

GNEP PEIS PUBLIC HEARING

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

THIS VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT CONSTITUTES  
THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF THE

THE GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY PARTNERSHIP (GNEP)  
DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL  
IMPACT STATEMENT (PEIS)  
PUBLIC HEARING

HELD AT THE  
BOB RUUD COMMUNITY CENTER  
150 NORTH HIGHWAY 160  
PAHRUMP, NEVADA 89060

ON  
MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2009

BEGINNING AT  
7:00 P.M.

REPORTED BY: JILL JACOBY  
VERBATIM REPORTER

1 MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2009, 7:00 P.M.

2 BOB RUUD COMMUNITY CENTER, PAHRUMP, NEVADA

3

4 MR. BROWN: IF FOLKS CAN TAKE THEIR SEATS AGAIN,

5 WE'LL GET STARTED WITH THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

6 THANKS VERY MUCH. IT'S NOW TIME TO RECEIVE YOUR

7 FORMAL COMMENTS ON THE SCOPE OF THE DRAFT PEIS. THIS IS

8 YOUR OPPORTUNITY TO LET DOE KNOW WHAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE

9 ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT DOCUMENT. THE COURT REPORTER WILL

10 TRANSCRIBE YOUR STATEMENT.

11 LET ME REVIEW A FEW GROUND RULES FOR THE

12 COMMENTS. PLEASE STEP TO THE MICROPHONE OVER THERE WHEN

13 YOUR NAME IS CALLED, INTRODUCE YOURSELF, PROVIDING AN

14 ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION WHERE APPROPRIATE. IF YOU HAVE

15 A WRITTEN VERSION OF YOUR STATEMENT, PLEASE PROVIDE A COPY

16 TO THE COURT REPORTER AFTER YOU'VE COMPLETED YOUR REMARKS.

17 ALSO, PLEASE GIVE THE REPORTER ANY ADDITIONAL ATTACHMENTS

18 TO THE STATEMENT THAT YOU WOULD LIKE ENTERED IN THE RECORD

19 AND IT'LL BE LABELED AND INCLUDED.

20 I WILL CALL TWO NAMES AT A TIME. THE FIRST IS

21 THE SPEAKER AND THE SECOND IS THE PERSON TO FOLLOW. IN

22 VIEW OF THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO HAVE INDICATED AN INTEREST

23 IN SPEAKING TONIGHT AND TO ADD VARIETY, PLEASE CONFINE YOUR

24 PUBLIC STATEMENTS TO FIVE MINUTES. THE STAFF PERSON SEATED

25 IN THE FRONT ROW IN FRONT OF YOUR PODIUM WILL HOLD UP A

1 SIGN INDICATING WHEN YOU HAVE ONE MINUTE REMAINING AND IF  
2 AT THAT POINT YOU COULD SUMMARIZE YOUR STATEMENT.

3 MR. GOLUB WILL BE SERVING AS THE HEARING OFFICER  
4 FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY THIS EVENING. HE WILL NOT,  
5 HOWEVER, BE RESPONDING TO ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS DURING  
6 THIS SESSION.

7 SO WITH THAT BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION, LET ME  
8 START OFF WITH OUR FIRST SPEAKER, GARY HOLLIS, NYE COUNTY  
9 COMMISSIONER. WELCOME. AND GARY WILL BE FOLLOWED BY  
10 DARRELL LEVY.

11 AUDIENCE SPEAKER: LACY.

12 MR. BROWN: LACY. SORRY. DARRELL, YOU NEED TO  
13 WORK ON YOUR HANDWRITING.

14 MR. LACY: OKAY.

15 MR. HOLLIS: FIRST OF ALL, LET ME ASK, IS THERE  
16 ANYBODY HERE THAT FAVORS NUCLEAR PROJECTS IN NYE COUNTY AND  
17 IS NATIVE NEVADAN, PLEASE STAND UP. BOY, I FEEL BETTER  
18 ALREADY. AT LEAST I CAN GET OUT OF HERE IN ONE PIECE.

19 GOOD EVENING, MY NAME IS GARY HOLLIS, AND I'M THE  
20 NYE COUNTY COMMISSIONER HERE IN -- AND MY DISTRICT HERE IS  
21 IN PAHRUMP. FIRST, I'D LIKE TO THANK YOU FOR HOLDING THIS  
22 PUBLIC MEETING IN NYE COUNTY TO RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE  
23 GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY PARTNERSHIP DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT  
24 STATEMENT. MY COMMENTS WILL BE SUPPLEMENTED -- SUPPLEMENT  
25 ANY COMMENTS ALREADY SUBMITTED BY STAFF.

1 AS YOU WILL SEE FROM MY STATEMENT, THE ACTIONS  
2 DESCRIBED IN THAT DRAFT PEIS HAS THE POTENTIAL FOR MAJOR  
3 IMPACT TO NYE COUNTY. NUCLEAR POWER GENERATION IS CRITICAL  
4 TO THE ENERGY -- TO AMERICA'S ENERGY SECURITY. ALL METHODS  
5 OF ELECTRICITY GENERATION HAVE AN IMPACT TO THE ENVIRONMENT.  
6 WE SEE GNEP AS A RESPONSIBLE PART OF AN ENERGY POLICY THAT  
7 LIMITS GREENHOUSE GASES AND ALSO REDUCES THE VOLUME AND  
8 TOXIC NATURE OF THE WASTE PRODUCT ASSOCIATED WITH NUCLEAR  
9 GENERATION.

10 NYE COUNTY HAS A FUNDAMENTAL APPROACH TO YUCCA  
11 MOUNTAIN. THE LOCATION OF THE REPOSITORY AT YUCCA MOUNTAIN  
12 IS SPECIFIED BY FEDERAL LAW. THE LICENSE APPLICATION HAS  
13 BEEN SUBMITTED. AND IF THE LICENSE IS GRANTED, WE FULLY  
14 EXPECT THAT NUCLEAR WASTE WILL COME TO NYE COUNTY, NEVADA.  
15 NYE COUNTY HAS NOT TAKEN A POSITION IN FAVOR OF THE  
16 REPOSITORY IN YUCCA MOUNTAIN. IT HAS SAID THAT IF THE  
17 REPOSITORY IS BUILT AT YUCCA MOUNTAIN, IT MUST BE DONE IN A  
18 MATTER THAT PROTECTS HEALTH, SAFETY, AND ECONOMIC WELL-BEING  
19 OF THE CITIZENS OF THIS COUNTY.

20 IF YUCCA MOUNTAIN BECOMES A REALITY AND WE BELIEVE  
21 THAT NYE COUNTY SHOULD RECEIVE BENEFITS ASSOCIATED WITH THE  
22 REPOSITORY. WE HAVE A GOAL TO ENSURE THAT PEOPLE WHO WORK  
23 AT YUCCA MOUNTAIN LIVE IN NYE COUNTY AND THAT THE BUSINESSES  
24 AND INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATED WITH YUCCA MOUNTAIN ARE LOCATED IN  
25 NYE COUNTY.

1           IN ADDITION, SINCE NYE COUNTY WILL BE THE FUTURE  
2 HOME TO THE NATION'S NUCLEAR WASTE AND IS ALREADY  
3 BURDENED -- WE ARE ALREADY BURDENED WITH YEARS OF  
4 CONTAMINATION STEMMING FROM OVER 900 NUCLEAR TESTS, WE  
5 SHOULD RECEIVE ECONOMIC BENEFITS IN THE FORM OF INVESTMENTS  
6 IN THE NUCLEAR WASTE REPROCESSING AND RELATED FACILITIES.

7           THE SAFEST AND BEST PLACE TO BUILD THESE PLANTS IS  
8 CLOSE TO YUCCA MOUNTAIN REPOSITORY TO REDUCE THE RISK OF  
9 TRANSPORTATION AND ADDITIONAL HANDLING. EXCLUDING THE  
10 CONSIDERATION OF NEVADA AND NYE COUNTY, SPECIFICALLY AS A  
11 HOST TO GNEP, WE AS NEVADANS MAY WELL MISS THE POTENTIAL  
12 MAJOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES THAT GNEP WILL  
13 BRING IF GNEP IS IMPLEMENTED AT SOME POINT IN THE FUTURE.  
14 CLOSING THE DOOR TO THOSE OPTIONS IS LIKELY TO BE A COUNTER  
15 TO THE LONG-TERM INTERESTS OF NYE COUNTY AND ALL OF NEVADA'S  
16 CITIZENS.

17           ONCE AGAIN, I THANK YOU FOR HAVING A HEARING IN  
18 NYE COUNTY. WE LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH DOE TO SOLVING  
19 THE NATION'S ENERGY PROBLEMS.

20           THANK YOU.

21           MR. BROWN: OKAY. DARRELL WILL BE FOLLOWED BY  
22 IRENE NAVIS.

23           MR. LACY: GOOD EVENING, I'M DARRELL LACY,  
24 DIRECTOR OF THE NYE COUNTY NEVADA NUCLEAR WASTE OFFICE. I'M  
25 PROVIDING COMMENTS ADDITIONAL TO WHAT MR. HOLLIS JUST GAVE

1 YOU AND THE ONES WE HAVE PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED IN WRITTEN  
2 FORM.

3 NYE COUNTY IS HOME OF THE NEVADA TEST SITE WHICH  
4 INCLUDES A LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL SITE AS WELL  
5 AS THE PROPOSED YUCCA MOUNTAIN REPOSITORY FOR USED FUEL AND  
6 HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE. AS SUCH, WE HAVE A VESTED  
7 INTEREST IN GNEP AND OTHER FUEL CYCLE INITIATIVES WHICH  
8 MIGHT CHANGE THE VOLUME AND TYPE OF NUCLEAR WASTE SLATED FOR  
9 DISPOSAL IN NYE COUNTY. WE HAVE A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM IN  
10 PLACE TO MONITOR AND OVERSEE THE REPOSITORY DEVELOPMENT.  
11 THIS AUTHORITY IS GRANTED TO NYE COUNTY BY THE NUCLEAR WASTE  
12 POLICY ACT. WE HAVE STUDIED THE GNEP PROPOSALS TO IDENTIFY  
13 IMPACTS ON NYE COUNTY AND MY COMMENTS WILL REFLECT THOSE  
14 ANALYSIS.

15 ALL THE ACTIONS DESCRIBED IN THE DRAFT PEIS,  
16 INCLUDING THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE, INCLUDE THE NEED FOR A  
17 REPOSITORY FOR DISPOSAL OF HIGH-LEVEL WASTE AS WELL AS MANY  
18 CASES ADDITIONAL LOW-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE.

19 UNLESS THERE'S A SECOND REPOSITORY BUILT, IT'S  
20 LIKELY THAT YUCCA MOUNTAIN WILL BE EXPANDED WELL PAST THE  
21 70,000-TONNE STATUTORY LIMIT. IT'S VERY POSSIBLE THAT YUCCA  
22 MOUNTAIN WILL BE ONLY REPOSITORY IN THE U.S. REGULATED BY  
23 THE NUCLEAR POWER INDUSTRY AS WELL AS ANY ADVANCED FUEL  
24 CYCLE REACTORS AND PROCESSING FACILITIES DESCRIBED IN THIS  
25 GNEP PEIS.

1           THERE'S SOME TALK THAT CLOSING THE FUEL CYCLE WILL  
2 ELIMINATE THE NEED FOR YUCCA MOUNTAIN. THIS IS NOT TRUE.  
3 THE ULTIMATE NEED FOR A REPOSITORY FOR DISPOSE OF HIGH-LEVEL  
4 RADIOACTIVE WASTE DOES NOT GO AWAY. SOME OF THE  
5 ALTERNATIVES HERE DO REDUCE THE VOLUME AND/OR TOXICITY OF  
6 THE WASTE, HOWEVER ALL THE ALTERNATIVES DO NEED A  
7 REPOSITORY.

8           SOME OF THESE OPTIONS WILL EXTEND THE LIFE OF  
9 YUCCA MOUNTAIN AND MAY DELAY THE NEED FOR A SECOND  
10 REPOSITORY FOR MANY YEARS. BUT AS MENTIONED IN THIS  
11 PROGRAM, THERE'S CURRENTLY ENOUGH WASTE IN THE COUNTRY TO  
12 PRETTY MUCH FILL UP YUCCA MOUNTAIN TO THE STATUTORY LIMITS  
13 TODAY.

14          THE DRAFT PEIS INDICATES THAT THE INITIAL 70,000  
15 TONNES SLATED FOR YUCCA MOUNTAIN WOULD NOT BE USED FOR  
16 RECYCLING OR REPROCESSING. IT APPEARS THAT THIS DECISION  
17 MADE SOLELY ON ECONOMICS. WE RECOMMEND THAT THE GNEP  
18 PROGRAM NOT PRECLUDE RECYCLING THESE MATERIALS. YUCCA  
19 MOUNTAIN IS DESIGNED FOR RETRIEVABLE STORAGE AND IT APPEARS  
20 CAPABLE OF ALLOWING RETRIEVAL OF THE WASTES FOR THE USE AND  
21 REPROCESSING FOR MANY, MANY YEARS. THE ADVANCED  
22 TECHNOLOGIES DISCUSSED IN THIS PEIS IS CAPABLE OF REDUCING  
23 THE VOLUME OF RADIOTOXICITY OF THIS WASTE AND WE ENCOURAGE  
24 DOE TO EXPLORE THIS POSSIBILITY.

25          IN ADDITION, SCATTERING LOCATION OF GNEP

1 FACILITIES AROUND THE COUNTRY WILL NOT OPTIMIZE  
2 ENVIRONMENTAL, SAFETY, AND COST IMPACT. COLOCATING  
3 FACILITIES IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE GEOLOGIC REPOSITORY IS  
4 A SOUND APPROACH. WE BELIEVE THAT BECAUSE OF THE LINK  
5 BETWEEN THE GEOLOGIC REPOSITORY AND ANY FUTURE GNEP  
6 FACILITIES, THAT DOE SHOULD LOOK AT A PLAN THAT ADDRESSES  
7 GNEP SAFETY AND HOST COMMUNITY BENEFITS. ANY DECISIONS THAT  
8 FORECLOSE THE LOCATION OR OPTIONS OF FUTURE GNEP FACILITIES  
9 MUST BE AVOIDED.

10 TO SUMMARIZE OUR POSITION, THE ACTIONS DESCRIBED  
11 IN THE DRAFT PEIS HAS THE POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT FOR PROFOUND  
12 CONSEQUENCES TO NYE COUNTY. SOME OF THE GNEP ALTERNATIVES  
13 CAN CHANGE THE AMOUNT OF WASTE DISPOSED AT YUCCA MOUNTAIN  
14 AND THE NEVADA TEST SITE. THEY CAN REDUCE THE HAZARD OF  
15 WASTE SLATED FOR PLACEMENT IN THE REPOSITORY, ESPECIALLY IF  
16 THE FIRST 70,000 METRIC TONNES ARE FOR RECYCLING. THEY CAN  
17 PROVIDE SIGNIFICANT INVESTMENT AND JOBS TO NYE COUNTY,  
18 NEVADA, ESPECIALLY IF THE GNEP FACILITIES ARE LOCATED IN  
19 CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE REPOSITORY. WE CAN REDUCE THE RISK  
20 OF WORKERS IN THE PUBLIC FROM ADDITIONAL TRANSPORTATION AND  
21 HANDLING OF WASTE BY KEEPING THE GNEP FACILITY IN CLOSE  
22 PROXIMITY TO THE REPOSITORY WHICH WOULD BE THE ULTIMATE  
23 DESTINATION OF ANY HIGH-LEVEL WASTE PRODUCED IN THESE  
24 FACILITIES.

25 NYE COUNTY IS WILLING TO WORK WITH DOE TO HELP

1 FIND OPTIMAL SOLUTIONS FOR WASTE DISPOSAL FOR BOTH THE  
2 REPOSITORY AND GNEP PROGRAMS. I WILL LEAVE COPIES OF OUR  
3 COMMUNITY PROTECTION PLAN IN THE BACK IF ANYONE IS  
4 INTERESTED. THAT'S THE RESULT OF SOME OF OUR WORK ON THE  
5 YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROGRAM. IT ILLUSTRATES OUR WILLINGNESS TO  
6 WORK WITH DOE TO ENSURE THAT THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN REPOSITORY  
7 WILL BE BUILT IN A MANNER THAT PROTECTS THE CITIZENS OF NYE  
8 COUNTY AND THE STATE OF NEVADA AS WELL AS PROVIDE A  
9 MEANINGFUL BENEFIT TO THE HOST COMMUNITY.

10 THANK YOU.

11 MR. BROWN: THANKS VERY MUCH. IRENE.

12 IRENE WILL BE FOLLOWED BY ED MUELLER.

13 MS. NAVIS: GOOD EVENING, I'M IRENE NAVIS,  
14 PLANNING MANAGER FOR CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA, NUCLEAR WASTE  
15 OVERSIGHT PROGRAM. THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR CLARK  
16 COUNTY HAVE BEEN OPPOSED TO YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT FOR ABOUT  
17 TWO DECADES. I'M NOT HERE TO TAKE A FORMAL POSITION ON GNEP  
18 THIS EVENING ONE WAY OR THE OTHER, JUST WANT TO POINT OUT  
19 SOME THINGS THAT WE'VE OBSERVED IN THE READING THE DRAFT SO  
20 FAR.

21 I WANT TO THANK DOE FOR CONDUCTING A PUBLIC  
22 HEARING ON THIS IMPORTANT ISSUE IN NEVADA. MY COMMENTS ON  
23 BEHALF OF CLARK COUNTY ARE IN ADDITION TO THOSE THAT I MADE  
24 AT A PUBLIC HEARING CONDUCTED IN WASHINGTON, DC ON  
25 DECEMBER 9.

1           SINCE THE DRAFT PEIS WAS DEVELOPED, SEVERAL  
2 RELATED ACTIONS HAVE OCCURRED. THE NRC DOCKETED AND HAS  
3 BEGUN ITS REVIEW OF THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN REPOSITORY LICENSE  
4 APPLICATION. THE NRC RELEASED A DRAFT UPDATED WASTE  
5 CONFIDENCE RULING. THE DOE RERELEASED ITS 180C DRAFT POLICY  
6 DOCUMENT THAT RELATES TO PUBLIC SAFETY FIRST RESPONDER  
7 PREPAREDNESS. THE DOE RELEASED A REPORT ON THE FEASIBILITY  
8 OF A SECOND REPOSITORY AND ANOTHER ON INTERIM STORAGE. THE  
9 SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD HELD A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE  
10 PROPOSED CALIENTE RAIL LINE ON DECEMBER 4, BUT NO FORMAL  
11 DECISION HAS BEEN RENDERED.

12           SEVERAL OF THESE ACTIONS ARE SEPARATE  
13 POLICY-RELATED CONSIDERATIONS AND HAVE A DIRECT RELATIONSHIP  
14 TO AND IMPACT ON THE DRAFT PEIS. THESE ACTIONS POTENTIALLY  
15 HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE DATA, ASSUMPTIONS, ANALYSIS, AND  
16 FINDINGS IN THE DRAFT PEIS, AND SHOULD BE EVALUATED TO  
17 IDENTIFY ADDITIONAL ISSUES, IMPACTS ON THE ASSUMPTIONS AND  
18 DATA, AND AREAS REQUIRING FURTHER ANALYSIS WHICH MAY IMPACT  
19 THE DRAFT PEIS FINDINGS.

20           FOR EXAMPLE, THE DOE'S SECOND REPOSITORY REPORT  
21 CALLS FOR AN EXPANSION OF YUCCA MOUNTAIN TO THREE TIMES ITS  
22 CURRENT CAPACITY RATHER THAN SITING A SECOND REPOSITORY.  
23 BASED ON THIS REPORT, THERE'S A HIGH DEGREE OF CERTAINTY  
24 THAT ALL FINAL WASTE PRODUCTS RESULTING FROM GNEP, AS WELL  
25 AS SPENT FUEL FROM EXISTING AND NEWLY BUILT REACTORS OVER

1 THE NEXT SEVERAL DECADES, WOULD BE EMPLACED IN THE YUCCA  
2 MOUNTAIN REPOSITORY FOR LONG-TERM DISPOSAL. THE SECOND  
3 REPOSITORY REPORT APPEARS TO CONTRADICT THE ASSERTION ON  
4 PAGE S-5 OF THE DRAFT PEIS SUMMARY THAT REDUCING THE BODY,  
5 THERMAL OUTPUT, AND/OR RADIOTOXICITY COULD EXPAND THE NUMBER  
6 OF ACCEPTABLE SITES FOR FUTURE GEOLOGIC REPOSITORIES AND  
7 COULD REDUCE BOTH THE COST AND DIFFICULTY OF SITING AND  
8 OPERATING A GEOLOGIC REPOSITORY.

9 IN ADDITION, AS WE ALL KNOW, A NEW ADMINISTRATION  
10 IS SET TO BEGIN ON JANUARY 20. A NEW PRESIDENT AND  
11 SECRETARY OF ENERGY ARE LIKELY TO BRING NEW THINKING AND  
12 DIRECTION ON THE GNEP CONCEPT. A NEW BUDGET IS LIKELY TO  
13 SIGNIFICANTLY IMPACT FUNDING FOR GNEP RENDERING MUCH OF WHAT  
14 IS INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT UNREALISTIC AT BEST AND COMPLETELY  
15 INVALID AT WORST.

16 THESE MOST RECENT ACTIONS HAVE POTENTIALLY SERIOUS  
17 PUBLIC SAFETY, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS,  
18 WHEN TAKEN ACCUMULATIVELY IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH GNEP AS  
19 DESCRIBED IN THE DRAFT, AND THESE IMPACTS SHOULD BE  
20 REEVALUATED IN A COMPREHENSIVE FASHION.

21 THE POTENTIAL FOR SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS OF  
22 RECENT DOE ACTIONS, AND THE POTENTIAL FOR A CHANGE IN  
23 DIRECTION ON THIS PROGRAM, JUSTIFIES THE NOTION THAT THE  
24 CURRENT DRAFT PEIS SHOULD BE PLACED ON HOLD AND REDRAFTED,  
25 PENDING INCLUSION OF THE NEW YUCCA MOUNTAIN RELATED

1 INFORMATION, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, THE DRAFT PEIS SHOULD BE  
2 WITHDRAWN PENDING DIRECTION FROM THE NEW ADMINISTRATION.

3 WE ARE AWARE THAT THERE IS SPECULATION THE NEW  
4 ADMINISTRATION MAY CALL FOR A BLUE RIBBON PANEL TO EXAMINE  
5 NUCLEAR WASTE ISSUES. SHOULD THE NEW ADMINISTRATION DECIDE  
6 TO CONVENE SUCH A PANEL, CLARK COUNTY WOULD NOT OBJECT TO  
7 THE EVALUATION OF THE GNEP PROGRAM AS PART OF THAT  
8 EXAMINATION. SUCH A BLUE RIBBON PANEL WOULD PROVIDE A  
9 CRITICAL AND RARE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLORE AND IDENTIFY  
10 POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS TO THE NUCLEAR WASTE PROBLEM IN A  
11 COMPREHENSIVE AND HOLISTIC FASHION.

12 WE HOPE THAT YOU WILL TAKE THESE COMMENTS INTO  
13 CONSIDERATION AS YOU MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE NEW  
14 ADMINISTRATION ON A PATH FORWARD TO ADDRESS THE SHORT- AND  
15 LONG-TERM SAFETY AND SECURITY IMPLICATIONS OF WASTE  
16 MANAGEMENT WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF GNEP.

17 BY THE MARCH DEADLINE, WE WILL PROVIDE MORE  
18 EXTENSIVE COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT PEIS, PARTICULARLY WHETHER  
19 WE BELIEVE NEPA REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THIS PROPOSED  
20 ACTION HAVE BEEN MET.

21 THANK YOU FOR INCLUDING THESE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS  
22 FOR THE FORMAL RECORD.

23 THANK YOU.

24 MR. BROWN: THANK YOU. ED IS NEXT AND WILL BE  
25 FOLLOWED BY ROBERT SULLIVAN.

1 MR. MUELLER: GOOD EVENING, MY NAME IS ED MUELLER,  
2 I'M THE DIRECTOR OF THE ESMERALDA COUNTY REPOSITORY  
3 OVERSIGHT PROGRAM FOR YUCCA MOUNTAIN. I WOULD PERSONALLY  
4 LIKE TO THANK THE U.S. DEPARTMENT AND OFFICE OF NUCLEAR  
5 ENERGY FOR CONSIDERING RURAL NEVADA, TAKING THE TIME AND THE  
6 EXPENSE OF COMING AND MAKING THE PRESENTATIONS THAT THEY'VE  
7 DONE AND ALSO TO MAKING IT ABLE TO PRESENT COMMENTS.

8 I'M HERE TODAY ON BEHALF OF THE ESMERALDA COUNTY  
9 BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS. ESMERALDA COUNTY IS ADJACENT TO NYE  
10 COUNTY, THE HOST COUNTY TO YUCCA MOUNTAIN NUCLEAR WASTE  
11 PROJECT. WE ARE ALSO -- THE PROPOSED RAIL LINE WHICH WILL  
12 CARRY SPENT FUEL AND HIGH-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE PROJECT PASSES  
13 THROUGH OUR COUNTY. IN 1983 BY LAW AND THE STATE OF NEVADA  
14 AND TEN COUNTIES WERE DECLARED AFFECTED MULTIPLE USE OF  
15 GOVERNMENT. ESMERALDA COUNTY IS ONE OF THE MULTIPLE USE OF  
16 GOVERNMENT -- AFFECTED MULTIPLE USE OF GOVERNMENT.

17 ESMERALDA COUNTY APPRECIATES THE FACT THAT THE  
18 NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1982 ESTABLISHED A PROCESS AND  
19 TIME SCHEDULE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATION'S FIRST  
20 GEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY FOR THE PERMANENT DISPOSAL OF SPENT  
21 COMMERCIAL NUCLEAR FUEL AND HIGH-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE.

22 ESMERALDA COUNTY ALSO APPRECIATES THE IMPORTANCE  
23 OF HAVING A SEAT AT THE TABLE. TO ASSURE THE HIGHEST LEVEL  
24 OF SAFETY AND SECURITY FOR RESIDENTS WHO MIGHT BE IMPACTED  
25 BY THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THE NUCLEAR WASTE

1 FACILITIES AS WELL AS THE TRANSPORTATION OF NUCLEAR WASTE  
2 THROUGH NEVADA AND THROUGH OUR COUNTY TO THE FACILITIES.

3 WITH THAT SAID, IT'S MY PRIVILEGE TO READ TO YOU  
4 TODAY COMMENTS FROM THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN COUNTY BOARD OF  
5 COMMISSIONERS FOR THE GNEP DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL  
6 IMPACT STATEMENT. AND I ALSO PRESENTED THESE COMMENTS ON  
7 DECEMBER 9 IN WASHINGTON, D.C. THE COMMENTS FROM THE YUCCA  
8 MOUNTAIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS IS IN THE FORM OF A LETTER,  
9 AND THE LETTER IS ADDRESSED TO DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY OFFICE  
10 OF NUCLEAR ENERGY.

11 THE ESMERALDA COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
12 APPRECIATES THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT  
13 GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY PARTNERSHIP (GNEP) PROGRAMMATIC AND  
14 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT. WE APPROVE THIS LETTER AND  
15 READ THE CONTENTS OF THE COMMENTS INTO THE RECORD ON THIS  
16 DATE, DECEMBER 2, 2008, FOR SUBMITTAL TO DOE AS OUR COMMENTS  
17 ON THE PEIS.

18 WE BELIEVE THE REALITY IS THAT A NUCLEAR  
19 RESURGENCE WILL REQUIRE A BROAD INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGICAL  
20 EXPANSION. IT IS ABOUT ENRICHING URANIUM, FABRICATING FUEL,  
21 RECOVERING VALUABLE RESOURCES FROM SPENT FUEL, AND RECYCLING  
22 IT AND RESEARCHING AND DEVELOPING NEW TECHNOLOGIES. IN  
23 ADDITION, WE SUGGEST THERE BE COORDINATION AMONG COMMERCIAL  
24 AND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS TO ENSURE  
25 DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT OF THE MOST EFFECTIVE

1 REPROCESSING AND REACTOR TECHNOLOGIES.

2           ULTIMATELY, THE ROAD TO AIR AND SUCCESS FOR  
3 NUCLEAR -- ULTIMATELY, THE ROAD TO CLEANER AIR AND SUCCESS  
4 FOR NUCLEAR POWER MUST RUN THROUGH YUCCA MOUNTAIN. WITH  
5 THAT SAID, THE COMMISSIONERS ARE PLEASED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT  
6 THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY HAS INCLUDED IN THE GNEP DRAFT PEIS  
7 IN SECTION 1.1.2, THE FOLLOWING: THE GNEP PROGRAM HAS BEEN  
8 PROPOSED IN ADDITION TO YUCCA MOUNTAIN REPOSITORY MANDATED  
9 BY THE NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1982, AND DOES NOT CHANGE  
10 THE PLANNING FOR THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN REPOSITORY. ANY  
11 DECISION PURSUANT TO GNEP PEIS WOULD NOT DIMINISH IN ANY WAY  
12 THE NEED FOR NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM AT A PERMANENT  
13 GEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY.

14           SECTION S.1, UNDER INTRODUCTION OF THE PEIS STATES  
15 THE FOLLOWING: AT THIS TIME, DOE IS NOT PROPOSING  
16 PROJECT-SPECIFIC OR SITE-SPECIFIC ACTIONS, SUCH AS THE  
17 CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF INDIVIDUAL FACILITIES TO  
18 SUPPORT THE DEMONSTRATION AND DEPLOYMENT OF ANY PROGRAMMATIC  
19 ALTERNATIVES. END OF QUOTES.

20           ESMERALDA COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FEEL  
21 REGARDLESS OF WHATEVER DECISIONS ARE MADE REGARDING GNEP  
22 FACILITY LOCATIONS, CONSIDERATION MUST BE MADE TO LOCATE  
23 FACILITIES WITHIN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE GEOLOGIC REPOSITORY  
24 FOR WHICH THE WASTE IS ULTIMATELY DESTINED. DOE MUST NOT  
25 RULE OUT LOCATIONS OF THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT AND THE

1 NEVADA TEST SITE IN NYE COUNTY AS A POTENTIAL SITE.

2 ESMERALDA COUNTY APPRECIATES YOUR CONSIDERATION

3 AND LOOKS FORWARD TO WORKING CONSTRUCTIVELY WITH DOE ON THIS

4 IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROGRAM. SINCERELY, SIGNED, R.J. GILLUM,

5 CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD. NANCY BOLAND, VICE CHAIRMAN. AND

6 WILLIAM KIRBY, COMMISSIONER.

7 THANK YOU.

8 MR. BROWN: ROBERT SULLIVAN IS NEXT. AND HE WILL

9 BE FOLLOWED BY JANE FELDMAN.

10 IS ROBERT SULLIVAN HERE?

11 AUDIENCE SPEAKER: HE LEFT. HE WAS NOT WELL.

12 MR. BROWN: OH, I'M SORRY. OKAY. WELL, I GATHER

13 HE'LL SUBMIT HIS STATEMENT, THEN, FOR THE RECORD. ALL

14 RIGHT.

15 OUR NEXT SPEAKER, THEN, IS JANE FELDMAN. AND SHE

16 WILL BE FOLLOWED BY RITA RANSOM. I'M SORRY FOR THE SHORT

17 NOTICE.

18 MS. FELDMAN: IT'S ALL RIGHT. MY NAME IS JANE

19 FELDMAN. I LIVE IN LAS VEGAS. I AM THE CONSERVATION CHAIR

20 FOR THE SOUTHERN NEVADA GROUP OF THE SIERRA CLUB.

21 I HAVE A WRITTEN COPY OF THE COMMENTS THAT I

22 PREPARED FOR TONIGHT. BUT IN MY ORAL COMMENTS, I HAVE A

23 COUPLE OF EXTRA THINGS TO SAY.

24 FIRST OF ALL, THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR GIVING US A

25 CHANCE TO HAVE A PUBLIC HEARING WITHIN THE STATE OF NEVADA,

1 WE APPRECIATE THIS ONE HEARING BEING HELD HERE, IT'S REALLY  
2 IMPORTANT TO US. THE SECOND THING IS THAT AS I LISTEN  
3 TONIGHT, I REALIZE THAT THE CRUX OF THE SIERRA CLUB'S  
4 PROBLEM WITH GNEP IS THAT WE ADAMANTLY OPPOSE THE PURPOSE  
5 AND NEED. SO ACTUALLY, THE INTRICACIES OF THE SPECIFICS  
6 AREN'T THAT IMPORTANT BECAUSE THE WHOLE IDEA IS CONTRARY TO  
7 WHAT WE THINK THE BEST DIRECTION FOR THE NATION, FOR THE  
8 PLANET, FOR CLEAN AIR IS. SO THAT'S WHY I AM PREPARING SOME  
9 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO MAKE RIGHT NOW.

10 THE PURPOSE AND NEED IS TO ENHANCE OUR ABILITY TO  
11 PRODUCE ELECTRICITY WITH NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS AND THAT IS AN  
12 EXTREMELY BAD IDEA THAT THE SIERRA CLUB AND OTHER  
13 ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS HAVE, AGAIN, OPPOSED TO FOR A  
14 VERY LONG TIME.

15 FIRST OF ALL, IT'S NOT A CARBON-FREE PROCESSING  
16 SYSTEM. THERE'S A LOT OF CARBON PRODUCED IN MINING THE  
17 MATERIALS THAT ARE NEEDED IN PROCESSING THEM, HANDLING THEM,  
18 TRANSPORTING THEM, MOVING THEM TO THE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS  
19 SITE, AND THEN TAKING CARE OF ALL THOSE MATERIALS AFTERWARD.  
20 ALL THOSE CO2 COSTS NEED TO BE INCLUDED IN THE BUDGET CYCLE  
21 WHEN CO2 IS TALKED ABOUT AS A PRODUCTION RESULT OF NUCLEAR  
22 POWER, AND THAT HASN'T BEEN DONE ADEQUATELY AT ALL.

23 IF NUCLEAR POWER MADE THE AIR CLEANER, THE SIERRA  
24 CLUB WOULD SUPPORT IT. IT DOESN'T DO THAT AND WE CANNOT  
25 SUPPORT NUCLEAR POWER FOR PRODUCTION. ALL THE INFORMATION

1 THAT I READ GETTING READY FOR TONIGHT'S PUBLIC HEARING  
2 INDICATED THAT THE CLOSED CYCLE, THE GNEP PROCESSES, WOULD  
3 END UP PRODUCING A LARGER VOLUME OF HIGH-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE  
4 RATHER THAN A SMALLER VOLUME OF NUCLEAR LEVEL WASTE. I'VE  
5 SEEN IT IN EDITORIALS, I'VE SEEN IT IN INFORMATION PROVIDED  
6 BY ORGANIZATIONS SUCH AS THE NUCLEAR INFORMATION RESOURCES  
7 SERVICE. AND THAT MAKES ME WONDER HOW YOU CAN PRESENT  
8 INFORMATION TO SHOW THAT ONE OF THOSE MAJOR GOALS IS BEING  
9 MET BY THE GNEP PEIS.

10 IT'S ALSO A CONCERN TO ME THAT THE NUCLEAR  
11 INDUSTRY IS NOT BEHIND THE GNEP PROPOSAL AT ALL BECAUSE THEY  
12 WILL NOT FUND IT, SO THIS ENDS UP BEING A FEDERAL BUY-IN  
13 PROGRAM IN ORDER TO IMPLEMENT THE PROPOSAL.

14 THERE WAS AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT IN YOUR PRESENTATION  
15 TONIGHT THAT THE CLOSED CYCLE SYSTEMS WILL END UP REQUIRING  
16 MORE TRANSPORTATION AND MORE HANDLING THAN THE OPEN CYCLE  
17 FUEL SYSTEM. THAT'S AN INCREDIBLY IMPORTANT PART TO THE  
18 WHOLE SOLUTION HERE. THE THREATS AND THE RISKS ARE HUGELY  
19 MORE INCREASED WHEN YOU START TRANSPORTING NUCLEAR WASTE AND  
20 THAT IS ONE OF THE MAJOR REASONS WHY WE HAVE, AT THE SIERRA  
21 CLUB, HAVE OPPOSED THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN WASTE DUMP SO  
22 ADAMANTLY IS BECAUSE OF RISKS AND THREATS OF TRANSPORTING  
23 HIGH-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE ALL OVER THE NATION TO THE SITE  
24 HERE AT YUCCA MOUNTAIN. AND THE TRANSPORTATION, HANDLING  
25 COSTS ARE GOING TO INCREASE EXPONENTIALLY BECAUSE OF CLOSED

1 CYCLE FUEL PROCESSING. THAT'S ANOTHER CONCERN THAT WE WANT  
2 TO MAKE SURE IS HANDLED PROPERLY.

3 WHEN I PREPARED THE COMMENTS FOR TONIGHT, I HAD  
4 SEVEN REASONS WHY THE GNEP PROPOSAL HAD PROBLEMS FOR US IN  
5 THE SIERRA CLUB. I'LL JUST LIST THEM VERY QUICKLY WITH MORE  
6 COMMENTS IN THE WRITTEN REPORT THAT I WILL LEAVE, AND THEN  
7 GO ON TO A SUGGESTION FROM THE SIERRA CLUB ABOUT WHAT WE  
8 SHOULD BE DOING INSTEAD OF GNEP.

9 THE FIRST REASON IS THAT REPROCESSING URANIUM AND  
10 PLUTONIUM RESULTS IN MORE, NOT LESS, NUCLEAR WASTE THAT NEED  
11 PERMANENT STORAGE AT A WASTE DUMP SOMEWHERE. AND AS I JUST  
12 DESCRIBED, THERE'D BE SOME CONTROVERSY ABOUT THAT PARTICULAR  
13 SITUATION.

14 NUMBER 2, THE UNITED STATES HAS YET TO ESTABLISH A  
15 DISPOSAL PLAN FOR THE LARGE AMOUNT OF HOT, RADIOACTIVE  
16 HIGH-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE THAT WE HAVE ALREADY GENERATED.  
17 YUCCA MOUNTAIN MAY HAVE A LICENCE APPLICATION SUBMITTED, BUT  
18 IT HASN'T BEEN PROCESSED YET BECAUSE THERE ARE FLAWS IN THIS  
19 SO-CALLED GEOLOGIC BARRIER THAT WE HAVE TO HAVE HIGH-LEVEL  
20 NUCLEAR WASTE BE STORED HERE.

21 THREE, REPROCESSING URANIUM AND PLUTONIUM IS  
22 HUGELY EXPENSIVE ON THE SCALE OF THE \$700 BILLION BAILOUT  
23 THAT THE NATION JUST MADE FOR THE FINANCIAL INDUSTRY.

24 FOUR, REPROCESSING SEPARATE URANIUM AND PLUTONIUM  
25 FROM HIGH-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE WHICH ACTUALLY MAKES THEM MORE

1 VALUABLE AND MORE VULNERABLE TO TERRORIST USE AS NUCLEAR  
2 EXPLOSIVES FOR WEAPONS. THAT IS A CONCERN I HAVE SEEN  
3 REPEATED OVER AND OVER IN VARIOUS PLACES. IT NEEDS TO BE  
4 DEALT WITH, CONFRONTED UPFRONT AND VERY CLEAR FOR MOST OF US  
5 WHO ARE CONCERNED ABOUT THESE KIND OF THINGS.

6 NUMBER 5, ANY REPROCESSING FACILITY, GNEP  
7 FACILITY, WOULD ITSELF BECOME A DUMP FOR THE MOST LETHAL  
8 HIGH-HEAD RADIOACTIVITY TOXINS THAT WE KNOW.

9 NUMBER 6, WE'VE ALREADY TRIED AND FAILED AT  
10 CLEANING UP PAST REPROCESSING EFFORTS. THIS IS SOMETHING  
11 THAT I JUST LEARNED ABOUT. FOR THREE DECADES, THE UNITED  
12 STATES WORKED TO CLEAN UP RESULTS OF COLD WAR ERA  
13 REPROCESSING WEAPONS-GRADE PLUTONIUM AND URANIUM. AFTER  
14 MORE THAN 20 YEARS AND BILLIONS OF DOLLARS, DOE HAS  
15 PROCESSED LESS THAN 3 PERCENT OF THAT RADIOACTIVE WASTE AT  
16 ONE SITE IN SOUTH CAROLINA. SO WE'RE BUILDING ON SOMETHING  
17 THAT WE'VE ALREADY FAILED AT? THAT WAS A HUGE CONCERN ABOUT  
18 THAT.

19 THE SEVENTH PROBLEM WAS THAT THERE ARE TECHNICAL  
20 PROBLEMS WITH THE GNEP PEIS THAT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED. FOR  
21 EXAMPLE, THERE ARE NOT GOOD LINKS BETWEEN THE PEIS AND THE  
22 NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO HLNW TO YUCCA MOUNTAIN.  
23 IT'S NOT RELEVANT TO THE RAIL EIS, THE CALIENTE EIS THAT WAS  
24 THE DRAFT THAT JUST CAME OUT. AND WE'RE CONCERNED THAT  
25 WE'RE GOING TO GET A DECISION THAT'S COMPARTMENTALIZED AND

1 FRAGMENTED.

2 FOR ALL THESE REASONS, WE SHOULD REJECT THE GNEP  
3 PROPOSAL.

4 WHAT WE SHOULD BE DOING INSTEAD. FIRST, WE SHOULD  
5 STOP CREATING HIGH-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE. WE SHOULD CLOSE THE  
6 NUCLEAR POWER PLANT THAT WE HAVE AND WE SHOULD NOT BUILD  
7 ANYMORE. THIS HAS BEEN THE SIERRA CLUB'S POSITION FOR 25  
8 YEARS AND WE HAVEN'T MOVED OFF THAT POSITION BECAUSE IT'S  
9 THE SAFEST POSITION FOR PUBLIC HEALTH AND FOR ENVIRONMENTAL  
10 PROTECTION.

11 SECONDLY, WE SHOULD MAKE SURE THAT ANY  
12 HIGH-NUCLEAR WASTE THAT ALREADY EXISTS IS MADE AS SAFE AS  
13 POSSIBLE AND KEPT AS CLOSE AS POSSIBLE TO THE SITE WHERE  
14 IT'S GENERATED. AND THAT MINIMIZES THE THREATS AND RISKS OF  
15 TRANSPORTATION IN HANDLING MANAGEMENT OF THOSE ITEMS. IF WE  
16 CAN BUILD TRANSPORTATION CANISTERS TO BRING ALL THAT  
17 HIGH-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE HERE TO NEVADA, WE CAN CONTAINERIZE  
18 IT SAFELY AND KEEP IT CLOSE TO THE SITE OF GENERATION AND  
19 KEEP IT AT THE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS AS IT PROVIDES BENEFITS  
20 TO THOSE BACK EAST OR WHEREVER THE NUCLEAR PLANTS ARE  
21 LOCATED.

22 THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

23 MR. BROWN: THANK YOU. OUR NEXT SPEAKER IS RITA  
24 RANSOM.

25 MS. RANSOM: MY NAME IS RITA RANSOM, I'M FROM LAS

1 VEGAS, AND I TOO AM REPRESENTING THE SIERRA CLUB. HOWEVER,  
2 MY ESTEEM COLLEAGUE, JANE, HAS DONE AN EXCELLENT JOB AND SO  
3 I'D LIKE TO SPEAK ON A MORE PERSONAL LEVEL.

4 INSANITY HAS BEEN DEFINED AS DOING THE SAME THING  
5 OVER AND OVER AGAIN AND EXPECTING DIFFERENT RESULTS. MY  
6 PERSONAL OPINION IS PROLIFERATING THE USE OF NUCLEAR POWER  
7 IS THAT TYPE OF INSANITY. AND I TAKE EXCEPTION TO THE  
8 ARGUMENT THAT SINCE NYE COUNTY AND ITS NEIGHBORING ESMERALDA  
9 COUNTY ARE ALREADY TERRIBLY CONTAMINATED FROM ALL THE  
10 NUCLEAR TESTS THAT TOOK PLACE THERE, HECK, YOU OUGHT TO HAVE  
11 SOME COMPENSATION FOR IT. SO LET'S BRING IN SOME MORE  
12 POTENTIAL CONTAMINATION. THAT'S LIKE THROWING GOOD MONEY  
13 AFTER BAD. IT'S A VERY SPECIOUS ARGUMENT.

14 I'M PAINED GREATLY BY THE IDEA THAT WE BELIEVE WE  
15 CAN SOLVE OUR NATION'S ENERGY NEEDS BY USING MORE NUCLEAR  
16 POWER TO GENERATE ELECTRICITY. THE REALITY IS THERE IS NO,  
17 I REPEAT, NO TRULY SAFE ENVIRONMENTALLY NEUTRAL WAY TO USE  
18 NUCLEAR POWER. TO SAY THAT IT DOES NOT CONTRIBUTE TO THE  
19 GLOBAL WARMING BECAUSE THERE ARE NO CO2 EMISSIONS UTTERLY  
20 IGNORE THE ENVIRONMENT AND DEVASTATION CAUSED BY MINING FOR  
21 URANIUM AND TRANSPORTING IT, WHICH WILL INCREASE ITS NUCLEAR  
22 POWER PROLIFERATE.

23 AND I'D LIKE TO IMAGINE A TIME IN THE FUTURE IF WE  
24 DO THIS EXPANSION OF NUCLEAR ENERGY IN THE UNITED STATES,  
25 WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THERE'S NO MORE URANIUM TO BE MINED IN THE

1 UNITED STATES? WHAT IF WE ARE HELD HOSTAGE BY OTHER  
2 COUNTRIES THAT HAVE THE URANIUM WE NEED BECAUSE NOW WE'VE  
3 BECOME DEPENDANT ON IT? I CAN JUST SEE THE CONFLICT THAT  
4 WILL ARISE ON A GLOBAL LEVEL AS WE COMPETE FOR URANIUM AND  
5 WE'RE COMPETING WITH TERRORISTS AS WELL WHO WOULD LIKE  
6 NOTHING BETTER THAN TO GET THEIR HANDS ON IT. SOUNDS LIKE  
7 THE PETROLEUM STORY, DOESN'T IT? DO WE REALLY WANT TO GO  
8 DOWN THAT ROUTE ESPECIALLY WHEN IT'S NOT SAFE TO BEGIN WITH?  
9 SO MUCH TIME AND RESOURCES THAT WE SPEND SHAPING  
10 THE MYTH OF NUCLEAR ENERGY SHOULD INSTEAD BE FOCUSED ON THE  
11 DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT OF RENEWABLE ENERGY, THE ONLY  
12 TRULY SAFE ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY AND SUSTAINABLE ANSWER  
13 LONG-TERM TO OUR NATION'S ENERGY NEEDS. WE ARE FOOLING  
14 OURSELVES IF WE THINK THAT NUCLEAR ENERGY IS GOING TO BUY US  
15 ANYMORE THAN POTENTIAL TROUBLE, BOTH FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL  
16 DEVASTATION AND THE POTENTIAL CONTAMINATION SAFETY,  
17 TRANSPORTATION ISSUES, WHICH ARE NOT GOING TO GO AWAY.  
18 SO WHILE I RESPECTFULLY APPRECIATE ALL THE WORK  
19 THAT THE DOE HAS DONE, JUST SAY NO TO NUCLEAR POWER.  
20 THANK YOU.  
21 MR. BROWN: THANK YOU. THAT CONCLUDES THE NUMBER  
22 OF SPEAKERS WHO SIGNED UP AHEAD OF TIME TO SPEAK. IF  
23 THERE'S ANY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC IN THE AUDIENCE WHO HAS NOT  
24 YET SPOKEN WHO WOULD LIKE TO ADD COMMENTS, YOU'RE WELCOME TO  
25 RAISE YOUR HAND AND CALL ON YOU TO COME UP AND MAKE A

1 COMMENT. DOES ANYONE WANT TO ADD ANYTHING?

2 (NO RESPONSE.)

3 MR. BROWN: OKAY. THAT, THEN, CONCLUDES OUR  
4 MEETING FOR TODAY. I APPRECIATE ALL OF YOU ATTENDING AND  
5 YOUR COMMENTS. WE ARE OFFICIALLY ADJOURNED. THANKS VERY  
6 MUCH.

7 (WHEREUPON THE PUBLIC HEARING CONCLUDED.)

8 -OOO-

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1                   REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2

3

STATE OF NEVADA    )  
                          ) SS  
COUNTY OF CLARK    )

5

6

7                   I, JILL JACOBY, DO HEREBY ATTEST THAT I

8 TOOK DOWN IN SHORTHAND ALL OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN THE

9 BEFORE-ENTITLED MATTER AT THE TIME AND PLACE INDICATED; AND

10 THEREAFTER SAID SHORTHAND NOTES WERE TRANSCRIBED INTO

11 COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION; AND THAT THE FOREGOING

12 TRANSCRIPT CONSTITUTES A FULL, TRUE, AND ACCURATE RECORD OF

13 THE PROCEEDINGS HAD TO THE BEST OF MY SKILL AND ABILITY.

14                   EXECUTED THIS 20TH DAY OF JANUARY 2009, AT

15 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA.

16

17

18

19

\_\_\_\_\_  
JILL JACOBY  
VERBATIM REPORTER

20