

1 MR. KAMPS: I just wanted to come
2 back up.

3 MR. BROWN: Oh, sure, that's fine.

4 MR. KAMPS: My name is Kevin Kamps,
5 with Beyond Nuclear. But I was asked by Great
6 Lakes United to also read a statement. And
7 I'm on the Great Lakes United Green Energy
8 Nuclear Free Task Force as well, as a member
9 group. Great Lakes United is a coalition of
10 150 organizations in Canada and the United
11 States, whose purpose is to protect and
12 preserve the Great Lakes environment. And
13 this was a resolution passed in June of 2004
14 by Great Lakes United, at its annual meeting.

15 A prohibition of barge shipments
16 of high-level radioactive waste on the Great
17 Lakes. Whereas, in its February 2002 final
18 environmental impact statement, for the
19 proposed national high-level radioactive waste
20 dump site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, published
21 by the Department of Energy, the US DOE
22 proposed up to 453 barge shipments of highly

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 radioactive irradiated nuclear fuel. Upon the
2 waters of Lake Michigan, from commercial
3 nuclear reactors in Wisconsin and Michigan,
4 into the ports of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and
5 Muskegon, Michigan.

6 And whereas the Department of
7 Energy Reaffirmed its proposal to barge highly
8 radioactive wastes on US waterways, in its
9 federal register announcement and record of
10 decision in April 2004, to use mostly rail
11 shipments to Yucca Mountain via the Caliente
12 Nevada rail corridor. And whereas DOE's
13 decision to use mostly rail shipments means
14 that nuclear reactors, lacking direct rail
15 access, such as the Point Beach, Kewaunee, and
16 Palisades nuclear power plants on the Lake
17 Michigan shoreline are now more likely to use
18 barges to ship irradiated nuclear fuel into
19 the nearest railhead.

20 And whereas the US Nuclear
21 Regulatory Commission's design criteria for
22 high-level radioactive waste transportation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 casks only account for an accidental,
2 underwater submersion to a depth of two
3 hundred meters, or 666 feet, while Lake
4 Michigan is more than two hundred meters deep
5 in locations near DOE's proposed barge routes.

6 And whereas NRC does not require full scale
7 physical safety testing of high-level
8 radioactive waste shipping containers.

9 And whereas each barge would carry
10 a rail-sized high-level radioactive waste
11 shipping container, which would hold up to 240
12 times the long lasting radioactivity, in terms
13 of radioactive Cesium isotopes alone, released
14 by the Hiroshima atomic bomb. And whereas
15 high-level radioactive waste rail casks, on
16 barges, fully loaded with irradiated nuclear
17 fuel, would weigh one hundred to one hundred
18 and fifty tons, requiring special, heavy load
19 cranes that could greatly complicate or delay
20 emergency cask recovery operations.

21 And whereas underwater submersion
22 accidents could cause release of radioactive

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 contaminants, or the inadvertent nuclear chain
2 reaction of fission materials still present
3 within the high-level radioactive waste, due
4 to the neutron moderating effect of
5 infiltrating water. And whereas Lake
6 Michigan, which flows into the rest of the
7 Great Lakes and the Saint Lawrence Seaway, is
8 the source of drinking water, recreation,
9 tourism, industry, and fisheries for many tens
10 of millions of people in the United States,
11 Canada, and indigenous first nations.

12 Therefore be it resolved that
13 Great Lakes United urges the prohibition of
14 shipments of high-level radioactive waste on
15 the Great Lakes. Certified June 6th, 2004, at
16 the annual general meeting in Northeast
17 Pennsylvania. And I would just like to add
18 that the current environmental impact
19 documents have reaffirmed the Department of
20 Energy's proposals to barge high-level
21 radioactive wastes on certain waterways in the
22 United States.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And I learned during the poster
2 session that just because certain nuclear
3 plants are not shown to use barge transport,
4 that it still could happen when the actual
5 Yucca Mountain plan is carried out. That the
6 barge shipments that are mapped in 2002 and
7 reaffirmed in an appendix of this 2007
8 document do list a number of about a dozen
9 ports in the United States that could see
10 barge shipments. There could be additional
11 ports as well. And there's a lot of concern
12 about this proposal.]

13 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay,
14 again, is there anyone else who would like to
15 add a comment at this point? Okay, we are
16 scheduled to stay in session to take comments
17 through five o'clock, and what we customarily
18 do is to recess at this point. If anybody
19 decides they would like to add formal
20 comments, just see me. We will reconvene.
21 The Department of Energy staff is still
22 available, as is the court reporter. So we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

will take a recess at this point, thanks.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com