.

I heard from my southeast New Mexican

neighbors a lot of comments that confused technology with science, and I want to clarify.

You say you believe in science, as I do, but what you are really talking about is technology. Technology cannot change the laws of physics, and it's the laws of physics that limit the safety of this project.

I hear the confusion people have about science when they claim they are reassured that the waste isn't a liquid. Radioactive waste is composed of subatomic particles and energy releases. It doesn't matter what the form of the liquid is.

So there is no compelling purpose or need for interim storage. Moving the waste only creates exponentially more risk of radioactive exposure to Americans and their property, and it simply moves it.

The only way to describe a project that moves dangerous waste for no compelling reason is that of a shell game. Shell games are supposed to fool rubes. New Mexicans are not rubes, and we aren't fooled.

The DEIS does not reassure. It is strangely silent about how the waste will be transported and admits it has not details for the routes it will use.

Well-documented history of bribery, lies, and being banned from doing business with government agencies, is more than baffling. You are considering licensing this company to do the most exacting and dangerous work possible. Your own specialist in nuclear cask safety, Dr. Landsman, describes Holtec as having no quality assurance.

Holtec wants to hold this dangerous and long-lived waste in canisters of less than one inch thickness when the international standard is 10 to 19 inches. Nothing in the DEIS explains the wisdom of allowing a private company with integrity problems to use a substandard canister.

Because we know nuclear waste storage is dangerous, we keep passing it on from one generation to the next, up from one state to the next, including a state like New Mexico that didn't make it and didn't benefit from the energy it produced.

Dr. Jonas Salk, inventor of the polio vaccine, said our greatest responsibility is to be good ancestors. Using his wisdom as my guide, I must state that we do not consent to store commercial nuclear waste in New Mexico.

Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. Thank you very much. Nice to hear Dr. Salk's name.

And who do we have on? Is that Steve Nesbitt?

MR. KRAFT: This is Dave Kraft. I don't know if you can hear me.

MR. CAMERON: Oh, yeah, David. Go ahead. We can hear you.

MR. KRAFT: Okay. Good evening, Chip. How are you?

MR. CAMERON: I am good.

MR. RAFT: I am Dave Kraft. I am director of Nuclear Energy Information Service based in Chicago, Illinois.

A couple weeks ago, our organization turned 39, and during that period we have been watch dogging both the nuclear industry and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. So our experience with all of this process is much different than a lot of what we have heard on the call tonight.

I want to compliment and thank Senator

Jeff Steinborn for recognizing that this process is

supposed to be about a national -- a component of the

national nuclear waste infrastructure and not merely

a beneficial economic development project for

southeastern New Mexico, and because he recognized it as a national issue, I feel very comfortable in pointing out the flaws in the DEIS that you have really neglected the rest of the nation when it comes to the transportation issue.

We have 10,000 or 11,000 tons of high-level rad waste here in Illinois that we would love to get rid of, but we want it disposed of permanently and responsibly and only shipped once.

We are not going to solve our problem by dumping it on somebody else in New Mexico because they are poorer. So the fact that the DEIS probably did not involve the citizenry and the state agencies of every state involved in the transportation route down to the Holtec facility shows that there is a glaring lack of due diligence on the part of the NRC to bring that testimony into the DEIS itself.

Second point is we have a -- we would really contest the finding that it's a small to moderate socioeconomic impact on the state of New Mexico. We recall in the late 1980s, early '90s, that a homeowner, property owner, along the route of the WIPP facility successfully sued the DOE for \$300,000 because of the negative impact just being on the route had on his property.

I doubt that the DEIS has examined the socioeconomic impact on property values for every homeowner along the proposed rail or trucking routes for this project, and if you haven't, then, again, you have not done due diligence, and the socioeconomic impact is not small or moderate.

Our third point is the issue of the high burn-up fuel that is likely to be taken into the facility over time. The license is supposed to be for 40 years, but we have heard some people tonight mention that this could go on for as much as 120 years.

And we do know that the nuclear industry and the utilities want to increase the burn-up even beyond what is already happening with reactor fuel.

My guess is that this DEIS has not taken into account the high burn-up rates of fuel that could be enriched as much as 10 or 20 percent, which changes both the thermal load on the fuel and the radioactive inventory of contents of that fuel.

That invalidates any calculations you've already done on transportation safety and on the long-term viability and safety of the facility if you're going to go out to 120 years.

My final point, though, is a beef I've

different.

had with the NRC for a long time, and that is that you folks analyze these projects as if they were car accidents or, you know, a potential for fire hazard for a home, as if they were a normal accident that could take place when not being honest enough to recognize that a nuclear accident is qualitatively

It's what's known in the statistics world And because there is no mathematics as a black swan. that really captures accurately and truthfully what a black swan inclident is, a DEIS is just a set of assumptions and a bunch of calculations and this is what you came out with. That should not be confused with a pronouncement that this project is safe in the long term or that it would have certain outcomes, and until you recognize and are honest about the fact that the mathematics can't do the job that you're talking about, this process is really a fraud.

Now it's interesting. I believe one of the speakers earlier had talked about a checkered history of the nuclear industry in New Mexico. would like to point out that the largest radioactive release of human radiation in North American history will be observed on July 16th next month, and that took place at Church Rock, New Mexico, and as was

also previously pointed out, in 2014 the WIPP facility burped at the tune of \$2 billion for cleanup.

Now, if the folks in southeastern New Mexico were to have to pay for that, I think they would understand that these radiation issues are national in scope and not just local economic projects.

You may be getting economic benefits, but there are folks down the line in the rest of the country that are paying the price, whether it's in taxes or remediation of accidents that cost up to \$2 billion.

So we will go into some detail when we submit these comments in writing. But we at least wanted to get that much on the record tonight.

And I guess my last point was an interesting one on the transportation that the representative from NEI brought out, talking about rail transport being safer than truck transport.

That may be true. But a year or so ago, the American Society of Engineers evaluated the Illinois rail network and gave it a D rating and then went on to say that that was higher than the national average.

So if you're comfortable with trains

running at a D mimus or F evaluation of the American Society of Civil Engineers, well, in Illinois we call that the cream of the crap, and that's just not satisfactory for transporting high-level radioactive waste.

Thanks for listening and appreciate the time.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, David.

Carol are you on? Carol Merrill.

Is Steve Nesbit on?

MR. NESBIT: Yes, Chip. This is Steve.

Can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can. Welcome.

MR. NESBIT: Thanks, Chip. I am Steve Nesbit, the vice president of the American Nuclear Society, and on behalf of the society's 11,000 nuclear professionals, I am pleased to provide comments on the draft environmental impact statement for the proposed Lea County spent nuclear fuel storage facility.

The draft NRC environmental impact statement is a thorough evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposed facility and related actions.

I'd like to make a couple of specific points.

First, the American Nuclear Society agrees with the NRC that public and occupational health impacts would be small. That position is supported by decades of experience with safe storage and transportation to which earlier speakers have alluded. Also, it's consistent with the review and evaluation by American Nuclear Society nuclear waste professionals.

Second, I'd like to observe the development and operation of a consolidated interim storage facility would be a positive step for the management of used fuel in the United States as well as providing economic benefits for the folks in the vicinity of the facility.

Once again, I appreciate the Nuclear Regulatory Commission putting together a good quality document. I found it to be comprehensive and thorough, and I appreciate what you're doing in terms of ensuring that there's adequate public input on this issue.

Thanks again for the opportunity to comment.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Steve. Thank you for those comments, and I'll try one more time for Carol.

Carol Merrill? Carol?

Okay. We are going to go on. Maybe Carol will join us later. But let's see if we can get Wallace Taylor, Tomas Trujillo, Stephen Picha, and Judy Smith on.

So let's give them time to do the *0 and see if we can get them on. Wallace Taylor, Trujillo, Stephen Picha, and Judy Smith.

(Pause.)

MR. TAYLOR: This is Wally Taylor. Can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, Wally. We can.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

MR. TAYLOR: I am an attorney. I am representing the Sierra Club.

As Camilla Feibelman told you earlier, the Sierra Club has thousands of members and supporters in New Mexico including members who live in Eunice, Hobbs, and Carlsbad. So we are not the outsiders we are accused of being by the local officials.

The first comment I want to make is that in response to the local officials' comments that we heard earlier, it seemed to me that they really did

NEAL R. GROSS

not address aspects of the draft EIS, which is what we are here about. They were simply cheerleading for the project, which they are entitled to do in their capacity.

But that is not the purpose of this meeting and the purpose of the comments that we are supposed to be hearing today. So I trust that the NRC will not give those comments a lot of weight in reviewing the EIS when you prepare the final draft.

The other comment I want to make concerns the review of alternatives. NEPA is clear that the agency that's doing the EIS, in this case the NRC, must evaluate all reasonable alternatives and make it a thorough reasonable evaluation.

What the draft EIS in this case did was reject an alternative called hardened onsite storage, or HOS for short. They rejected it because it is allegedly a generalized concept, according to them, and the NRC has not reviewed detailed plans.

But HOS has been a well-described plan since at least 2003, and there have been numerous reports and studies examining HOS and determining that it is a valid alternative.

And HOS is not a complex idea. It consists of a dry storage module placed on a concrete

pad surrounded by a conical mound of dirt, gravel, and rocks, and sealed on top with a steel or concrete cap, and this facility would be near or on the site of an existing reactor. So it wouldn't have to be transported. You wouldn't have these thousands and thousands of tons of waste being moved across the country.

So the NRC has had plenty of time and ability to review and analyze the practicality of HOS. Furthermore, Sierra Club presented HOS as an alternative that should be considered in our petition to intervene in the NRC proceedings back in September of 2018.

The NRC claimed it has not reviewed HOS.

It is, therefore, not -- and is therefore not a viable alternative.

That is a problem of the NRC's own making.

NEPA requires the agency to make a thorough review of alternatives. In this case, that would mean the NRC should undertake a review of HOS.

An alternative can be rejected, according to the courts, only if the agency can give plausible reasons for rejection, and the NRC has not done that.

The DEIS also claims that HOS was rejected as an alternative because it would not

satisfy the purpose and need for the project. In other words, only a CIS facility will satisfy the purpose and need as expressed in the DEIS.

But the purpose and need statement cannot be defined so narrowly that only one alternative will satisfy it. The courts have been clear on that. The real purpose and need for this project is to accommodate long-term storage of nuclear waste, and HOS can accomplish that purpose.

As the DEIS itself says at page 1-2, the purpose of the proposed Holtec CISF is to provide an option for storing spent nuclear fuel from nuclear power reactors before a permanent repository is available. There is nothing in that statement that demands that the storage be away from the reactor site.

So in order to avoid all of the problems that previous speakers have mentioned about having this so-called interim storage site in New Mexico, which could very well be a permanent repository without the protections of a permanent repository, the DEIS must give a hard look at the alternative of HOS.

So we would ask that the NRC revise this analysis in the final EIS. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much, Wally.

Mr. Trujillo, are you on?

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Mr. Trujillo?

Stephen? Stephen Picha? I am not sure I am pronouncing your name correctly. But you could hit *0 and come on and talk to us. That would be great.

And Judy? Judy Smith?

Tomas? Stephen? Judy?

OPERATOR: Once again, if you are online, please press * then 0 at this time.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Lorraine.

Okay. Well, let's move on and maybe they will join us later, and let's go to Ellen Thomas from the Proposition Ome Campaign, Hilda Lozano, and Jack Volpato.

So Ellen, Hilda, and Jack. Jack Volpato.
*0. Hit *0 to get on.

(Pause.)

MR. CAMERON: *0 for Tomas, Stephen, Judy Smith, Ellen Thomas.

MS. THOMAS: Yes, thank you.

OPERATOR: Excuse me. Ms. Thomas has

NEAL R. GROSS

joined you.

MS. THOMAS: Can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Oh, great. Yes, Ellen, we can.

MS. THOMAS: Oh, wonderful. I am so glad that I got through.

Yeah, I am a strong proponent of the hardened onsite storage, and I really appreciate the presentation that the attorney for the Sierra Club gave us just a few minutes ago. I couldn't have said it better.

So that's all I really want to say.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, good.

That's -- so you're supporting Wally's comments on hardened onsite storage then?

MS. THOMAS: Yes. Yes. I do not want to see any more transportation of radioactive waste across our highways. We have -- there has been enough of it, and we have been lucky that there hasn't been anything happening.

But as Fukushima and Three Mile Island and Chernobyl and God knows what else will tell you, you know, that we don't know about, radioactivity is not safe, and we really need to not be spreading it around.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And there are plenty of other things that the people in New Mexico can do besides endanger the citizens that live there, particularly the indigenous people who have suffered so much from so many of the radioactive problems, from uranium mining all the way through.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Well, thank you. Thank you, Ellen. Thank you very much.

Do we have Tomas or Stephen or Judy Smith?

Hilda? Jack Volpato? Hit *0 to join us.

(Pause.)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. While we are waiting to see if they come on, we have four more people who want to comment. Not the final four but the next four.

And one of them is Michael Keegan from Don't Waste Michigan. Then we have Marvin Lewis from Philadelphia. Marvin --

MS. SMITH: Hello, this is Judy Smith.

MR. CAMERON: Hey, hi, Judy. Go ahead.

MS. SMITH: Hello?

MR. CAMERON: We can hear you. Go ahead.

MS. \$MITH: Oh, great. I am so glad.

Thank you for your time and being persistent and

trying to get me and others in. I think it's a good example of just the need for in-person, especially in a state where broadband and internet -- I am lucky I am in Albuquerque. But others aren't so lucky.

But I am Judy Smith. I am a member of a reform Jewish congregation, Congregation Albert in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and Ι represent congregation as a board member of New Interfaith Power and Light.

And I am asking to speak tonight for two reasons: my faith and my interactions with the Holtec team and the Holtec case manager at a public meeting event in southeast New Mexico more than a year ago.

And my experience left me with a very big lack of confidence. The reason I went is that my faith inspired me to travel and personally attend the meeting in southeast New Mexico because one of our wise well-known rabbis, Rabbi Hillel, said I will pray with my feet, and he said if I am not for myself who will be for me, and if I am only for myself then what am I, and if not now, when.

So I felt compelled to get educated and remember that what he also said was in a free society where wrongs exist some are guilty but all are responsible, and I felt responsibility to learn for

myself about Holtec.

And the consequence was that after meeting with the leadership manager of the Holtec project for New Mexico, sat at a roundtable with her to ask questions and be educated, I concluded it would be a very big mistake for our state.

One reason was a safety issue that I raised. I was learning about these heavy caskets to be transported by rail across highways and bridges, and I guess out of naivete or whatever I asked if there were studies of how our aging infrastructure, especially bridges, would tolerate this exceptionally heavy weight.

And the answer was oh, if that's a problem we will ship it by water. And I said really, like to where? To Texas? To Mexico? And then what? It was such a offhand remark with no depth to the answer.

Then I asked about the fact that this was being sold as a temporary solution but the contract was only for 40 years, and I noticed that that would leave New Mexico citizens or the government to pick up the tab, and it was only then that I realized that perhaps this was going to become a permanent situation. It needs to be researched as permanent, if that is the attitude of the government and the

company.

And then when I asked where -- after they showed me this amazing video -- drawings and sketches of their big proposal with all these caskets lined up safely in their little tucked-in spaces, I said well, where have they done such a thing before in the size that they were describing and the type of geology and regulations that they would face in our state.

And the answer was well, the only similar place was Ukraine. Well, I did not feel confident at all in the type of regulations and oversight for safety standards that Ukraine at that time was known for its corrupt government.

And I just ended with no confidence in this company, and I feel that others are beginning to feel the same way. And when I persisted to try to get a little bit more detail, the manager seemed very put off with me. So I was left with a very poor impression.

And I also agree, as was said, that the comment period should be extended to people who are not able to access and use technology.

Thank you so much for your time.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Judy, for relating your experience to us.

NEAL R. GROSS

And let me just try once more with Tomas
Trujillo or Stephen Picha, Hilda Lozano, or Jack
Volpato.

MR. KEEGAN: Michael Keegan here.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Michael, let's go with you since you're on. Why don't you tell us what's on your mind?

MR. KEEGAN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Cameron.

My name is Michael Keegan. I am with Don't Waste Michigan. We have been in existence for 33 years. Frequent intervenors on regional, national, state level.

Back in 2002, 2003, we had advised the NRC and Consumers Energy not to ship the Big Rock Reactor to Barnwell. We were concerned about rails breaking down.

Lo and behold, that is what happened.

Rail broke down in Michigan. Next day a train comes through. There was a derailment. A few days later, there was a breakdown of the track in South Carolina. A couple days later a train derailed.

These are heavy shipments. That was the smallest reactor in the U.S. But the weight we are talking is comparable.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

I don t have confidence in the NRC to do quality assurance. Just recently, I am looking at Brattleboro. They learned in March, early March, that there had been shipments from NorthStar of low-level waste to WCS in Texas, and the rail cars were missing 59 days. It was supposed to be there in 20 days. They went missing for 59 days.

Just within the last two weeks there was a rail car fire just outside of Chicago, low-level radioactive waste smoldering. Came from Pennsylvania into a Chicago rail yard on its way to Texas, smoldering.

There was no fire hydrant. A thousand gallons of water were used, but there was no fire hydrant available. We are talking zirconium cladding. We are talking what is questionably not low-level waste.

Just over the weekend in Vermont a heavy haul tractor carrying eight unloaded casks tipped over. It was 105 tons with several hours before the crane could arrive, the emergency crews could arrive. Shut down the highway for two days.

The quality assurance is lacking, and I am concerned about the return to sender policy. If it arrives contaminated, it gets returned to sender.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

That is not possible.

There is no dry transfer system at Holtec site in New Mexico. There is no dry transfer at any ISFSI and any nuclear plant across the nation.

You could not unload a leaking cask if you had to. There is no quality assurance. You talk about the containers are certified. If they are certified why is it going into fifteenth amendments, looking for license exemptions or license amendments 15 times on certain casks for example.

It's not tried and true. You really need to go back. The Nuclear Waste Transportation Review Board has said you're 20 years away from even considering shipping. The casks are just not there. The technology is just not there.

What are we doing considering this site when it's really just a hypothetical? This is a money-making scheme, and we are all about to get looted. I would request that an auditor general take a look at all this, and I am really concerned about what's being proposed.

So those are my comments. I will put a substantial comments in writing to you. But this is not acceptable, and I represent Don't Waste Michigan in the Great Lakes Basin where we have several nuclear

power plants.

Our concern about the transportation regionally on rail yards, New York, Chicago, Detroit.

There need to be hearings in regional locations. I want to see people. I want to look people right in the eye and talk to them.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Michael. Thank you very much.

And Marvin, are you on? *0 for Marvin Lewis.

Or Marvin Resnikoff. If either of you could join us that would be great.

Okay. So we will hear from Jack Volpato soon. Okay, Jack We are waiting for you.

OPERATOR: Marvin Lewis, go ahead.

MR. LEWIS: Hi. This is Marvin Lewis.
Can you hear me?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can.

MR. LEWIS: Wonderful. Wonderful. Wonderful. It's been three hours pure whatever. I don't have to say whatever.

Look, here's my problem. I live on I-95.

I live right within sight of I-95. Some of I-95 is

90 feet off the ground, overpasses and what have you.

The casks are only designed for a 30-foot fall. These are thin-walled casks. Why don't you just put them in cardboard? Maybe that would do us well.

Look, I got a -- I am a graduate registered professional engineer, two degrees. I hope you'll forgive me not presenting a full-fledged stress and failure analysis when I say that the darn canisters are designed for 30-foot drops, and here I am sitting beside an I-95 in Philadelphia with 90-foot high overpasses.

And vou're saying oh, the danger is minimal. Oh, the chance of a problem is ha ha. Yeah, ha ha. I don't feel you've done an EIS that is inadequate. I feel you haven't done an EIS.

Look, there's a lot of things I can point to. First of all, and most especially, your idea of radiation damage is out of the -- it's out of the comic books.

Alice Stewart, M.D., showed that one x-ray of a female -- a pregnant woman will produce a doubling of the chance of the fetus eventually getting cancer. The British public health agency immediately took a look at her numbers and were impressed, and put out guidance which was accepted throughout the

world that care must be considered in x-raying pregnant females because these results were so evident and so true.

And this goes on throughout every EIS.

You take what is known and pick and choose. That
does not produce adequate EISes. That doesn't
produce a real EIS.

Again and again I see this, and I see what you're doing. You're absolutely ignoring real Zircon um can have fantastic fires and has problems. shown it, and if you can't believe me look up in any reference and you'll Fukushima of fantastic fires on the roofs the reactors.

You sure have been able to ignore them so far. Try looking at some of your own references.

I don t know really what to say about all of this. You're obviously throwing this CIF, whatever, consolidated interim spent fuel storage, at one of the poorest states in the union.

And this is supposed to be fair? This is supposed to be environmental justice? This is a example to be copied in every law book of environmental injustice.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Marvin, I am going

to have to ask you to stop now. It was nice to hear you again, and thank you for your comments. Thank you very much.

MR. LEWIS: You're welcome. Bye.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Bye bye.

How about Jack Volpato? Jack, are you

with us?

*0 to join.

And Marvin Resnikoff? Marvin, are you with us?

Okay. We have a couple names out there we are waiting to see if they are coming in. In the meantime, we will go with -- we will go with six names.

Okay. And one is John Buchser, Barney Magrath, Jacob Evenson, who's with the Boilermakers Local. There is Gary King, Louis Dodson, and Brian Condit, who's with --

MR. VOLPATO: Hello?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, hello. Who do we

have?

MR. WOLPATO: This is Jack Volpato. Sorry, we are having a few technical problems on my end, I guess.

MR. CAMERON: That's okay, Jack. You're

with us now. Why don't you just go and tell us what's on your mind?

MR. VOLPATO: All right. Thank you very much.

My name is Jack Volpato. I am a former county commissioner for Eddy County, District 4. I have been involved with the Eddy-Lea Alliance as a board member since its inception back in -- from the GNEP days when we were looking at getting the GNEP project down here, and we lost it to Idaho.

We have been looking at this project for several years and studying the best way to go about providing this to our area and be safe with our people that live here and our -- not to endanger any of the economies.

You have to look at the two Es. You know, you have to look at the economy and you also have to look at the environment, and I think we have done a very good job of vetting the Holtec project. They were leaps and bounds better than anybody else that interviewed to do this very project with us.

We look at safety. Safety is the most important. We live here. I live here. I raise my kids here. I am a farmer here. I raise cattle here.

There is nothing that I want to do to

NEAL R. GROSS

damage the environment and to prevent me from doing such activities. I believe that this is a very safe project. I think that I agree with the draft policy that it is very low risk.

I kind of cringe when people say there's environmental justice. I am not sure who we are denigrating in this whole process because we have reached out to communities. We have gone along railroad tracks in the near -- adjacent -- (telephonic interference).

People, civic leaders had forums in order to vet this out. There is -- basically, this is a safe project, and I agree with the safety evaluation and the environmental evaluation. There is no aquifers to contaminate. There is no populations to expose.

The safety of transporting these casks is going to be awe some. We are very familiar with transporting nuclear waste. We have had the WIPP site here and had an outstanding and a stellar record of transporting that waste with no accidents. Zero accidents over its entire life.

Railroad is actually even safer. You're on dedicated lines. You're running at a slower rate. You have dedicated cars.

You have dedicated people, and the contact time between the communities on the road and the normal train route is less than 30 minutes in most cases, and there's very little exposure whatsoever, way, way lower than background radiation.

The studies show it. I've seen some of the safety testing on the casks where they actually fired a missile at one of the casks and it still held.

These casks are very robust, very safe, and to be honest, I feel more comfortable about shipping radioactive waste on rails than on the roads, and I think that is really pretty much all I have to say.

I just want to thank you for the opportunity to let me speak, and sorry about the technical difficulties on my end.

MR. CAMERON: That's okay. Just thank you for coming in and giving us your comments.

So do we have Marvin Resnikoff?

How about Jack Buchser or Brian Magrath?

Hit *0 if you want to come in and talk to

us. There's someone. Do we have someone on the

line?

And we also -- we are looking for Jacob Evenson and Brian Condit. Louis Dodson, Gary King.

NEAL R. GROSS

Let me just run through some names that we called and we haven't heard from.

Tomas Trujillo, Stephen Picha, Hilda Lozano, Marvin Resnikoff.

REPRESENTATIVE RUBIO: Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Who? Who do we have?

REPRESENTATIVE RUBIO: This is Angelica

Rubio. I am a state representative in New Mexico.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Are you ready to say something?

REPRESENTATIVE RUBIO: Good evening.

Yeah, I am ready. Say when.

MR. CAMERON: When. Go ahead.

REPRESENTATIVE RUBIO: Great. My name is Angelica Rubio, and I serve in the New Mexico state legislature here in New Mexico. I am also the chair of the Radioactive and Hazardous Materials Committee, a vice chair in Energy, Natural Resources, and Conservation Committee.

And I want to call in -- I called in today to -- in terms of my opposition to this project. A lot of the issues that I have are related to public health and environmental racism.

But, more importantly, it has to do mostly too with the fact that we are in a position,

I think, here in this country specifically there is no real energy plan to really fulfill the goals and really the ideas that this project is considering.

I was born and raised in the southeastern part of the state. I was born just north of Carlsbad.

Many of my family members still live there, and many of them have and continue to be employed by many of the extractive industries that exist there, including and indirectly the nuclear economy.

And I will say that in my time in the legislature over the course of the last four years, of course for me the issues around public health and the issues raised around (telephonic interference) is real, unlike what the previous caller mentioned, is that there's also inconsistencies when we talk about nuclear energy here in this country.

I have traveled the world and I have -- (Telephonic interference.)

REPRESENTATIVE RUBIO: -- really hard to understand, better understand this whole process, and the more that I learn and the more that I understand, it isn't that I am becoming more and more opposed to nuclear. It's more of the fact that we as a country are unable to really -- we don't have the capacity to

be able to work

(Telephonic interference.)

REPRESENTATIVE RUBIO: -- to work in some sustainable plan to make all of this work. It is very much a patchwork which, unfortunately, leads to New Mexico being the dumping ground for the rest of the country.

And, for me, having been born and raised here and knowing the nuclear history here in this state and what it has done to deprive so many in our state from just having a better quality of life, I think it is very - it's a situation that really puts a lot of fear in me, knowing that we as a nation are just not prepared for this and that Holtec should not get the licensing that they need to be able to do this transporting and housing in the southeastern part of the state.

I just want to just further illustrate the fact that many people have already mentioned already is that the NRC's commission, the draft, and the environmental impact statement, a lot of the things that came out of that are still not 100 percent in a position for us to really feel comfortable with.

We believe -- I know I certainly believe, along with our governor, our senators, our delegation

who all oppose in addition to the Public Council of Governors here in the state of New Mexico, among other people.

We are all in opposition of this licensing for Holtec, but, furthermore, I think even under the conditions that we find ourselves with COVID, it is -- we are in even a more dire situation when we are not allowing more public comment because of this.

I urge you all, the NRC, to please keep our -- keep public comment not only open but that it continues to stay open beyond COVID until after we have found a vaccine because we are in jeopardy of making a huge mistake if we are not making this process as inclusive as possible.

So thank you.

(Pause.)

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Anybody that I've called so far that hasn't been on, can you tell us if you're on? Most recently, John Buchser, Barney Magrath, Jacob Evenson, Gary King, Louis Dodson, and Brian Condit.

MR. KING: This is Gary King. Hello?

MR. CAMERON: Hi, Gary. Go ahead.

MR. KING: Oh, there we go. Once again,

NEAL R. GROSS

I think I was a victim of the delay. So this is Gary King. I was formerly the Attorney General of New Mexico from 2006 to 2014. I was a state legislator for 12 years. In between those times, I was the Policy Advisor for Environmental Management at the U.S. Department of Energy and corporate counsel for a specialty environmental engineering company called Advanced Sciences, Inc., that specialized in mixed waste and nuclear waste. I also have a Ph.D. in organic chemistry.

So I'm calling in support of the draft environmental impact statement. While I was working for Advanced Sciences, Inc., I was on the permitting team for WIPP, and a lot of people have talked about WIPP but very few people have talked about how successful WIPP has been in helping to clean up the environment around the country. It's been a key in dealing with nuclear waste issues around the country, and it's very near the location where the CIS facility is going to go.

So we actually have a lot of information that supports the EIS. One of those is, and John Heaton said this, the geology of the area has been well characterized with regard to nuclear waste.

Now, there are differences. WIPP is a deep

underground repository, and this would be a temporary storage facility on the surface, but there are a lot of things that are beneficial in both cases.

It's in the desert. There's very little rainfall, very little relative humidity, and very low surface water, so there's a lot of discussion about water here but water is not the big issue there. There's a significant level of local knowledge base for people that understand nuclear and mixed waste in New Mexico and particularly in Southeastern New Mexico, and so they know how to handle nuclear waste and they know how to deal with it in a way that's protective of the environment and of people. And all of the comments that I've heard tonight, nobody has really talked about specific instances of exposure to people and that's because there really aren't any.

Nuclear materials are interesting from a point of view that they're really easy to find. Even in very small quantities, you can find them with a Geiger counter and you can clean them up. So when they talk about clean-up, I think people don't recognize that nuclear waste is one of the easier things to clean up.

But I think the most important thing that I want to comment on is that this is used nuclear

fuel and it still has a lot of energy in it, and there have been a lot of speculation about whether it might be there for a hundred years, but I think it's equally as likely that within the next 40 years that we will come up with an idea and a plan for recycling this energy and for utilizing it. And we've had somebody that talked tonight about the fact that this is a carbon-free way to produce energy, and I think it's going to be very important. All of those people that are concerned about global climate change need to be concerned about how we deal with the nuclear cycle because, if we do it right, it's very helpful to us.

I want to add that I'm in the hinterlands of New Mexico and on my cell phone and haven't really had any particular problems being a part of this meeting. And I've noticed that we've had people from Chicago and Philadelphia and all those places. I think this is a great way to get public comment, and I think it's a positive way to get public comment, and I would not be in favor of extending the public comment further because I think that this has actually been positive in a lot of ways.

MR. CAMERON: Great. Gary, thank you.

Thank you for taking the time and the energy to join us from the hinterlands of New Mexico.

Are you ready to talk yet, Tom Smith from Public Citizen in Austin? Let's see if Tom Smith catches up with us. In the meantime, how about Karen Douglas, Patricia Marida, Dr. Jim Conca, and Allen Davis? Hit *0. I think we're dealing with the delay. Dr. Conca, Allen Davis, Marissa Bell, Joan Brown. There's someone. Do we have someone on?

MR. SMITH: Yes, Chip, this is Smitty, or Tom Smith. How are you?

MR. CAMERON: Good. Thank you very much.

MR. SMITH: I'm here as special projects coordinator for Public Citizen's Texas office, and we oppose the whole Holtec application and for a variety. We believe your analysis is full of holes, holes in the evidence, holes in the logic, and certainly a lot of holes in the geography out there. This relies on a see no evil, speak no evil, say no evil school of deregulation in nuclear waste. In Texas and New Mexico, there's huge concerns about these irradiated rods coming and being transported through their states to the Holtec site.

Holtec is going to bring in 173,000 metric tons of this radioactive waste, which is going to come across the Gulf, across through Texas, and into New Mexico. Officials have been speaking out

in Texas. There have been over a dozen resolutions passed by cities and counties that represent over 5.4 million people, all of who said we don't want it coming through our state.

Governor Abbott has spoken up and said there's some people who want to put high-level radioactive waste in Texas, and he doesn't want it. But Governor Lujan and the entire congressional delegation of New Mexico also said put that stuff someplace else, we don't want it, not our problem, don't bring it here and don't poison us.

Now, I think it's important to take a the people who are most affected transporting this waste. And by the way, you all didn't really look at that. You said it's not our responsibility $t\phi$ look at this stuff. And, yet, there are over one million people of color or who live in poverty who live along these rail lines in Texas and about 132,000 of people living along those lines in New Mexico. Overwhelmingly, more than 60 percent, as high as 79 percent on some of those segments on the EPA's Environmental Justice website, About 30 percent across the board are minorities. don't speak, don't read English well enough to know what it is you're talking about. And when those

trains are stopped at a siding, they're not stopped in rich people's neighborhoods generally. They're stopped where the poor people live. They're stopped communities in downtown near the district, near the hospitals, and near the military bases. And only during transportation is it fair to say that the exposure is no greater than that of an x-ray. When it stops, standing still, it's an x-ray after x-ray after x-ray, sometimes for more than a sitting on a siding next while it's low-income housing project.

Now, the route from Holtec to Roswell, to around the sinkhole, it's going to cost a billion dollars to clean up. What kind of logic is that? Another big hole in this thought process that you have.

you have said trust us, our text to show that there's no risk during transportation, but I'll point out in the last two years there have been collisions head-on that exceeded your head-on collision train studies. There have been 28 train cars blown off of a bridge and trestle in New Mexico and dropped 40 feet, exceeding the standards by which There have been fires in the last ten you test. years in Baltimore that exceeded the length of time that you fire test these things. Yet, you persist in saying our tests are good enough. Your tests were done before drones and before the analysis of the armor-carrying weapons that were used in Iraq and Iran, almost 50 percent of which were left behind in the field and are now in terrorist hands. Right. We should trust you guys that these studies are good enough.

You know what? I think it's time for you all to do what you joined the NRC to do, and that was to protect the people from unreasonable radioactive waste and risk, and your job is to do that, not to enrich some company based in New Jersey. Do your jobs. Turn this permit around and say it is unacceptable environmental risk. Thank you for your time.

And if I sound angry, I've played your game. I've shown up time and time, and I've written comments and they've been ignored and ignored and ignored, just exactly like the 10,000 or more people who have submitted comments into this process. Do your job.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Smitty. Karen Douglas or Patricia --

MS. DOUGLAS: Yes, this is Karen Douglas.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. CAMERON: Oh, hi, Karen. Go ahead. We hear you.

MS. DOUGLAS: Yes. I'm a director for the League of Women Voters of New Mexico. The League of Women Voters of New Mexico supports the disposal of spent nuclear fuel only when it is implemented in a manner that protects public health and safety and the environment. During the licensing approval process for the proposed Holtec consolidated interim storage facility in New Mexico, the League of Women Voters would urge that license approval be withheld unless the NRC: (1) Ensures that private ownership of spent nuclear fuel, ISFSIs and CISF, must operate the safety controls required according to licensing of utility-owned or government-owned spent nuclear fuel; (2) Ensures that the current aging management program for spent nuclear fuel casks in ISFSIs, some in use since 1986, is also imposed on the proposed New Mexico CISF; (3) Requires that Holtec map the subsurface using modern techniques such as 3D seismic imaging to ensure no potential hazard, such substantive karst, hydraulic fracturing, as wastewater disposal wells are close to the site; (4) Ensures that there is adequate funding or other

financial guarantees to fund operations in the event of abandonment by Holtec; (5) Ensures that private contracting of spent nuclear fuel transportation complies with both the NRC-Department Transportation Agreement State requirements and with the same state and tribal notifications required for government transportation; (6) Ensures that responsibility for transporting the waste, funding for upgrades to rail and roads, and for clean-up in case of an accident are all identified prior to license approval for the Holtec CISF; (7) that the current NRC rulemaking process Ensures underway for greater than Class C waste storage at the CISF provides adequate protection of the public and the environment until a permanent U.S. solution for both spent nuclear fuel and greater than Class C waste disposal is approved; (8) Ensures that requirements for backaging spent nuclear fuel prior to acceptance at the proposed New Mexico CISF will be sufficient to resist corrosion so that casks stored at these sites will be free of corrosion; (9) Ensures that prior NRC approval of the Urenco environmental impact statement adequately covers the risk factors prior to reducing the extent of the evaluation required for the New Mexico Holtec proposal.

If the New Mexico CISF license application pending with the NRC is approved, the League of Women Voters of New Mexico asks the NRC to impose a limit on the number of NRC license renewals allows the consolidated interim storage facility until a permanent disposal solution for spent nuclear fuel is approved.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Karen. Thank you for being so organized. That was very helpful.

Do we have --

SISTER BROWN: Joan Brown.

MR. CAMERON: Oh, hi, Joan. We're here to listen to you. Go ahead.

SISTER BROWN: Okay, great. So my name is Sister Joan Brown. I'm a Franciscan, and I'm the Executive Director of New Mexico Interfaith Power and Light. And I hope that I don't get cut off because my landline went off with the storm, and so did my computer, so I could not get the PowerPoint, and we are in a dead zone with the cell coverage here, which just points to the challenges technologically in our state because of economic injustices that are historical.

So I'd like to address some moral and

ethical concerns that are woven into this project, and I want to refer first to Pope Francis in his document, Laudato si, On Care for our Common Home, where he talks about the throwaway society or the throwaway culture which exists when an economic system lacks ethics. And the throwaway culture is seeing that certain areas of land, water, air, people are dispensable because communities they're considered of no worth, as opposed to someone who said no one lives down there. Lots of people live in the southeast part of the state. At New Mexico Interfaith Power and Light, we work with people of faith and faith communities all over the state, including in Artesia, Roswell, Hobbs, Carlsbad, and other little areas around there. This idea that no one lives there | hankers back to the Doctrine of Discovery and Papal Bull which were the origin of taking this land | from the Native Americans in this country. And we continue in that kind of a mentality. It's the throwaway culture lacking in ethics.

So with that, I was grateful that Kevin Kamps mentioned the sacred lands, sacred trust map, which Deborah Reed, our map maker, helped create, myself and Sister Marlene Perrotte who was a Mercy sister, and the Sisters of Mercy of the East helped

create that map and pay for it. And the reason was because we kept going to permit hearings all over the state, going to different geographic areas, and we saw cumulative effects of extractivism of the nuclear fuel chain industry that has created over 500 abandoned uranium mines in the Grants Uranium Belt with Dine, Pueblo, and Anglo communities. We saw all kinds of violations of environmental justice.

But in these permit hearings, similar to Holtec, you're only looking at one area, one thing, and it's not the cumulative. We need to be looking at the cumulative effects of all of these, and, indeed, there is environmental and economic injustices and racism there.

Pope Francis talked about integral ecology. We need to take the whole. Everybody is interconnected.

Regarding this plan also, it has taken over 50 years for this government to come up with some kind of a plan to address nuclear waste, and we still haven't addressed it. And we're saying that this is going to be stored here for 40 years, but we know it's going to be longer than that. And the EIS is inadequate in addressing that.

Some questions around that. Well, what

NEAL R. GROSS

happens within that 40 years? If there's an accident, New Mexicans are culpable. We're the second to the poorest state in the country. We already have so much pollution here, and we are sacrificed as an entire state. That's a huge environmental justice issue.

Who would pay for this accident? We would have to pay for it. Holtec is not culpable. And as Judy Smith, who is part of Interfaith Power and Light, stated, we asked that question of Holtec and they refused to answer the questions. And we asked it very kindly, and they said that we were being belligerent. People say that we're being belligerent for asking about who is financially responsible, knowing we're an economically poor state and we cannot afford to have any more accidents. That is not an ethical way of doing business in my estimation.

We already are stuck with hundreds of oil and gas wells in this state who do not have adequate bonding and some who have gone bankrupt, and we have to take care of that pollution. There is a sinkhole in Carlsbad that we, as a state, are having to pay for because the company went bankrupt. There are hundreds of abandoned uranium mines. There are health concerns from all of the cancer in the state

from the nuclear fuel chain. We do not see them as waste dumps. We see all as sacred, and we want to protect all of our communities and all of our land.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Joan. Thank you --

SISTER BROWN: Just one final thing is that another thing that hasn't been brought up and it's a question | for you all, what would be the cumulative effect of one of the canisters being faulty some kind of terrorist attack when you have hundreds of canisters surrounding them? I can only think of a huge disaster. And then I also would recommend that we wait until after the virus to have in-person hearings because it's just so difficult now, and that in itself is an environmental justice concern, especially in a state where our greatest percentage of those who have been ill are those who are Navajo people who would be affected by the transportation of this waste.

So thank you very much for this hearing tonight.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Joan.

MS. MARIDA: Hello?

MR. CAMERON: Yes. Who is that?

MS. MARIDA: Hi, it's Patricia Marida.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 MR. CAMERON: Oh, good, good. How are you doing, Patricia?

MS. MARIDA: I'm okay. I want to say I was a member of the core team of the Sierra Club Nuclear Free campaign, and I chair the Ohio Sierra Club Nuclear Free Committee. But because the Sierra Club is a party to a legal action against this move, I'll just reserve my comments as personal comments.

I want to say that if the waste is moved to an interim site, there are two outcomes. Only two. Either the site becomes a permanent dump or the waste must be moved a second time. How does that make any sense? It boggles my mind anyway. It doesn't make sense economically or safety-wise, and it misleads the public.

The Holtec site is not being evaluated as permanent repository or dump site. And uneconomic is this? It will spend billions of dollars, and it will be completely unnecessary. this is kind of an illusion or a delusion that somehow is being taken care of the waste and communities, reactor communities think they're going to get rid of this, but it's going to sit in their communities for a long time and it's not safe where it is right now.

So we're talking about people who have brought all this up, a mobile Chernobyl, you know. The rail and waterway and road infrastructure is becoming increasingly degraded, and tens of thousands of shipments of waste would travel through states and cities across the nation and this could happen for decades. And studies predict multiple major accidents that will spill contamination over decades of shipments.

So the last thing I'll say about that shipping is that the NRC is railroading this project through. So consolidated interim storage, it would contaminate more sites with high-level radioactive waste because all along the transport route, you know, small, large, catastrophic spills are going to occur. And then a financial liability would be transferred from utilities to the public once the waste is moved to an interim site. And that's hardly a good deal for taxpayers.

Now, CIS has been opposed, widespread opposition, by the U.S. Council of Mayors in 2014, by numerous cities, towns, environmental, social justice, many other organizations. And as far as environmental injustice goes, waste is always consistently targeted with low-income Native American

and, of course, in New Mexico, Latino communities.

They're the most likely to be dumped on with CIS.

Nobody has mentioned this background on consent-based siting, but, you know, as pressures mount to deal with the waste when reactors close, the Department of Emergy in 2016 sought input for consent-based siting so that any municipality or jurisdiction that would be willing to accept the waste, we're looking for those. Well, no communities stepped up, so the DOE changed that idea and they said how about if a private or profit corporation volunteers to have this stuff? Well, I bet they certainly have gotten, they got Holtec. company with a questionable, extremely questionable record and lacking experience, too, in waste. if this is privatized, could effectively end public input and oversight.

So the NRC's assessment of the transport danger, that's highly flawed. The NRC has licensed extremely vulnerable, thin canisters. Stainless steel, dry storage canisters are only one-half to five-eighths inch thick, and these thin canisters are accumulating at almost every commercial nuclear site. They can crack through, cause major radioactive leaks and explosions in as little as 17 years. They're

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

welded shut, and there's no protocol for opening them. They cannot be maintained. They cannot be monitored either externally or internally. And these radiation levels from outlet air vents are kept. In fact, the NRC has given them, given these canisters a pass on monitoring at their outlet vent and they only monitor radiation at the intake, air intake, so how does that really monitoring what the radiation of the canisters? Are there --

MR. CAMERON: Patricia, I'm going to have to ask you to stop right now, but thank you for those comments. The NRC staff was writing all of them down, so thank you for talking to us, Patricia.

Do we have a Dr. Conca, an Allen Davis, or a Marissa Bell still with us? We're going to go to -- is someone on the line? James Mayer, Diane Turco, Monica Perales, and Missi Currier, do we have any of those still with us? James Mayer, Diane Turco, Monica Perales, and Missi Currier. Hit *0 if you want to join.

Okay. Let me try to this last group of names, and then we'll see if we catch up with anybody.

Jeff Radford, Ruth Striegel, Jason Shirley, Josh Grassham, Janet Greenwald. Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE FERRARY: Hello. This is

Representative Joanne Ferrary.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, Representative Ferrary, go ahead.

REPRESENTATIVE FERRARY: Okav, I just wanted to reiterate the support of my you. colleagues, Senator Steinborn and Representative We have all been in many interim committees, and I also serve on the House Energy, Environment and Natural Resources Committee with Representative Rubio, and we've listened to many of the presentations from Holtec and very skeptical of the different things and safety features that they tout. New Mexico has had a lot of environmental impact that has not been good for our state from oil and gas, from other And even we're still fighting for the things. downwinders from the Trinity site, the first atomic energy explosion. We still can't get compensation for the health detriments that happened to those families that were not warned because they said there weren't people in that area, and there were very many farms and people and livestock and, you know, impacts to those people that we still see today in their families. So the trust that what Holtec says is not going to have detrimental effects to our communities and it won't hurt people, I still don't believe from even back in the 40s that that won't happen now, no matter what high technology issues they take.

And hearing all the other people, like Sierra Club, which I'm a member of, you know, suppose that we have the hardened in place protections of the high waste nuclear waste, there's also things that our country is not looking at, like thorium being used to use up that spent fuel where there still is enough that could produce clean energy and we're just ignoring the things that really we could do the hard work on instead of just taking this easy way out. So I will still oppose Holtec coming to our state. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, thank you very much, Representative Ferrary. And I haven't heard from some of the people that we called, so we're getting close to the end of our time to be in the room here at the NRC. I'm going to ask three people who I know are on the line, Donna Gilmore, Georges Scott, and John Waters, to join us and we'll try to keep you brief so that we can try to be out of here as soon after ten as we can.

But, Donna, are you with us? Who is that? Is that Georges Scott?

MR. MCLEOD: This is Mike McLeod with

Xcel Energy.

MR. CAMERON: Okay, Mike. Why don't you go ahead quickly and tell us what's on your mind, please?

MR. MCLEOD: Okay. Thank you. Xcel Energy is pleased to provide comments to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission regarding the subject draft environmental impact statement for Holtec proposed high storage consplidated interim storage facility. Xcel Energy is headquarters in Minneapolis, Minnesota and serves more | than three million electric and natural gas customers in eight states, including New The Holtec facility is located in Mexico and Texas. our service territory in Southeastern New Mexico and would be a customer of Xcel Energy. If approved, the Holtec project would also promote sound energy policy not only in New Mexico but in Minnesota and throughout the nation.

Xcel Energy is uniquely qualified to provide comments on Holtec's proposal with over 55 years of nuclear power operation and used fuel management experience, as well as over 25 years' experience safely managing used nuclear fuel in dry cask storage. Xcel Energy's nuclear experience began in 1964 with the Pathfinder Atomic Power Plant in

South Dakota and includes the Ford St. Vrain Nuclear Power Plant in Colorado, as well as currently operating nuclear power plants located in Redwing and Monticello, Minnesota. The two nuclear facilities in Minnesota both have dry fuel storage facilities where the first site became operational in 1995.

Acel Energy has over 1800 fuel assemblies and dry storage at each of our operating nuclear power plants. In addition to our nuclear power plant operations and fuel storage experience, Xcel Energy has extensive experience in safely transporting spent nuclear fuel assemblies to off-site locations. The Monticello plant in Minnesota shipped over a thousand spent fuel assemblies to off-site storage locations over commercial rail lines similar to the proposal for the Holtec CIS facility.

We support the preliminary NRC staff recommendation to issue a license to Holtec authorizing the initial phase of the project. The Xcel Energy experience operating dry cask storage facilities has proven storage facilities have minimal environmental impact. The sealed canisters combined with the solid nature of the fuel itself fully isolate the fuel material from the environment.

Our experience demonstrates the safety

and minimal environmental impact of storing spent fuel dry cask technology. Similarly, our experience in shipping spent fuel demonstrates the inherent safety and minimal impact of fuel shipments.

Nuclear plants operate without producing any greenhouse gas emissions and play a key role in Xcel Energy's carbon reduction strategy. We have already achieved a 38-percent system-wide reduction of carbon emissions by 2005 levels, but we aim to go much further. We plan to reduce our carbon emissions 80 percent by 2030, and we were the first utility in the nation to announce a vision for a completely carbon-free system by mid-century.

Must continue to provide our customers with affordable and reliable electricity. In order to do this, we need the ability to provide zero-carbon dispatchable and firm resources like nuclear energy. Our Prairie Island and Monticello nuclear plants avoid over 13 million tons of carbon emissions annually, which is the equivalent of removing two million cars from the roads.

In closing, as we noted in our comments, hearing the EIS scoping process, Xcel Energy supports a robust stakeholder engagement process and a

thorough regulatory and licensing proceeding for any proposal interim facility, including the Holtec facility. We look forward to progress as the NRC considers Holtec's international application for a license to conduct and operate a consolidated interim storage facility in Lea County, New Mexico, as well as parallel process for a permanent storage solution.

Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Michael. Still looking for Donna Gilmore, Georges Scott --

MS. GILMORE: This is she. Can you hear me?

MS. PERALES: This is Monica Perales.

I've been waiting Hello?

MR. CAMERON: Hello. Is this Monica?

MS. PERALES: Yes, yes.

MS. GILMORE: And I just want to know if you can hear me. This is Donna Gilmore. Do I have a connection here?

MR. WATERS: This is John Waters. Can you hear me? I'm not sure anybody can hear me.

MR. CAMERON: John, we can hear you. We're going to hear Donna Gilmore, and then we're going to go right to you, so just hold on. We can

hear you.

MS. GILMORE: Okay, great. How are you doing, Chip?

MR. CAMERON: I'm doing fine, Donna. How are you?

MS. GILMORE: Well, I'll tell you how I am. I live five miles from San Onofre. The current Holtec site that they want to build in New Mexico, and it's been one screw up after another with Holtec. They are poorly engineered. Every single canister, thin canister, gets loaded interview these storage holes gets gouged on the walls, and the NRC is saying, well, we'll deal with that problem later. It's been one nightmare after the other.

But I don't want to talk about, I don't want to talk about all the problems. You can go to sanonofresafety.org and see the full list. But what I want to talk about is solutions. The alternative that needs to be looked at in this EIR is an example of what we should be doing in this country is what's going on in Switzerland. They use top-of-the-line thick-wall casks They have an on-site hot cell You can go to San Onofre Safety and see facility. Compare that to what we're doing. details. Until this fuel is, this fragile fuel is repackaged into high-end thick-wall casks similar to what Switzerland has chosen to standardize on and have a hot cell so that when these things need to be repackaged or inspected, it can be done, that is the only solution that the NRC and the nuclear industry have left us with, and I know our elected officials and everybody else wants solutions.

I've searched the world, and this is our only option and we need to quit playing this game of, you know, who is going to get stuck with this stuff and get real, get real here and start advocating for the only available solution. There's no great solution, but this is the best available in the country. So, please, step back and re-evaluate your options on this.

I've studied this for over a decade in detail, as you know.

MR. CAMERON: I know. Thank you, Donna. And we're going to go to John Waters, and then we're going to go to Momica. Pardon me?

MR. SCOTT: I'm on the line also, but I'll let the others speak.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's hear from John, and then we'll go to Georges and then Monica.
Okay. Go ahead.

MR. WATERS: Okay. Well, Chip and

members of the NRC Commission and staff, I do want to thank you again for offering this opportunity to participate, especially during these trying times. I, as with former Attorney General Gary King, agree that it's fantastic that we've been able to hear people from all across, as he said, hinterlands of the United States. And while there were some minor issues, I tend to find this as remarkable and it gives all sorts of folks that might not have had the opportunity to come down to participate in it, whether or not we agree with their point of view. I think it's great that technology has allowed this, so thank you again for the opportunity. And I would be against extending it past September 22nd, as well.

You know, I just want to start that my wife and I were raised in Carlsbad here in New Mexico. We've, in turn, raised our four children here. We chose to come back to New Mexico and raise our children after WIPP and Urenco opened.

There was a comment earlier that talked about home values and everything going down after a facility like this came into place. I'll have you know that, as the head of the economic development for the area and somebody who has been back here now for 13 years, after WIPP opened the prices of homes

were elevated significantly and they've continued to go up. So that's a fallacy to say that the price of homes went down.

I also was offended to hear somebody talk about the education level of the folks in the Carlsbad Since we have two national laboratories here area. and a number of major companies that do all kinds of things, we have a very diverse economy, we have the second highest number of Ph.D.s in the state of New per capilta. We're very proud intelligence of our folks here, and by saying that we're all a bunch of folks that are poorly educated and can't read and we're not diverse, you know, that is just not true and to let the members know that this is something that the community jointly wanted. Everybody in the community moved forward. councillors that you heard represented every walk of life, every different occupation, you know, with both Eddy and Lea Counties. We all want this.

We're very well educated. We've spent a long time learning about the nuclear materials with WIPP. WIPP has been a tremendous success. We have a large number of people here who are familiar with the nuclear industry, and we're very proud of that, and we're very proud that we've been helping the

nation take care of solutions. The lady before me talked about solutions; if you live near Rocky Flats, you can thank Carlsbad and Eddy County and WIPP. We offered a solution when there was none. We're offering another solution.

educated, because it's something that's the right thing to do, and it's rich that people in Albuquerque are talking about not wanting to be part of the nuclear fuel cycle solution and that they're getting ready to shut down a major coal plant and their only, only avenue for power to back that up is going to be the nuclear power coming from the state of Arizona. They are part of the problem. They need to be part of the solution, and we're proud to say that we down in Southeastern New Mexico are part of the solution. We have read, and I come from an environmental background, I have read the long CIS.

I'm very happy to see that it's examined multiple angles, it's exhaustive, and we do agree with the conclusions of the NRC, the staff, as well as the BLM, on the rail spur. We think that this is not only going to be negligible as far as an adverse impact, but it's actually going to be very positive for both New Mexico and Southeastern New Mexico, as

well as the nation. It gives the nation a solution to the problem. It may be a temporary solution, but it's better than what we have now.

So thank you again for giving us the time to comment.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much, John. I think we have Monica and Georges on the phone. Monica, can you talk to us?

MS. PERALES: Yes, sir.

MR. CAMERON: Oh, good.

MS. PERALES: Good evening. Can you hear

me?

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Yes, we can.

MS. PERALES: Oh, thank you. others have raised many of my concerns, but I have a few to add. First of all, honestly, participating in several of these sessions, I must say that it's hard to fathom that an agency that struggles so much with the technology required for these webinars is entrusted to handle nuclear waste. struggle every time I try to call participate.

Also, I suggest that you require that anyone commenting first disclose any interest or gain from these proposed projects, whether it be as an

investment from political contributions or otherwise.

I think transparemcy is warranted.

I've become absolutely aware that it's is to get to yes on these proceedings. You don't give much weight, if any, to comments from the opposition, no matter how profound But I still want to point out that the International Atomic Energy Agency, of which the U.S. is a member, they published a report on away from And when storing spent fuel away reactor storage. from reactor, Section 3 of their publication advises void land with exploitable mineral and energy Yet, here, Holtec intends to place spent resources. in the middle of America's most fuel smack dab productive oil field.

Nuclear engineers from the IAEA came out to West Texas and to Southeast New Mexico about a year ago, and when they saw the Holtec site all they could say was what the hell are you all thinking? I just, it's hard to believe, it's hard to fathom. And, earlier, I believe that an official from Eddy County said the New Mexico nuclear waste facilities are working fine, and one said nuclear waste is easy to clean up. Seriously, I don't understand how they can say that. How is it possible that elected

representatives from New Mexico are not aware of the accident and of the release resulting from that accident? And it was all caused by human error.

And I think, finally, with regard to money to the state and municipal communities from this project, I'd ask that same Eddy-Lea official and every other New Mexico resident demand to see a revenue-sharing agreement with Holtec before they drink the Kool-Aid.

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Monica. John, are you still on?

MR. WATERS: Yes, I'm on.

MR. CAMERON: Sorry. Georges, go ahead.

MR. SCOTT: Thank you, thank you, Chip.

Just for the record, my name is Georges Scott, and I live here in New Mexico. And I appreciate all the out-of-state comments, angry as they have been. But we know what's best for our state.

And just on the previous caller, she didn't tell us her interest. My interest is that I'm an energy consultant, and I want to point out that the previous governor and state land commissioner supported this project.

And the other question that I have is

the people that tried to call in tonight, I hope they get an opportunity in July 9th to be on the top of the list instead of having to wait for so many hours.

But saying all that, I thank you for webinar providing today's and giving us all opportunity to express our thoughts on the proposed Holtec project here in Southeast New Mexico. doing this format because of the scientifically-based suggestions from public health officials to combat the COVID-19 pandemic. Science is about the pursuit of truth. In the case of COVID-19, it helps us determine how to protect the world's population. Science is also at the foundation of the Holtec That same science that is determining a project. limiting the effects of COVID also vaccine and educates us that muclear energy is safe. And if you accept the science concerning pandemics, then you must accept the science concerning nuclear energy. Since science tells us that nuclear energy is safe, then the storage of spent nuclear fuel is needed and the storage technology is also safe. Science was used in the draft environmental statement, and that report tells us that the project will have a minimal impact on the region's environment.

The draft EIS also tells us that the

transportation spent nuclear fuel will have a minimal effect. shouldn't be You allowed cherry-pick science to fit your needs. Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but everyone is not entitled to their own scientific facts. Science is not about an emotion, and it's also not about creating misinformation and fear. Science is about providing answers to questions, the pursuit of truth. used science to design their products and the consolidated interim storage facility.

I understand that there are concerns over the proposed project, which is why Holtec has been investing in meetings with community leaders around the state. I know this because I scheduled the meetings. These meetings have been with emergency management directors, law enforcement, and elected leaders from Gallup to Clovis to Lordsburg. And each meeting has been positive with sharing of ideas and addressing concerns. Holtec is committed to New Mexico and to working with all the communities that may or not be along the transportation route.

And, again, thank you for allowing me to speak today.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, thank you, Georges. And thank you for that suggestion

about allowing people who've had to wait so long to go first the next time, but we are looking at, we think we understand what happened here with the delays and everything. And Lorraine, our operator, has been very helpful about that. So I think the July 9th meeting will go more smoothly. And you will have the transcript. Toby Walter has been taking the transcript for us. And you will have that to look at before the July 9th meeting, and you can see what everybody has said.

Now, I just want to make sure before I go to John Tappert, the senior agency official, to close us out because we do have to be out of the room, I just want to make sure that there's no one on the line now whose name I called who we're avoiding. So I hear someone's voice. Is someone on the phone?

MS. GARDNER: This is Rose Gardner. You haven't called me, but I was worried you weren't going to call me.

MR. CAMERON: And I have the list. I don't see you, Rose, but, since you're on the phone, why don't we go with you?

MS. GARDNER: Well, thank you so very much. Bless your heart. Yes, I did email my request

yesterday. This is Rose Gardner from Eunice, New Mexico. And my interests, if you care to know, is that I live here, born here, have children and grandchildren here. And you folks out there, some of you have got the right idea. Some of you are just interested in money. You know what? God takes care of that, so my interest is not in money. My interest is in this project in regards to the safety to my family and my community.

My first comment is I do oppose this project of Holtec bringing in all this nuclear waste from other communities that produced it and I got no benefit from it. I oppose the use of these canisters that could be anywhere from half-inch to five-eights of an inch when I could have the Cadillac of a 10 to 20-inch robust container. This is a joke. This is a lemon. It gets gouged every time it goes in the hole and comes out the hole. Not good. It cannot be monitored properly, and now the NRC is allowing some of the monitoring to be done away with. That is not good.

The other thing I wanted to mention was that we already know that WIPP has cost us, that is the DOE has told us it costs us over \$2 billion to fix the mess that happened in 2014. What a shame.

That's not a success, people. That's a failure. All of these nuclear waste dumps have failed in one way or another. And we could go on and talk about waste control which is four miles out of my town, but I don't want to take that time for that today.

The other thing is I want to note that there is a rancher that lives within a mile of this proposed facility, and the wife has actually reached out to me because no one has reached out to her. I suggest that you people get in touch with the people that live close to that proposed facility site and find out what they have to say. I'll be you won't get their consent anymore than you'll get mine.

The other impact that I'm concerned about is transportation, not just to the site but throughout the country, over water, and whatever messes that comes to these sites, it has to be looked at. Those communities have to be contacted and discuss, you know, what's happening to this. A lot more than what I connect to this because you know what? Holtec hasn't reached out to me. They just want to shut me up. But that's okay. I won't shut up because I live here.

Another thing I have a problem with is that this makes me and my community part of an

experiment, which I am unwilling to undergo. I do not wish high-level nuclear waste to remain here for 40 years or 120 years or however long you may guess it will remain here. Just last night, we had a grass fire that took two hours to put out. Folks, this place is 35 miles from any town. Unless you have a fire station out there, we've got a situation. This grass fire outside of town took two hours to put out, caused my lightning. I urge you to look into more of a fire plan.

I also urge the congressional leaders, the government, and all those involved to ask the right questions and make this company accountable to us because they | re not going to be. This is a diabolical plan where Eddy-Lea is out to make a killing, and I dom't really like the revenue-sharing How did that come about? Were they actually thinking that the company was just going to volunteer that money? Was there some negotiating that perhaps we don't know about? Is there something that needs to be addressed through the attorney general's office right now? Then when there's the contract stuff? When was the agreement negotiated and agreed upon? When was the lawyer paid that set up the agreement? Who is really running this show?

I don't want to be a patsy. I won't be a patsy. You're not going to shut me up. So, Holtec, you got a problem with me. You better watch out because I am going after you.

Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Rose. Thank you, Rose. And there's just one person I just want to check with because she disappeared from the list, the final list that we had, and that's Maya van Rossum of Delaware Riverkeeper. Maya, are you out there? I don't know why you disappeared from the list, but I just wanted to make sure that we didn't completely avoid you.

But I'm going to turn it over to John Tappert to close out for us. I just have to say that I really appreciate all of you joining us tonight and, you know, basically, following the ground rules, okay? So I really appreciate that, as a facilitator. And I know you gave the NRC a lot of good information, and I'm going to go to John, John Tappert. John?

MR. TAPPERT: Thank you, Chip. So I'd just like to say I greatly appreciate everyone sharing their time with us this evening, as well as their thoughtful comments. We'll certainly reflect on those as we work on developing the final EIS. As a

reminder, the transcript of today's meeting will be posted on our website I expect sometime next week. And we currently have one additional webinar planned at this time for July 9th. And, of course, we are also accepting comments both electronically through email and also through traditional mail. So please continue to send those comments in, and, again, thank you and be safe.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. And that's goodnight everybody.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:23 p.m.)

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701