

1 I also am concerned about the national map,  
2 because I look at the map, we have three nuclear  
3 facilities in California, we have none in Nevada, we  
4 have none in Utah, we have none in Colorado. I think  
5 we have one in Arizona, we have none in New Mexico,  
6 we have none in Montana, we have none in North and  
7 South Dakota. These are the areas that are close.  
8 Where are the nuclear facilities? They're all or  
9 almost all, some in the Midwest but mostly on the  
10 East Coast coming from the north to the south.

11 You're going to have a huge transportation  
12 problem moving that nuclear waste. I agree with the  
13 speaker who said it would be much better to leave it  
14 where it is for 50 years and see what kind of a  
15 solution could be developed with the best science.  
16 Thank you.

17 BARBARA BYRON: Good evening. On behalf of  
18 the State of California, [I'd like to thank the  
19 Department of Energy for the opportunity to appear  
20 tonight. My name is Barbara Byron and I'm the  
21 Nuclear Policy Advisor for the California Energy  
22 Commission.

23 My comments today focus on the significant  
24 issues and concerns regarding the potential  
25 environmental impacts to California from the proposed

1

1 repository and the need for DOE to analyze these  
2 impacts in a revised draft SEIS.

3 Over the past two and a half decades,  
4 California has provided comments concerning the  
5 federal nuclear waste management and transportation  
6 program. In the year 2000, 13 California agencies  
7 completed an extensive review of DOE's draft EIS on  
8 the proposed project. California's review concluded  
9 that the proposed action will cause significant  
10 impacts to California and that DOE's environmental  
11 assessment was seriously deficient.

12 Unfortunately the major deficiencies  
13 identified in DOE's evaluation for the repository  
14 persist. In fact, the draft SEIS and its proposed  
15 TAD canister system have only increased the  
16 uncertainties and concerns regarding the potential  
17 impacts in California. Because of these deficiencies  
18 in the draft SEIS, DOE should issue a revised draft  
19 SEIS addressing these concerns before developing a  
20 final SEIS.] ... Continued

21 I'd like now to focus my remarks on a few of  
22 the areas of concern for California. First, [DOE has  
23 not met the requirements under NEPA to fully assess  
24 and disclose the potential impacts of the project and  
25 provide adequate notice to the affected communities

1 in California. The draft SEIS should describe and  
2 provide a thorough analysis of the potential impacts  
3 in California, and they include a thorough analysis  
4 of the route specific transportation impacts and  
5 groundwater impacts in California as well as the  
6 impacts on wildlife, natural habitat and public use  
7 parks in California.

8 Second, a major flaw in DOE's analysis is it  
9 has not identified the likely route for the expected  
10 shipments. Using DOE's estimates, if the Caliente  
11 rail corridor is used, approximately 755 rail casks  
12 and 857 truck casks would be transported through  
13 California. If the Mina rail corridor is used, an  
14 estimated 1963 rail casks and 857 truck casks would  
15 be transported through California.

16 Nevada's transportation experts have  
17 estimated a potential for as many as 4400 rail casks,  
18 or 45 percent of the total shipments, being routed  
19 through California. And if no rail access is  
20 developed to Yucca Mountain, a potential for as many  
21 as 24,000 truck shipments.

22 Repository shipments could impact major  
23 cities in California, including Sacramento, San  
24 Diego, San Bernardino, Fresno, Bakersfield, Los  
25 Angeles and Barstow. An estimated 7.5 million people

---

1 live within a mile of possible rail routes in  
2 California.]

3 The third area of concern relates to DOE's  
4 proposed use of the TAD canister system. [The draft  
5 SEIS should assess the risks and impacts the TAD  
6 systems poses to workers at reactor sites, the  
7 surrounding communities, the environment and the  
8 population in transit at or near reactor sites.

3

9 In addition, the draft SEIS should analyze  
10 how will the TAD system interface with dry cask  
11 storage system at these reactor sites, how it would  
12 work at decommissioned reactors where spent fuel  
13 handling equipment and facilities have been removed  
14 from these sites, who will be responsible for  
15 building the facilities needed to house the fuel  
16 handling operations, and what are the costs and  
17 impacts associated with transferring spent fuel into  
18 TADs at reactor sites.]

19 The fourth area of concern relates to DOE's  
20 possible use of State Route 127 in Southern  
21 California for shipments from eastern states to the  
22 repository. [If DOE is considering using State Route  
23 127 in California as a southern access route to the  
24 repository, the draft SEIS should assess the impacts  
25 from shipments using this route.]

4

1 A fifth area of concern is the potential  
2 impact to the repository groundwater in California.  
3 [Groundwater flowing beneath Yucca Mountain discharges  
4 in springs to the south including springs in Death  
5 Valley, California. The draft SEIS should better  
6 characterize the regional hydrology in the Death  
7 Valley area to evaluate groundwater flow and  
8 potential impacts to California aquifers.]

5

9 Sixth, and finally, [DOE considers Inyo  
10 County to be outside of the region of influence for  
11 the socioeconomic impact analysis. Although the  
12 repository is about 15 miles from the Inyo County  
13 line and the boundary of Death Valley National Park,  
14 we believe Inyo County should be considered within  
15 the region of influence for socioeconomic impact  
16 analysis and that the draft SEIS should evaluate  
17 these potential impacts to Inyo County.]

6

18 In conclusion, [because we found the draft  
19 SEIS to be significantly deficient in analyzing  
20 potential impacts to California and several major  
21 areas, we respectfully urge DOE to augment its NEPA  
22 analyses in the areas we've identified, recirculate a  
23 revised draft SEIS as another public draft for review  
24 and properly notify the California communities that  
25 face potentially significant impacts from the

... 1  
Continued

1 repository.]

2 The State of California will be submitting  
3 more detailed comments before the January 10th  
4 deadline, and I would like to again thank you for  
5 this opportunity to present our views.

6 CASH JASZCZAK: Cash Jaszczak for Nye County  
7 Nuclear Waste Repository project office, represent  
8 the interests of the Nye County Board of County  
9 Commissioners.

10 I want to thank DOE for having this  
11 meetings. And those hearings continue to be advised  
12 that we've been a cooperating agency on the  
13 supplement EIS, and a great majority of our interests  
14 have been pursued in that vein. And we will have  
15 significant comments on the rail alignment EIS and  
16 those formal remarks will be made by the appropriate  
17 deadline.

18 Everybody knows that Nye County is the site  
19 county for the repository. That decision was made by  
20 others elsewhere and designated by Congress in July  
21 of 2002. Nye County's elected officials have  
22 pragmatically engaged DOE to actively and  
23 constructively be involved in the process.

24 The law is what the law is, and until that  
25 changes, if it ever does, Nye County believes it