

12 DAVID WEISMAN: Good evening. My name is
13 David Weisman, and I am with the Alliance for Nuclear
14 Responsibility, a statewide organization. [I'll try 1
15 to be brief in my five minutes. Maybe I'll petition
16 for six minutes, that would be one minute for each
17 hour I spent in the car driving here from San Luis
18 Obispo to attend, which brings up first and foremost
19 the question of process.

20 Our California Energy Commissioner, Jim
21 Boyd, in repeated letters earlier this year did send
22 letters to the DOE saying, If you're holding
23 something in California, particularly Lone Pine,
24 could you please also hold something in Sacramento,
25 which, of course, is easily accessible by rail and
1 plane. Apparently that request was not headed.
2 Actually, as I understand it, Mr. Boyd's letter was
3 never answered.]

4 Speaking of the California Energy
5 Commission, what the alliance is involved with is a
6 state bill passed two years ago, AB 1632, by our
7 assemblyman, Sam Blakeslee, which calls for the state
8 energy commission to do a full cost benefit risk
9 analysis, cradle to grave, of nuclear power before
10 deciding whether it's in California's interest to
11 continue using nuclear power beyond the current
12 licenses, which expire in 20 years, for the two
13 remaining plants, Diablo Canyon and San Onofre.

14 This question of economics is one I will

15 bring here today, though I wholeheartedly agree and
16 concur with the many issues of science and technical
17 nature raised by others. But this is our big issue,
18 economics, because this is something over which the
19 state has control. We are all rate payers, and as
20 you know, in your bills you are paying, for those of
21 you who have nuclear utilities, for the cost of Yucca
22 Mountain.

23 [The other thing I'm a little disappointed
24 about of course is that there will be no answers to
25 our questions this evening. I will leave my
1 questions and my card with an appropriate
2 representative from the DOE. We would like answers
3 to the following questions because we have
4 appointments with state legislators. State
5 legislators on both sides of oil would like answers
6 to these questions.]

7 [Part of the difficulty in formulating these
8 questions is it has to do with transportation. That
9 is a purely California issue here, our roads and
10 rail. And the maps, until it was explained to me by
11 a representative, the maps are deceptive. When you
12 look at the map in the booklet, and I'm a guy who
13 rides a lot of trains, I don't really travel by plane
14 anymore, and I'm looking and I'm thinking, well, now,
15 gee, waste from here might go this way to California
16 and avoid California or it might go this way. And
17 then I find out this is a composite map of a bunch of
18 scenarios. So among the other questions would be why

2....
Continued
below

3

19 in the EIS are these maps not clearly identified and
20 delineated separately.

21 So here go a few of the questions that which
22 we'd like to see answered. First one was of course
23 is any radioactive waste, civilian or otherwise, that
24 did not originate in California going to pass through
25 our state to get to Yucca Mountain? What percentage
1 and how much by volume? Obviously I now know the
2 answer is yes, waste will be passing through
3 California with the discarding of the Mina route.

4 Okay. If that's the question, then the
5 following things apply: Well, it applies to waste
6 within California as well, but more so from the
7 outside. Has the Department of Energy notified the
8 first responders in each county or municipality
9 through which this waste will pass that this waste
10 will, indeed, be passing through their areas? If so,
11 when did you notify these parties? Have you received
12 comments and responses from any of these municipal
13 and local county concerned parties or first
14 responders? If so, we would like to see a copy of
15 that list because we'd like to meet with the
16 legislators from those districts.

17 If you did not notify them, have you
18 notified the California governor of the final
19 transport route selected? Which other state agencies
20 and legislative committees have you been working
21 with? We would like to know the list and the names

22 of these legislators you've already agreed to meet
23 with or have discussed this with.

24 Again, this is an economic question because
25 the follow-up on that is has the Department of Energy
1 budgeted for the training and equipping of the first
2 responders in communities along the routes through
3 which the waste will be passing in the event of an
4 accident or a radiological release? Who will be
5 paying for this training and equipment and what will
6 it cost? We'd like those answers, because, as I said
7 earlier, the assembly bill mandating the state do a
8 full cost risk analysis will require those numbers to
9 be completed. Those are all costs of nuclear power
10 and they need to be included in this study.

11 The study is underway now. A first draft
12 will be available at the very end of this year to
13 which we will be able to again input the questions
14 we'd like or note any deficiencies and numbers in
15 places and areas that are missing that we would like
16 to see.

17 So those are among the first economic
18 questions that we would like to have answered, as
19 well as the questions regarding first responders,
20 emergency responders and people along the routes.]

21 [The alliance is certainly aware, our
22 alliance, and the DOE must be aware that there's been
23 at least one radioactive transport accident per year
24 since 2004. Oakridge State Highway 95 in 2004;
25 Buffalo, New York in '05; the Southern California

4

1 SONGS shipment in '06; the Shearon Harris reactor in
2 North Carolina in '07. Now, we've not even begun to
3 see the full volume of shipments. If you use
4 computer modeling to predict future accidents, did
5 your same computer model predict the one per year
6 that occurred in the preceding four years?]

7 [Other question is what is the DOE proposing 5
8 to do to repair the dilapidated state of the rail
9 infrastructure, particularly in California? Again,
10 this is a cost. So if there's a cost associated with
11 having to upgrade any of the rail lines to be
12 accessible for this radioactive waste, what will that
13 cost be and who is expected to bear that cost?]

14 And, finally, [if the casks are now going to 2 continued
15 be using trucks, we at the Diablo Canyon site, where
16 I live, believe and have believed from the year 2002
17 EIS that a barge was going to take the waste through
18 the Santa Barbara Channel to the navy station at
19 Point Mugu and put it on a train at that point.

20 The maps now indicates having heavy truck
21 for 22 kilometers of the rural roads and seven
22 kilometers of urban roads in our county, to our
23 knowledge. And we meet with our supervisors
24 regularly. No one in our county has been notified
25 that this is the case. This has not even been on the
1 plate of the board of supervisors. So the question
2 is are you notifying the people in these counties
3 where there are changes to the proposing, this

4 applies to Humboldt Bay as well, so that we may
5 evaluate those within our own county?

6 And, finally, why should the world's seventh
7 largest economy, that happens to be the state of
8 California, accept these transportation risks and
9 accept them and not know who's going to pay for them?
10 What guarantees will the DOE make that we can expect
11 they're to be no damage to this, the seventh largest
12 economy in the world?]

13 So there you have our questions from a
14 purely economic point of view, though, as I said, I
15 wholeheartedly support those scientific and technical
16 questions that have been raised this evening. And
17 that if someone can identify who in the DOE I can
18 leave these written questions and a business card
19 with for a real answer, I'll be happy to slide those
20 over. Thank you.