

*[The following comments were typed by U.S. Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board staff from hand written notes submitted to the Board by Ms. Fawn Shillinglaw based on her review of transcripts of the Board's meeting held on Wednesday, February 16, 2011, in Las Vegas, Nevada.]*

1952 Palisades Dr.  
Appleton, WI 54915

March 16, 2011

(Page 1 of 23)

Public comment by Fawn Shillinglaw on written transcript of U.S. NWTRB Winter Meeting  
Wed Feb 16, 2011 in Las Vegas.:

**p. 24 Lines 4-11**

Wow! I just finished reading all the newspaper accounts of the nuclear problems in Japan today and finished listening to a radio program on Japanese & USA power plants. There was mention that we really don't know a lot about what is happening with the spent fuel — in pools, casks? — reprocessing facilities, etc. Then, right here, (in the paper) Monica Regalbuto states that Rokkasho Mura, a recycling center in Japan, “is a dump of information that comes from all these different instruments, and is really very difficult for one person, or two people, to really look at all the data that comes at the same time. So we are getting to the point that we have more information than we have the ability to process. This worries me even more than I already am, that models try to simplify way too much data than they can do well with. Is that the case in Japan now? How do you deal with this concern and maintain reliable safety information?”

**Pg. 36 line 13 & 14**

“The Board has come to that [conclusion], one way or another, that geological disposal of nuclear waste will be necessary.” This is a point that has to be kept very clear to the public and not hidden under the rug of all these new processes in research — reprocess, recycle, etc. etc. — we still need a repository — we still will be creating a lot of radioactive waste — we still will be filling more and more pools, and dry storage casks, and other future ideas — at the plant sites. Keep that very clear in your report please. Something has to be done. The problem needs to be solved — soon.

**Pg. 38 lines 10-18**

I think Dr. Kadak is wondering, as I am, — “what is the goal?” “Sustainable [??] fuel cycle by 2050” — He says, “that we all love you and every thing” — what is all this “gobbledygook” about really? A lot of paper planning, a lot of time, a lot of money, and very hard to see anything worthwhile — in this report — am I wrong” I'd like to know just what concerns and tests with spent fuel relate to “brittleness” — “to corrosion” — etc. Let's get specific. A lot of time and tax payer money is involved here. This progress report seems to say a lot of nothing.

**Pg. 42 line 13-15**

So they are going to “identify alternatives” and “do research and development on storage, transportation, and disposal”. Are we starting on base margin and doing everything over? Is all the past work on corrosion, seismic activity, etc. to be done again? How can it — without a site? I was always told it all depended on the site?

**Pg 46 line 21-24**

Well, thank you, Dr. Garrick, for saying (exactly what I was now thinking) “so, there’s the most concentrated effort of the last 20 or 30 years of technology. I hope that what this means is that you’re really taking a look at that, and that you’re being able to reassure the citizens that that “10 to \$13 billion didn’t go completely to waste.” That’s just what so often happens — all that time and effort — all that experience gets forgotten or unread or unknown because all new people take over. Thank Heavens the board is still there to remind them of this!

**Pg 49 line 21-22**

“What we’re looking at there is how do you develop data to justify 100 years of storage, 200, 300 years.” Here we go again — and the casks sit at Pt. Beach plant in Wis. along Lake Michigan and on Prairie Island in the Mississippi River, etc. etc. Today, on the news, they discussed flooding and seismic concerns about U.S. plant sites — little did the reporters know about all the radioactive waste stored there in aging pools and casks. Why, I remember the description of sort of “tie downs” to prevent casks from toppling over in a seismic event (attaching the cask to the concrete pad somehow). I remember the discussion long ago of a flood on the Mississippi and casks in the water, and vents clogged, that so called “passively cool” the aging fuel. A lot of this needs to be carefully looked at again. I mean, they are trying to use seawater! Full of salt and impurities at Japan’s reactors today – it will wreck the plants forever — will it cool the fuel? Planes are dropping water also. How does this work? And people are literally exposing themselves to death staying at the plants to do the work. Let’s look at reality. Store for 100, 200, 300 years? In what? Casks only last so long. Will the plant still be there for problem cases? For recasking? Etc.? What ever happened to TAD’s, and all the work on railroads, etc.? – Yet the plants keep loading different types of casks, and out they go in fields, dunes, along waterways near the plants. And can these aging plants, some with the same aging GE Mark I containment (considered washout) as those at the Japanese reactors with hydrogen explosions and venting gases today? It reminds me a lot of the hydrogen explosion in the dry cask at our local Pt. Beach plant, when one of the 1<sup>st</sup> casks was loaded – a chemical reaction with the painted coating on the cask – totally unexpected!! For heaven’s sake, let’s build on what we have worked on all these years. Use the history.

**Pg. 50**

\*—Well – here it is – my number one concern — he says, “what will happen after extended storage when you then to go to transport it. What state will it be in?” — Rotten Peaches I fear!! If you remember my argument — (not only the spent fuel — the cask itself)

## **Pg 51**

He keeps mentioning “granites” — better not be in Wisconsin — we fought it before and will again. Studies on granite were forbidden, but we knew they were going on in Canada any way, even though Yucca certainly had no granite!

## **Pg 54& 55**

Dr. Duquette put it all in a nutshell – “it’s very difficult to have a generic concept of anything.” He sees the problem of all this money spent. And they will spend it. Aren’t we just “running in place” here and getting nowhere? I think what we need now, more than anything, is a full evaluation of all the waste we have, it’s age and condition, where it is, what it is contained in, – (you think of the other things) – and how much more the plants will put in what, and where in even the next year? Do you know? You should. (You shouldn’t pick any more “peaches” until you know how many are rotting in the baskets or jars in the pantry from last year, should you?

## **P 63**

The feeling I get here is that the Board has made a report on technical needs for dry cask storage for 100 years. Is that so? \*\* Please send me a copy. Thank you. This is what the focus should be on now. It’s immediate and necessary. All this other stuff sounds so nebulous and frankly (to me at this point) not worth a lot. It’s just getting money to a lot of labs to do what? What is really needed to be done now? The Board has the expertise and long term experience to say so. \*Please do! We do need technical content — not another “executive summary”! (I just heard on the radio that there is another fire in that spent fuel pool in Japan – just try to picture what would happen at Pt. Beach right now if that was the case..... People are thinking about all this. How old is that pool? How inspected? What all is really in there? — things (tools, parts) that fell in etc. — chemical reactions with seawater (or? if we needed to use lake water – or river water) – and impurities are of concern. What will Japan do with these reactors, pools, waste? (Can’t be used again.) There are a lot of questions to be answered in the future.

## **P 68 line 6-8**

I can’t believe Mr. Boyle says this: “You can probably throw darts at a geologic map of the US and find a technically acceptable site.” !!!! Boy is this group “green”! — Do they know what we have gone through with Yucca Mt. at all? This comment just makes me go back to my argument that it should not be buried (out of sight) at all – probably won’t anyway – so plan for above ground storage, or “aging”, or “disposal”, or whatever you want to call it. Monitor it and keep it safe. Seeing it, is knowing what is happening to it. We would have an underground mess — (I just know it – somehow in the future – something unexpected would happen. Please reconsider this. Help select a storage site and make no more. That’s the only way you will get one sited – especially after what has just happened, and is happening, in Japan today and with this. I don’t think you could even bribe any Native American tribe to take it anymore now.

## **P 69**

Dr. Garrick is right – senators need something they can understand, but also technical enough that they can have their people explain it to them if necessary – answer questions honestly – its

not just about money – way too much has been wasted already – it is about “getting the job done — and doing it right.” And you need public acceptance to do that and you know it.

### **P 70**

You know we asked for standardization and integration in casks over and over and over – to make the system workable – nobody paid any attention – each new cask design was used if it was easier or cheaper for a plant to use – now we have a real mess of all sorts of cask designs and loading and unloading procedures just as the public foreseen. It just makes me angry.

### **P 73 line 17**

You know Dave Zabransky came from Pt. Beach – I’m pretty sure he spoke to us at the last hearing on dry cask storage there. The utilities do what they want as far as I see it. They don’t care about total waste system standardization and integration. They just want the government to pay to get it off their land and the sooner the better. There has got to be a working relationship with the utilities now for the good of getting this to work at all. People have to talk together not just do what is economically best for there own little place! It has to be all interconnected. The public saw that years ago! And the time to start a total system that is standardized and integrated is now.

Lake Barrett’s evaluation: Well, he talks sense and reality here. He’s looking at it as it is and actually repeating some of what I said in these comments. I surely remember in the 90’s, the MRS trying to be sited. No Dice! But, would that do now? I think it would. I really don’t think Yucca Mt. will ever be done, Mr. Barrett, — it’s over I hope. Retrievability was still a big problem as were the drip shields. I just don’t see it all as really workable. And now Mr. Barrett, what if the ventilation system didn’t work? I saw your comments on the Japan situation in “USA Today” today. I quote, “We are basically looking at Three Mile Island” says nuclear consultant Lake Barrett. — it goes on to say the rods melting through the floor of the reactor chamber is highly unlikely. Well — we will see won’t we? Are you worried about the spent fuel pool on fire? I am. — That’s why these aging plants and pools in USA should be closed now too, I think. Pt. Beach was built in the 70’s. My parents were so proud it was built here. Things have changed for sure.

### **P 87 line 16-17**

Lake Barrett says to the Board (state?) “I believe you negatively contributed to trust and confidence.” Does he mean the State here? Well if they questioned you, won’t it (be) up to you to convince them? You wanted trust and confidence – you only get that with honesty and the real facts. Communication was a big problem.

### **P 93**

Mr. Dials speaks as if it were all a political mess. That’s just not so. Over the years, the board had a lot of concerns about a hot repository, about corrosion, about the chlorine, drip shields, leaks, (and I certainly did too) as well as retrievability— but the real “cruncher” was storing waste on site in Nevada and using that weasel word “aging” — that took the cake! And when I saw that design for seismic attachments to the concrete pad to the casks, I just was flabbergasted! Way too many unknowns! Above ground, in sight, is much better and I think that will be the

case any way for a long time just as we always predicted when our public service commission allowed Pt. Beach to load casks in Wisconsin (against a lot of opposition). We said they would stay there for a long time, if not forever, and there they sit! And Mr. Dials is right – the plants, as he says, “are getting constipated” – “they shuttle fuel canisters around” “they don’t have a place to put it.” He recommends interim storage elsewhere. But — who would take it now? Not Nevada for sure.

**P 98 line 13**

If you both feel we should put this in the hands of a private federal corporation, I fear you would be asking for even more trouble. A corporation is about cutting corners to make profits and they won’t be liable for long term mistakes — they will be long gone if casks need to be retrieved. Don’t expect public trust and confidence for that liability. It’s not acceptable to just hand the problem to a corporation.

**P 102 line 5**

Mr. Kouts talks of trying to site an MRS in Tennessee, but I remember the MRS “negotiation” going all over the country trying to get a site. No takers! Anywhere!

**P 102 line 13**

He talks of the radioactive waste : fear factor” – Do you think any of us really think we are getting the full story from Japan today on what is happening at all these reactors? I doubt it — and fuel pools — and I understand casks are there – what happened to them? A lot will come out over time and talk about a “fear factor”! It’s going to get worse.

**P 106 line 9**

I understand the problems with changes in directions – and new people all the time — makes it difficult to work smoothly. Your comment on “quality assurance” is very important – one –NRC itself would be well advised to adhere to.

**P 112 line 8 & 9**

Good! – Congress should be kept informed and a timely acceptance be done or funding could be refused, because of lack of knowledge of what was being done.

You know the conversation here smacks of “bribery.” Getting a site in a place that needs the money, that needs the jobs, etc. – even the Native American tribes that were poor wouldn’t want it in their backyards and fought against even dry cask storage on their land. Just because you managed it with WIPP, doesn’t mean it would be the same with a repository (that expands & expands and expands to hold more & more – and then a 2<sup>nd</sup> repository, and a 3<sup>rd</sup>, etc. is needed) I’ve always thought, if no more waste were to be created, and nuclear power would be phased out, people would be more accepting of the need – but, this way, there is no end to the creation of more and more reactors to be decommissioned, radioactive casks, fuel rods – etc. etc. and transportation on our roads and railroads forever. People won’t accept this in their future. Our children see global warming is enough of a threat without adding nuclear waste problems too.

Energy conservation and renewables must be the answer. Wind energy is taking great strides. Nuclear waste will never be acceptable in anybody's backyard.

**P 123 line 21**

What does Mr. Kouts mean when he says "the State" – Does he mean the actual people? Or the politicians? Or the utilities? Or a private company making a storage deal with what entity? What is "the State"? Will the population of "the state" get to vote on acceptance or not? Who gets the money? (Always "follow the money.") If the "State" is a few important people in office for a short time, we are back where we started.

**P 124-125**

You know this all seems to verify the public opinion that you could dispose of the waste anywhere they accept it, and "benefit" from it, – (no science in site selection) – which was the exact reason Nevada described it as "stick it to Nevada" without any good reason. I really question the reasoning about site selection described by the men in these pages and section. It isn't fair to the population that may get stuck with a later disaster. (By the way, as I write these (notes), I'm continuing to follow accounts of the Japanese reactor problems – spent fuel pools above the reactors? Why? And now they say the generators would have only worked 8 hr. anyway and backup generators in US and only for 4 hr! – Is this true? Should waste storage casks, spent fuel pools even be near reactors at all? Some commentators question. People in California have already emptied store shelves of potassium iodide – nobody feels that clear information is being revealed and that things are getting out of control. Helicopters did not put out the fuel pool fire – it's going again today. And a containment has a crack. People question why reactors in a quake zone weren't ready with sea walls defense against a tsunami? And now you expect people to accept a repository to be "safe" for thousands plus years into the future? I very much doubt it. Nobody is going to want nuclear waste or nuclear plants any where near them.

**P 126 line 6**

Dr. Kadak asks the question about the incentive of the federal government to work in partnership with a private corporation, as if we as taxpayers should take over the land in the end, and not make the corporation liable. Is that good business sense at all? I don't think so. And if West Valley was so great, just what kept it from operating? How much federal money was wasted there? Then "private fuel storage" in Utah was referenced. What happens if the corporation goes bankrupt or there is a big problem there? Who pays? That's all that "private storage" does is take the waste out of the utilities load so they have room to put more casks out behind their reactors. That is the real situation. Current pads will only hold so many casks. And these need monitoring and are aging. Utilities don't want to be responsible for their backyard waste.

**P 128**

Dr. Kadak sees the problem when he says "if TVA ever had to pay back the bonds, they'd go broke." Enough said!

**P 136 line 12**

“Ante up what you get” – all this talk about so called “benefits” sound like “bribes” and that is just the sort of thing that brings on public distrust; don’t you people understand that? What people want is the honest facts. If you don’t know something, say so. If you can’t promise something, admit it. Talk to people with the truth – communicate, don’t expect risks to be acceptable for money.

**P 140**

Finally! — a discussion of sorts on the utility contracts with the government – 77 of them. And it says here “you’re dealing with people thinking about what’s good for their own organization”! That you’d better believe! And if you think a utility, on their own incentive, won’t use the cheapest casks and storage methods, and say “the heck with standardization and integration”, you are wrong. They run a business to make profits – not to solve a waste problem they have a contract with the government to take. Yet you let them create more and more waste and build more plants. It is just a mind boggling agreement to the public. We pay for the liability and they are off the hook! They are getting paid every year since the contracts – “gravy train” – as you call it on this page. And no, you can’t “change it (spent fuel) to gold” – as you can see MOX fuel is very dangerous in that reactor with a crack in it in Japan on the news today – talk of plutonium particles in pressure releases – is that truth? And now there are questions on the radio about reprocessing plants and waste left over from that. Public scrutiny will be very strong from now on in every aspect related to the Japanese reactor and fuel pool problems right now.

**P 142**

You say “the utilities would be very reluctant to give up that contractual obligation the government has to take the material.” I want an explanation of what material? How much for how long? Get out of your box, and say “what if we closed these plants”, so we can get a handle on a total amount and deal with it now so we know what the problem is. Get a standardized cask and an above ground site and stop utility handouts now. You people were supposed to solve the problem not just extend it out to – what 100 more years of more storage and waste creation until you are all dead. Then what? Take the tiger by the tail! I’m getting tired of all these excuses. We need some real leadership here. I watched “China Syndrome” again last night – remember the hearings where the parents brought their kids and said they didn’t want the nuclear plant started until the radioactive waste problem was solved. Do you realize how very old the movie is now? And there is old Jack Lemmon looking at the unchecked radiographs of welds – he should have seen the weld problems with the casks we have today! Same old stuff. Yes, the movie was scary – but so was the hydrogen explosion in our cask at Pt. Beach when nobody at NRC, the plant, or the vender could figure out why it happened! Expect the unexpected — we see it in Japan today. What can happen when you dump seawater (with all it’s impurities) into a reactor? Do you know? Nobody does.

Afternoon Session:

**P 155 line 12**

EPRI – (a so called utility membership group for non-profit) states here that “absolute scientific proof is unattainable, particularly as you move out in time” – This is reason enough for the utilities never to let go of contracts that keep paying them forever as long as they create more radioactive waste. Pretty good deal for them isn't it? Who represented the public in creating these ridiculous contracts??? The man talks of “Human behavior” – the news said today it was actually “human error” at 3 mile island – is that so? Human behavior can't ever be not considered as a concern. The world does not work as computer models predict – the quake and tsunami in Japan tells us that for sure. Just what is “reasonable expectation” in the light of Mother Nature in the future – which we humans are involved in her problems very much! If we didn't create nuclear waste or greenhouse gases, if more funds had been spent long ago on energy concerns, who could tell where you people would be today?

**P 157**

I agree with the necessity of always treating the repository (“problem”) as a system – holistically. There were too many “unrelated to the whole” features in the past to the point where sometimes one group never knew what the other was doing or why or how it related. Communication should be the main thrust – if everybody understands – they can interrelate – and help each other. Some small group in charge that works together and keeps the rest informed. It all became too unwieldy and in constant change.

**P 163 line 22**

The whole gist of what the EPRI seems to be proposing is that, as he says, they just need an “adequately safe site, good enough is good enough.” He seems to think 1,000 to 10,000 years of safety is OK and that a best site “neither exists nor is necessary”. All along, he seems to advocate a lowering of standards and regulatory expectations and conservative measures. Just seems to water everything down to make it easy to get a site and get that waste off utility land. I don't like his attitude at all here. Makes it sound as if all your hard work wasn't necessary in their view. Well sure, he won't be alive when the 100 or 1,000 years are up– and that is only a short period when it comes to radioactive decay!

**P 165 line 10-11**

Is he questioning the need for retrievability? Is he opting for storage above ground with an “option”?? to dispose? What do you think of these ideas? Doesn't sound like EPRI wants any waiting around anymore. Just get it done as easy as possible. (I just hope the Board continues to see fit to continue to require the “best” and ask the needed questions when research or testing is required for an answer.)

**P 167**

If you leave the capacity of any site “up in the air” to say 9 times the limit and require no 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> repository, don't expect any body to accept it any place. That would just be dumb! And you know it. If you want to negotiate a site – do it honestly –or you loose all creditability from the

start. No state will allow utilities to keep building new reactors & create more & more waste and say – “no problem, we’ll take it all – forever? He’s dreaming here!

### **P 170 line 21**

Dr. Kadak asks why EPRI numbers are so much lower – part of the response is that “our evaluation of the seismic processes were less conservative than those of DOE”. If he were listening to the news today on the reactors in Japan I doubt he’d even admit this!

Deep Borehole:

### **P 178**

Dr. Kadak asks a crucial question – how old? Aged to 2117 is the response. How? Where? And in what? Nobody seems to have wondered how long dry fuel in vented casks outside will stay intact and actually be able to be stable in rods or assemblies to put in a borehole. Zircaloy cladding – aged that long – wet & dry – wet & dry – banged around in handling – how many times do I have to ask this over the years? He just acts as if he’s going to have very “stable” stored fuel in 2117 – I don’t think so! Tests? Long term? And all spent fuel pools have different chemicals. Cladding “histories” are very important here. He says on p 174 that there’s bentonite (?) in the outside – “not a package at all” – just a “drilling casing” and “2 fuel assemblies stacked” ?? “the ends sealed” – “400 in one borehole”. And all this in holes they don’t know how far apart – but in granite. (in Wisconsin?) Sure doesn’t sound like sound science to me so far at all – to you??

### **P 180**

This scares me when somebody says the word “never” – “these things never make it out of the granite”. He says. “Never” asks for problems! And what about the Iodide coming out?

### **P 182**

He says “what happens if you get a canister stuck”. I thought there wasn’t any canister –?? And he talks about the importance of the seals. I thought these were on the bentonite drill casing ends – can’t show us cause it’s patented – strange description. Sounds like what we were told about our 1<sup>st</sup> cask at Pt. Beach, when in truth a lot of problems had not yet been solved – (until even after it was generically 1<sup>st</sup> cask accepted to the NRC certified) so much for communicating with the public!

### **P 183**

He talks about a retrievability concern,. You know they always told us that you just took the fuel out of a cask “the reverse of the way you put it in” – certainly far from true when they had to actually do it! You need actually tests. Retrievability is a must.

### **Line 9 & 10**

He says you could “rublize it” and “solution mine it down a straw” – what??

This all is made to sound so “easy”. If so, why not yet implemented someplace? He says may take 20 years to do a pilot program. Well, I think this has not been fully thought out to any extent at all.

### **P 193**

Good question Dr. Latanision – stacking, squandering, mechanical loads – “micro plastic yielding” over time — that is just why we need the expertise of Board members. Just this phenomenon, not already have been evaluated, could junk this borehole system from the start!

### **P 195**

Yes, Dr. Duquette – put the 6 boreholes in the backyard of each plant. Why should the state be liable? And if the plant makes more waste – dig more boreholes. Right. “This dog won’t hunt!” A borehole sounds to me like a well or a cave or cavity that can fill with ice or snow or melt water in spring etc. — the environment for example in Wisconsin is lots different than Yucca Mt, the freeze, thaw, cycle itself can cause brittleness and casks at Pt. Beach can’t even be moved at lower temperatures. Retrievability? In – say January — I think not! And he must realize that there is no such thing as “disposal” – it is underground storage – it doesn’t disappear at all because we can’t see it – it eventually falls apart over time – a long time – and what will this granite and the environment be like then I wonder?

### **line 14**

He says “the fact that it’s difficult to retrieve is fabulous! Just a while back he was retrieving it easily with a straw or something!!

### **line 24**

Now he says “you could actually just walk away from it.” You think any utility would be dumb enough to buy this method on their property? Well I sure hope the state of Wisconsin doesn’t get stuck with it to fight!

### **P 198 line 1**

He wants a pilot on this in Mexico because “for various reasons” – “we’re not too keen on the idea of them having dry cask” – why not??? Sounds very strange. Who would fund this? The US – in another country? Who is liable? Sounds like a real fantasy!

### **P 201**

Consolidate the fuel? I don’t think so. That was considered long ago for more space in spent fuel pools and rejected for many reasons, (one of which I suspect is that the assembly structure holds the rods together – you don’t know the condition of the fuel from casks so, now I think I see why they want a “from fuel pool to borehole idea” – eliminates opening any casks – leave them to just fall apart eventually. And what happens in the boreholes? – nobody seems to care too much in his plan it seems.

**P 201 line 8**

Dr. Hornberger asks the obvious question that our dry cask vendor hadn't worked out thoroughly – how to load & unload the thing? – It can be made to sound very easy – but certainly is not!

**P 216**

Well, I think Professor Jenkins-Smith's report on what the public thinks would be very different today! Every news program and newspaper is full of reports of the fires in the spent fuel storage "pool" above the Japanese reactor. People are asking all sorts of questions about waste storage and seismic concerns and back up power – etc. etc. People are interested in their local plants a lot today. So I think he'd get a very very different response today.

**P 216 line 12-17**

And you know the fact that he says in 2006 a lot of people thought Yucca Mt "was operating and doing just fine", shows the lack of communication with the public about nuclear waste. I bet most people in Two Rivers don't even know that dry cask storage is accumulating on that concrete pad down the road from the Pt. Beach huge park and camp ground and state forest there. The utility planted trees all around the pad and you can't see any thing there anymore from the main highway as you did when it was started. There is a sort of "secrecy" about nuclear waste that the public does not like once they know something about it. Better to inform them yourselves than have them misinformed, don't you think? It's a real surprise to people to find they are camped with their kids down the road from a nuclear plant built in the 70's, with a full storage pool, and dry cask storage of radioactive waste on site, and cooling water going into the lake they swim in, just down the way. I bet they wouldn't even know how to evacuate that park if the siren even went off – In fact, I bet there are no tests at all. I wonder..... I can just imagine that camp road clogged.

**P 218 line 11**

He says, "Any major event globally with respect to nuclear materials, of course, will resonate with those underlying perceptions of risk." He is right and Japan is the event locality!

**P 222**

I can't see why he is puzzled that the public asked, said they would want retrievability. After the technological changes – cell phones, microwaves, internet, books & news online, cameras, etc. etc. – people foresee great future changes also and surely don't want to accept "permanent" burial. The day of burying things underground is past. You can't throw dead cars or old tractors in the stream ravine behind the barn anymore than you can put any more oil & gas tanks underground that will rust open over time. You can't even put more garbage on the street to collect than your can will hold and you must recycle things you used to put in garbage cans. People are very aware of this. So why is he surprised at all? I'm not. He says people will tell you "to assume that what we know right now is the final answer for safe disposal, they think is just a little crazy". Well, I agree – that's why I don't want nuclear waste underground at all. And I'm not the only one. I don't think I'm crazy. I've studied this stuff for years – no expert – but not crazy I hope!

**P 223 line 15& 16**

To call “reprocessing” the word “recycling” is a weasel word, and should never be used any time especially in a poll like this. Either you explain reprocessing correctly, in that it produces plutonium and there is waste, or don’t ask the question. MOX fuel is a problem in Japanese reactors because of that fire today. People are hearing about this and asking good questions.

**P 228**

He is just really showing that how you word a questionnaire influences greatly the response. As a former teacher I’m not surprised at this at all. This doesn’t prove anything except that you can “slant” poll results by how you word them. Most people catch on to this. This is in no way accurate communication! You make a repository sound like a research site and more people accept it initially in a poll. So what? You prove more people want jobs and money – so what is new there? Nothing.

**P 231**

Well, certainly one would expect that there would be more acceptance once WIPP was open over time. It was a “done deal” and people moved on to another issue. If there is a problem, you’ll hear from them, I’m sure. Also, if the facility brings up the economy and jobs when it opens, people are reluctant to criticize the place their neighbor works at. Makes sense.

**P 235 line 10**

If you have read about what’s going on in Wisconsin right now, you would not opt for “state buy-in” as he calls it. The politicians of a state don’t represent the people’s view in all things obviously. You know I always remember at our hearings on dry cask in Two Rivers when the question of the monetary value of a human life came up – and the life of who? Etc. – very serious in that room that day! Compensation won’t convince a lot of people to accept a repository. That’s not communication – it’s a bribe.

Well, I know I write too much, but I do care about this issue because I worked so hard on it – to understand dry cask storage for our hearings – etc. – years ago. And I do find your transcripts so informative. It makes it very real as if I were there at the meeting. Thanks for listening to me too.

\*\* please send me a copy of your report on“(1) lessons learned” that the Board published. It should be good. I’d also like a copy of the “(2) extended dry storage” report you handed out at the meeting and the report on “NUWASTE” you mentioned. Thanks so much! I’d like all three reports please.

I really have no idea any more what waste casks are being used in Wisconsin or how many kinds or how many pads or casks there are here now. The microfiche were taken from the Two Rivers library years ago. But I often go to the beach there to watch birds and hike and can’t help of thinking of how many drives I made over to the library there, years ago, and all the time and money I spent on copies and postage and phone calls etc. So I do really appreciate the members of the Board so much. The good questions are still coming and so much past history of experience is known by Board members. Please continue your hard work. I know the waste

exists. I know we have to do something with it. I think the will of the people to solve this would be there if you'd stop making more. It was an issue when the 1<sup>st</sup> plants were put online and still is there. And maybe keeping it onsite is the best we can do – at the utilities in the states that used the electricity created. It was their benefit after all. Nobody wants the stuff transported really I think. The problems in Japan today will affect everything from now on.

Fawn Shillinglaw