

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Environmental Review on Evaluating the
Environmental Impacts from the Proposed
MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Savannah, Georgia

Date: Wednesday, September 18, 2002

Work Order No.: NRC-537

Pages 1-124

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING TO PROVIDE COMMENTS

ON THE NRC EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL

IMPACTS FROM THE PROPOSED MIXED OXIDE

FUEL FABRICATION FACILITY

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2002

+ + + + +

SAVANNAH, GEORGIA

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting was held at Conference Room,
Georgia Coastal Center, at 7:05 p.m., Francis (Chip)
Cameron, Facilitator, presiding

PRESENT:

FRANCIS (Chip) CAMERON

TIM HARRIS

DAVE BROWN

JOHN HULL

CHERYL TROTTIER

NEAL R. GROSS

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

I-N-D-E-X

	<u>SPEAKERS</u>	<u>Page</u>
1		
2		
3	CHIP CAMERON	4
4	TIM HARRIS	8
5	JUDY JENNINGS	20
6	SARA BARCZAK	21
7	JUDY JENNINGS	22
8	KIRK COBB	22
9	WILLIAM PLEASANT	24
10	SARA BARCZAK	25
11	RANOWELL JZAR	26
12	KIRK COBB	27
13	DAVE BROWN	27
14	ANTHONY JERNIGAN	29
15	FRED NADELMAN	29
16	DAVE BROWN	34
17	SARA BARCZAK	40
18	CHERYL JAY	45
19	LESTER JACKSON	47
20	JOHN HULL	48
21	JUDY JENNINGS	50
22	RANOWELL JZAR	53
23	EVELYN DANIELS	55
24	LESTER JACKSON	56
25	ERNEST CHAPUT	58

NEAL R. GROSS

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

I-N-D-E-X

	<u>SPEAKERS</u>	<u>Page</u>
1		
2		
3	LESTER JACKSON	60
4	ERNEST CHAPUT	60
5	REGINA THOMAS	61
6	JODY LANIER	65
7	CHERYL JAY	70
8	SARA BARCZAK	70
9	WILLIAM PLEASANT	82
10	FRED NADELMAN	84
11	ERNEST CHAPUT	87
12	JUDY JENNINGS	91
13	REGINA THOMAS	93
14	CHESTER DUNHAM	94
15	EVELYN DANIELS	98
16	SARA BARCZAK	98
17	JODY LANIER	101
18	LESTER JACKSON	102
19	CHESTER DUNHAM	104
20	JUDY JENNINGS	107
21	ANTHONY JERNIGAN	108
22	FRED NADELMAN	109
23	ERNEST CHAPUT	110
24	KIRK COBB	110
25	CHERYL TROTTIER	115

NEAL R. GROSS

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

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1
2 MR. CAMERON: Good evening, everybody. My
3 name is Chip Cameron, and I'm the Special Counsel for
4 the Public Liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory
5 Commission. And I'd like to welcome all of you to the
6 NRC's public meeting tonight.

7 Our topic tonight is the Nuclear
8 Regulatory Commission - NRC's environmental review
9 process on the application to construct a mixed oxide,
10 MOX fuel fabrication facility. And I'm pleased to
11 serve as your facilitator for tonight's meeting. And
12 my role tonight will be to try to help all of you to
13 have a productive meeting.

14 I generally like to cover three items of
15 meeting process before we get into the substance of
16 the meeting's discussion. And I'd like to talk a
17 little bit about why the NRC is here tonight;
18 secondly, discuss format and ground rules for
19 tonight's meeting; and third, to give you an overview
20 of the agenda for tonight's meeting so that you know
21 what to expect.

22 In terms of objectives for the meeting,
23 the NRC staff will be going into more detail on this
24 in a few minutes. But basically, simply stated, we
25 have two objectives. One is to try to clearly explain

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 what the NRC's process is for decision-making on this
2 application for construction of a MOX facility, and
3 specifically, to clearly explain what the
4 environmental review process is.

5 Secondly, and I believe a most important
6 objective is to get your comments, your advice on what
7 are the implications for the NRC's environmental
8 review from recent changes to the Department of
9 Energy's national MOX program. And the NRC staff will
10 be telling you a little bit about those changes later
11 on tonight.

12 The format for the meeting matches those
13 two objectives. We're going to begin tonight with two
14 brief presentations by the NRC staff, and after each
15 of those presentations we're going to out to you to
16 see if we can answer your questions about the - the
17 process that's - that's described to you.

18 Second part of the meeting is to hear from
19 you, and to give you an opportunity to come up and
20 give us some comments on - on the questions that the
21 NRC staff is going to put before you tonight.

22 In terms of ground rules, if you have a
23 question, when we're in the question-answer session
24 after each presentation and we'll go out to you to -
25 for questions, just signal me and I'll bring you this

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 talking stick. And please give us your name and
2 affiliation, if appropriate. Second ground rule is
3 please only one person speaking at a time. That will
4 not only help us to get a clean transcript - we are
5 transcribing it. Melanie is our stenographer tonight.
6 But most importantly, only having one person speak at
7 a time allows us to give our full attention to
8 whomever has the floor at the time.

9 Third ground rule, I would just ask you to
10 try to be as - as concise as possible in your
11 questions and - and comments so that we can make sure
12 that everybody has a chance to - to speak tonight.
13 And when we get to the public comment part of the
14 meeting, I'm going to ask you to try to limit your
15 comments to five minutes. Usually people can say what
16 they need to say in that time period. It's not going
17 to be a hard-and-fast rule where there's a trap door
18 that shoots you out onto the street or anything.

19 (Laughter.)

20 MR. CAMERON: But try to keep it to - to
21 five minutes.

22 In terms of agenda for tonight's meeting,
23 the first topic that the NRC is going to present is an
24 overview of the NRC's environmental review process.
25 And we have Mr. Tim Harris right over here who is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 going to do that for us. Tim is the Project Manager
2 for the environmental review on the construction
3 authorization request. He's in the Environmental and
4 Performance Assessment Branch at the NRC, which is in
5 our Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards.
6 And Tim has been involved in numerous activities at
7 the NRC: uranium recovery, low level waste disposal,
8 decommissioning. He's been with the NRC for about
9 nine years, and he has a Bachelor's in Civil
10 Engineering.

11 After that, go out to you for questions.
12 Then we'll come back to Mr. Dave Brown, right here.
13 And Dave is going to talk about the changes to the
14 Department of Energy national MOX program and the
15 potential implications for the environmental review,
16 the NRC's environmental review. We'll then go out to
17 you for - for questions again. Dave is in the Special
18 Projects and Inspection Branch of the NRC. Again,
19 that's in the Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and
20 Safeguards.

21 So we have someone here from the
22 environmental review side, which is - is Tim Harris,
23 and someone here from the safety evaluation side, Dave
24 Brown. And Tim, in a few minutes, is going to talk
25 about how those two evaluations---environmental and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 safety---come together to form the basis for an NRD
2 decision - NRC decision on whether to grant or deny
3 the application for a construction authorization. And
4 Dave, I should say, is a health physicist. He's been
5 with the NRC for two years. He was with the West
6 Valley demonstration project before that for about
7 five years. He has a - a Master's in Health Physics
8 from Clemson, and a Bachelor's in - in Physics.

9 I just want to say a couple words about
10 relevance before we get started. There may be
11 questions that - that you have that don't fit squarely
12 into the agenda items that we're talking about. We'll
13 keep track of those in the "parking lot" up here, and
14 we'll make sure that we come back and answer those
15 questions before the night is over.

16 And the second point about relevance is
17 that we know that there's a lot of issues connected to
18 the national MOX program. A lot of them fall outside
19 of NRC's jurisdiction. We're always glad to listen to
20 any public concerns and comments and try to answer
21 questions, but we are focusing on the NRC
22 responsibilities tonight.

23 And one other person I want to introduce
24 before we get started is Cheryl Trottier. Cheryl is
25 the Branch Chief, NRC manager of the Environmental and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Performance Assessment Branch where this environmental
2 review is being prepared, and she's with us here
3 tonight to listen to your comments.

4 And with that, I would just thank you all
5 for being here to help us with this important
6 decision. And I'm going to ask - Tim, are you ready
7 to - to do your presentation?

8 MR. HARRIS: I think so. Can - can you
9 all hear me?

10 Good evening. I'd like to personally
11 welcome you to the NRC's meeting on the environmental
12 review of the proposed mixed oxide or MOX---I think
13 we'll use that acronym tonight---fuel fabrication
14 facility. I'd like to personally thank you for taking
15 your time to come out this evening. We all know we
16 have busy schedules, and we want to thank you for
17 coming out and taking your time. We look forward to
18 hearing your comments.

19 This meeting is one of a series of
20 meetings that we have planned to engage the public in
21 NRC's environmental review which consists of
22 preparation of an environmental impact statement. And
23 I'll go into that in a little bit more detail. We're
24 also here to solicit your - your input on how changes
25 in the Department of Energy's program might affect our

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 environmental review. And I'll get to that in just a
2 little bit.

3 As Chip said, the presenters are myself
4 and Dave Brown. You got copies of the handout which
5 contains Email addresses and phone numbers. Please
6 feel free, if at some time after the meeting you get
7 a question or want to share a view with us, to contact
8 either Dave or myself. We're always receptive to
9 Emails or phone calls.

10 As Chip said, the purpose of tonight's
11 meeting is to get your comments on how the changes the
12 DOE has made in the surplus disposition program might
13 affect NRC's review - environmental review. We'll
14 provide some background information on our role in the
15 project, the EIS process. Dave will describe the
16 changes in some detail.

17 And then specifically we're going to be
18 looking for you to provide comments on the changes and
19 how they affect the environmental impact statement.
20 DOE announced earlier this year that they were going
21 to cancel the immobilization facility, and that
22 facilitated some changes in the proposed MOX facility.
23 And also the immobilization alternative was identified
24 by the public in our scoping as one of the
25 alternatives to the proposed MOX project. And since

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DOE has decided not to construct that facility, we
2 want to get your opinion tonight on how we should
3 consider that facility in the environmental impact
4 statement. And I'll try to go into some more detail
5 in a minute to lay that out.

6 I'd also like to note that there were some
7 - some feedback forms that I think Betty provided to
8 you. And that's one of the ways that you can let us
9 know how we're doing at the meetings. And we really
10 value those - those - the input that you provide us.
11 We read those carefully and use those to plan future
12 interactions. Next slide.

13 Because of the changes in the DOE program,
14 NRC decided to delay issuance of its draft
15 environmental impact statement. We issued a *Federal*
16 *Register* notice announcing that delay, and in that
17 notice we requested comments on two questions. And
18 that's what we're here to discuss tonight. So I put
19 the questions early in the presentation so that you
20 can look at them. I think they're also in the agenda,
21 if you want to refer to them if they're not up on the
22 screen. And these are the issues we want you to
23 comment on tonight.

24 Specifically:

25 How the immobilization alternative

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 should be treated in the NRC's
2 draft environmental impact
3 statement.

4 And second:

5 Whether there are any additional
6 reasonable alternatives that
7 weren't identified during scoping
8 that should be included.

9 We announced that we would accept comments
10 in the *Federal Register* until August 30th. However,
11 due to public concerns, we decided to extend that
12 comment period to September 30th. So we're going to
13 take your comments, you here tonight; plus, if you
14 decide to provide written comments, we'd like to have
15 those, as well.

16 And now I'd like to describe NRC's role.
17 Congress, in the *Defense Authorization Act of 1999*,
18 gave NRC a specific role in the proposed MOX project.
19 Specifically, Congress gave us licensing authority
20 over this facility. So our role is to make a
21 licensing decision regarding the proposed MOX project.

22 NRC is an independent government agency,
23 and our mission is to protect the public health and
24 safety, and the environment, from commercial uses of
25 radioactive material. Our role is different than the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Department of Energy. The Department of Energy's role
2 in this project relates to implementing nuclear non-
3 proliferation policy, including the disposition of
4 surplus weapons plutonium. As we discussed, DOE's
5 made changes, and they will describe those in the
6 second part of the - the meeting.

7 There were some questions at the last
8 meeting about the - the process, the licensing
9 process, so I'd like to take some time to describe
10 that. And I think it'll - it'll help put in context
11 how the environmental impact statement that we're
12 talking about here tonight will be used by NRC in its
13 decision making.

14 Specifically, NRC has two decisions to
15 make for the proposed MOX project. And those are
16 listed in the middle of the slide. They are:
17 decision whether to authorize construction of the
18 proposed facility; and later, whether to license the
19 facility.

20 DCS, which is the - the applicant, which
21 stands for Duke Cogema Stone & Webster, submitted an
22 environmental report in December of 2000, and a
23 construction authorization request in February 2001.
24 Due to the changes that were announced by DOE earlier
25 this year, Duke Cogema Stone & Webster submitted a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 revised environmental report in July of 2002. We are
2 currently reviewing those documents, and will prepare
3 two documents of our own. The first is the
4 environmental impact statement. And I'll describe the
5 environmental impact statement process after this
6 slide.

7 Our draft, as I stated, was initially
8 planned to be published in February. However, due to
9 the cancellation of the plutonium immobilization
10 facility, we thought it would be a good idea to seek
11 the public's input on - on how that should be treated
12 in the environmental impact statement before we
13 published it.

14 The top part of the slide, NRC will
15 prepare a safety evaluation report for the
16 construction authorization request. We had a public
17 meeting on that topic in North Augusta last month.
18 The safety evaluation report's different from the
19 environmental impact statement, in that it focuses on
20 a safety assessment of the design bases to determine
21 if it meets NRC's requirements. The environmental
22 impact statement documents environmental impacts for
23 the proposed action, which in this case is the
24 proposed MOX facility, and compares those with
25 alternatives to the proposed action. And as I stated

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 earlier, one of the alternatives that was identified
2 by the public was immobilization of plutonium, rather
3 than converting it to MOX fuel. So we're here tonight
4 to solicit your input on whether we should still
5 consider that as an alternative.

6 After we public the draft environmental
7 impact statement and the safety evaluation report for
8 the construction authorization, those will be the
9 basis for making a decision on whether or not to
10 construct the proposed MOX facility. And we
11 anticipate making a decision in September of 2003.

12 Duke Cogema Stone & Webster plans to
13 submit a license application, on the bottom of the
14 slide, in October of 2003. NRC will review that
15 document and prepare a second safety evaluation
16 report. And that safety evaluation report will focus
17 on the operational safety of the facility.

18 The second safety evaluation report and
19 the final environmental impact statement that was used
20 to support the construction authorization decision
21 will be used to support the decision on whether or not
22 to license the proposed MOX facility.

23 There are also two opportunities for
24 hearings, adjudicatory processes. And John Hull, from
25 our General Counsel, is here if you have any questions

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 on those. But, as I said, the purpose of this
2 discussion here is to put in context of how the
3 environmental impact statement is used in NRC's
4 decision-making process. And just to summarize, a
5 single EIS will be used to support the decisions on
6 whether to authorize construction, and later whether
7 also to authorize operation of the facility.

8 Now, I'll go through the process that we
9 use to develop the environmental impact statement.
10 The *National Environmental Policy Act* requires the
11 government agency to prepare environmental impact
12 statements for major federal actions such as the
13 potential licensing of the MOX project. An EIS or
14 environmental impact statement presents environmental
15 impact statements of the proposed action and
16 alternatives. And, here again, we're interested in
17 hearing your views on how the changes could affect
18 those alternatives.

19 Note that the shaded portions are areas
20 for public involvement. And we consider that to be a
21 very important part of the process and one of the
22 reasons we're back out here tonight, just to - to seek
23 your input. NEPA has some statutory requirements for
24 public involvement. This is not one of them. We felt
25 strongly that we needed to be back in the community to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 hear your views, so - so we're here.

2 DCS originally submitted their
3 environmental report, and we published a notice of
4 intent to prepare an environmental impact statement in
5 the *Federal Register*. And that was published in March
6 of 2001. We completed scoping; and I'll describe that
7 in just a minute. I think we had meetings here last
8 April, and we had a good turnout and a lot of good
9 support.

10 We're in the process of reviewing the
11 environmental report, and that review process will
12 include requests for additional information. And this
13 is information that the NRC feels is important to
14 complete its review. And then those requests are made
15 publicly available.

16 The next step of the process is to publish
17 the draft environmental impact statement. And we
18 anticipate to do that in February of 2003. After the
19 publication, there'll be a 45 day comment period, and
20 we'll hold public meetings in March. So we'll be back
21 down here in March to hear your views on that draft.
22 If you provided your mailing address to Betty at this
23 meeting or other meetings, we're going to mail you a
24 copy of the draft environmental impact statement. So
25 if - if you didn't include your full mailing address,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 please do so if you'd like a copy. Lastly, after we
2 hear your comments, we will revise the document and
3 publish it as final.

4 Now I'd like to go through the scoping
5 process. The purpose of scoping is to gather
6 stakeholder input on alternatives that should be
7 considered in an environmental impact statement, and
8 to get resource areas that might be impacted or are of
9 a concern to the citizens. We held public scoping
10 meetings in North Augusta, Savannah, and Charlotte,
11 North Carolina. We received - in addition to comments
12 we received at those meetings, we received written
13 comments and Email comments.

14 The scoping process we summarized in a
15 report that was issued in August 2001. And Betty has
16 a few copies in the back, if you don't already have a
17 copy or are interested. Betty has some, and if you
18 don't have one and would like one, please contact me
19 and we'll provide one for you.

20 I think the scoping process was very
21 successful, and I think that could be contributed -
22 attributed to the public's involvement. And I know
23 Sara has been very active down here, and I think she
24 provided quite a few new comments.

25 A significance to tonight's meeting and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the reason we're here tonight is that the public
2 identified a second no-action alternative. That is,
3 if the proposed MOX facility was not licensed, what
4 were the alternatives. One of those alternatives
5 would be continued storage of that material at the DOE
6 sites. The second one that was identified by the
7 public was immobilization of the plutonium, which was
8 an alternative in the scoping that we said we were
9 going to look at. Since the DOE has decided to cancel
10 that facility, we want to get your views on how we
11 should consider that as we go forth in preparing our
12 draft environmental impact statement.

13 So, just to summarize the next steps,
14 we're going to plan to publish the draft environmental
15 impact statement in February. We'll be accepting
16 written and Email comments. We'll also be holding
17 public meetings in March to solicit your views. We'll
18 consider those views, and then publish the final in -
19 it's going to be published in August of 2003.

20 And that concludes my explanation of the
21 NRC's role in the environmental impact statement
22 process. I'd be happy to answer questions.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much,
24 Tim. Tim gave you an overview of the - the entire NRC
25 process that's used to help us to make this decision.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So a lot of ground was - was covered there, and we
2 want to make sure that you understand what the process
3 is. So are there - are there questions about the
4 process at this point? Or about the specific
5 questions that the NRC is asking for a comment on at
6 this point?

7 MR. CAMERON: Yes? And I'll have to ask
8 you to talk into this and - and give us your - your
9 name, please.

10 MS. JENNINGS: Judy Jennings. About
11 the...

12 AUDIENCE: Can't hear you.

13 COURT REPORTER: I'm not sure - I'm not
14 sure your microphone is on.

15 MS. JENNINGS: I don't think I'm turned on
16 - the mic was turned on.

17 COURT REPORTER: I'm not sure the mic is
18 turned on.

19 MR. CAMERON: Well, it should be turned
20 on. Do you want to check that box again.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just hold it closer
22 to you.

23 MR. CAMERON: See if you can speak into
24 this closely and we'll see if it comes out.

25 MS. JENNINGS: About the - about the EIS

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 process, the facility would be for the Department of
2 Energy by Duke Cogema Stone & Webster?

3 MR. HARRIS: Yeah, Duke - Duke Cogema
4 Stone & Webster is a contractor for the Department of
5 Energy.

6 MS. JENNINGS: Right. So basically it's
7 a federal project. So where in the EIS is there an
8 economics analysis?

9 MR. HARRIS: Good question. I think we
10 were focusing on alternatives in our discussion. But
11 the - the environmental impact statement does include
12 a cost benefits section. There's other things like
13 environmental justice that are included, as well.

14 MR. CAMERON: So that there will be...

15 MR. HARRIS: There will be...

16 MR. CAMERON: ...the answer is there will
17 be an economic analysis in that.

18 MR. HARRIS: ...there will be a discussion
19 in...

20 MR. CAMERON: Sara?

21 MS. BARCZAK: My name is Sara Barczak.

22 Will the economic analysis, though, keep
23 - will it do an economic analysis for the no-action
24 alternatives that the NRC intends to study, or is it
25 just doing the economic analysis for the MOX building?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. HARRIS: Typically they are just done
2 for the proposed action, so that would be the
3 construction of the proposed MOX facility.

4 MS. BARCZAK: Well, then there's a
5 suggestion to add, to do an economic analysis on other
6 alternatives, on the no-action alternatives that the
7 NRC decides on.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Sara.
9 Judy, did - is that...

10 MS. JENNINGS: Well, I just...

11 MR. CAMERON: We got to - I'm sorry, we
12 got to get you on the transcript.

13 MS. JENNINGS: Judy Jennings. The
14 economics analysis would be part of the draft and also
15 available and subject to public comment?

16 MR. HARRIS: Yes, ma'am.

17 MR. CAMERON: Great.
18 Yes, sir?

19 MR. COBB: Can you hear me all right?

20 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

21 MR. COBB: I have more general questions,
22 I guess. Where's the plutonium? Is it out in
23 Colorado, Rocky Mountain Flats or something, or is it
24 all over the country, is it up in Washington?

25 MR. HARRIS: It's - it's at various DOE

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 sites.

2 MR. COBB: Are you going to bring it to
3 the - are you going to bring it to the Savannah River
4 Site?

5 Oh, I'm sorry, I didn't introduce myself.
6 Kirk Cobb. I'm an engineer in private industry here
7 in town.

8 The plan would be - I mean, one plan is to
9 take the plutonium, mix it with---what?---uranium, and
10 use it for commercial nuclear power plants; is that
11 right?

12 MR. HARRIS: That's correct.

13 MR. COBB: And when - what would be the
14 ratio of the plutonium with the uranium in the fuel?

15 MR. HARRIS: I think it's about 4%.

16 MR. COBB: 4%? So it's...

17 MR. HARRIS: Plutonium to uranium. The
18 rest would be...

19 MR. COBB: Okay. And - and when that fuel
20 is spent, chemically the plutonium is filled air,
21 pretty much? How long is it going to be until it
22 dissipates? Most of the plutonium, when you're done,
23 this fuel is spent, the plutonium will still be in the
24 fuel. So you haven't gotten rid of the plutonium;
25 right?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. HARRIS: Correct. Correct.

2 MR. COBB: So then what do you do with it?

3 MR. HARRIS: I think that the - the
4 purpose of DOE's program is to make the weapons grade
5 plutonium unusable, so that the plutonium is still
6 there, but now it's...

7 MR. COBB: Ah.

8 MR. HARRIS: ...in a highly radioactive...

9 MR. COBB: Right. Now I'm understanding
10 what - yeah. You don't - you want to mix it so it's
11 not pure enough to be used for...

12 MR. HARRIS: And also spent nuclear fuel
13 is - is a relatively hazardous...

14 MR. COBB: Yeah.

15 MR. HARRIS: ...material.

16 MR. COBB: Okay. I'm starting to
17 understand a little bit what you're trying to do here.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

19 MR. COBB: Thank you.

20 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Kirk.

21 Other questions on the process? Yes, sir.

22 MR. PLEASANT: Yes, my name is William
23 Pleasant from The Green Party.

24 Why was the immobilization program
25 dropped?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good question.

2 MR. HARRIS: That was a DOE decision,
3 Department of Energy decision. I think there was a
4 report to Congress that cited cost and - I think was
5 one of the principle reasons.

6 MR. CAMERON: So if people wanted to find
7 out more about that, a report is - is available?

8 MR. HARRIS: Yes. I think Dave will
9 provide the title in his...

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We're going to get
11 more information on that, and if we have further
12 questions, we'll - we'll come back out to you.

13 Anybody else on - on the NRC process
14 before we go into the changes in the DOE program and
15 what implications that has for the NRC environmental
16 evaluation? And if you do, if something occurs to you
17 later on, please feel free to - to ask that; okay?

18 Let's go to Dave Brown. Thank you, Tim.

19 Let's go to Dave Brown. And while you're
20 switching that, Tim mentioned that we - there's an
21 opportunity to submit written comments, if you would
22 like, on the two questions that he put on the board.
23 You can Email them, can fax them, or you can send us
24 a hard copy of them.

25 And, Sara, a question?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. BARCZAK: Just a - a quick comment.
2 If you don't want to write that down and you can't see
3 it, you can grab one of the pink flyers that's back by
4 the colorful tri-fold display that has it all written
5 out.

6 MR. CAMERON: Thank Georgians for Clean
7 Energy for providing that to us. Thank you.

8 Yes, ma'am?

9 MS. JZAR: Ranowell Jzar with Citizens for
10 Environmental Justice.

11 I'm - I just have a question. If
12 immobilization was something that was really - really
13 to be considered as an alternative and DOE dropped
14 building the plant for that, is there another way to
15 do that? Or is it because they dropped it, it's just
16 a done deal?

17 MR. CAMERON: When you say if there's
18 another way to - to do that, do you mean is there
19 another way for the immobilization facility to be
20 resurrected, so to speak?

21 MS. JZAR: Yes.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Tim, do you
23 understand the question?

24 MR. HARRIS: I think so. I think - I
25 think the answer is that NRC doesn't have a means to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 - to make DOE construct the facility. The question
2 here tonight is whether we should still consider that
3 in the environmental impact statement as an
4 alternative and as a reasonable...

5 MR. CAMERON: So it's possible that the
6 immobilization facility - the question the NRC is
7 asking is should we - even though that's been
8 canceled, should the NRC look at the - the
9 environmental impacts from that facility.

10 MR. HARRIS: As a - as an alternative to
11 the proposed MOX facility.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Do you have a
13 question on that?

14 MR. COBB: Just a follow-up to that, just
15 thought of it. If - if you do blend the plutonium
16 with uranium and use it in commercial reactors for -
17 for electricity production, eventually the spent fuel
18 from these radio - from these nuclear power plants is
19 going to be immobilized, is it not, at some - at some
20 point in the future? Or are we not going to
21 immobilize any of this spent waste or spent fuel?

22 MR. HARRIS: I don't - I don't think it's
23 immobilized. I think it's disposed of.

24 MR. COBB: I mean, it's a vitrification
25 type of process; right? Would - would then the spent

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 fuel that might have plutonium in it, with uranium,
2 eventually when it's spent and it's immobilized or
3 vitrified and gets buried some - in a mountain
4 somewhere, then the plutonium winds up there; is that
5 right? So, in essence, it would be immobilized?

6 I just - I don't know. I'm just asking
7 questions. Thank you.

8 MR. BROWN: The answer to your question
9 is: No, the - the spent fuel would not receive any
10 further treatment to it...

11 MR. COBB: It would just be immobilized?

12 MR. BROWN: ...further immobilize
13 plutonium.

14 MR. COBB: We'd just put it in a water -
15 we'd just put it in a water bath? Is that...

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Kirk, we need to - we
17 need to get you on the transcript. And I think we're
18 - you mentioned, and I think we should clear this up,
19 is that when - when you referred to "keeping it in the
20 water bath," Dave, can you just explain to the crowd
21 what the proposal - the DOE proposal is to do with
22 spent fuel from nuclear power plants, whether it's MOX
23 fuel or any other fuel. Could you just do that
24 briefly, so that people will understand that.

25 MR. BROWN: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay?

2 MR. BROWN: Okay. Am I being heard pretty
3 well? Okay.

4 The spent MOX fuel would be handled much
5 the same way that spent fuel is today. It would - it
6 is temporarily stored in pools at the nuclear power
7 plants. Those are, you know, water-filled pools.
8 That fuel would then be transferred to shipping casks.
9 And the proposal that the - the nation's considering
10 now is to dispose of the fuel at the Yucca Mountain
11 Site in Nevada, so that fuel in its - in the form that
12 it's in would be disposed of in Yucca Mountain.

13 One of the things you sort of alluded to
14 was this concept of reprocessing the fuel to maybe
15 remove things, to solidify waste. And that's not part
16 of the nation's program at this point.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's - let's go over
18 here and - right here, and then let's go to your
19 presentation, and we can open it up for some more
20 questions.

21 Go ahead, sir.

22 MR. JERNIGAN: My name's Anthony Jernigan.
23 I don't know if you can hear me or not.
24 Hypothetically - hype - I'm sorry, I can't talk.
25 Hypothetically speaking, if immobilization is included

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 in the EIS and it's found to be a better alternative
2 than MOX, would that be grounds for denial of the
3 license?

4 MR. HARRIS: I think the answer is - I
5 don't know whether it's yes or - it's a - yeah, you're
6 right, it's a potential grounds for denying the
7 license.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. That's a
9 great question. Million dollar question, I guess.

10 Yes, sir?

11 MR. NADELMAN: It's my understanding that
12 the...

13 MR. CAMERON: If you could give us your
14 name.

15 MR. NADELMAN: Yes. My name is Fred
16 Nadelman, and I - I'm a social worker. I'm with the
17 Citizens for Clean Air and Water. My view, however,
18 is my own. It does not represent that of everyone in
19 my organization. That doesn't mean it necessarily
20 does not.

21 Now, my question is: Although it's going
22 to Yucca Mountains, it's also my understanding that it
23 will be used in nuclear power - private nuclear power
24 plants throughout the country, the pellets. It's also
25 my understanding that not every nuclear power plant

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that we - we know is capable of processing or - or -
2 I'd rather - I'll restate that.

3 We don't know if every nuclear power plant
4 is capable of handling weapons grade plutonium and
5 uranium that these pellets - of which these pellets
6 will be composed. Has a thorough - has this been
7 thoroughly researched? And if it has not, why not?
8 And I would also like to know what precautions will be
9 used to prevent a terrorist - terrorist attacks during
10 the - against the vehicles transporting the fuel to
11 the - throughout the country to these plants? Also,
12 terrorist attacks as well as accidents, we need
13 precautions against, and I'm sure you acknowledge
14 that. And this is - remains a possibility, and it's
15 a definite danger to the public. I'll stop here.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And, Tim, in
17 answering that, can you - can you just tell people
18 what the further NRC process is in relationship to
19 those rods ever being used at a particular nuclear
20 power plant? Because I think that goes to...

21 MR. HARRIS: That was his - one of his
22 first questions was: Is this stuff proposed to be
23 used everywhere in the country? And the answer is:
24 No. The current program would be to utilize it in two
25 reactors at Catawba and two reactors at the McGuire

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 station, one in South Carolina and one in North
2 Carolina near Charlotte. So those are the only two
3 reactors that are currently proposed to use the
4 proposed MOX fuel.

5 The second question was: Are we looking
6 at the safety and environmental impacts of that? And
7 the answer is: In order for those reactors to use
8 that fuel, they would have to have a license, and then
9 - and that would be the step - the process for NRC to
10 go into detailed review of the safety of the use of -
11 of this type of fuel. The...

12 MR. CAMERON: The terrorism,
13 transportation.

14 MR. HARRIS: ...the last question was -
15 was terrorism. And I think there are - there are
16 procedures, regulations, policies in place to - to
17 safeguard this type of material.

18 MR. NADELMAN: I ask that question
19 because...

20 MR. CAMERON: Fred, Fred, Fred. I'm
21 sorry, you know, I hate to - to take away from the
22 spontaneity here, but we really do need to get this on
23 the transcript. And if you - do you have a follow-up?
24 I take it you do.

25 MR. NADELMAN: Yes. In view of the - of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the fact that nuclear material has been hijacked from
2 Oak Ridge and - it's been hijacked and it's - that is,
3 it's been stolen, it could be more - probably be more
4 easily stolen from a truck or a train, just as Jesse
5 James did in his days.

6 (Laughter.)

7 MR. CAMERON: Let me just - let me make
8 sure that we've set the record straight on - on this.
9 Can you just describe how this fuel is - is shipped,
10 so that you can give people an idea of what the actual
11 risk is of things like it being - being stolen? And
12 I don't - you know, obviously we don't have any -
13 we're not necessarily agreeing that - that material's
14 been stolen from - from Oak Ridge. But...

15 MR. NADELMAN: It has.

16 MR. CAMERON: ...if you have anything to
17 say on that, why don't you - why don't you do that for
18 - is it Fred?

19 MR. NADELMAN: Fred, yes.

20 MR. CAMERON: Fred. And then let's get
21 Dave up there to talk. And I don't - we'll come back
22 to these types of questions.

23 Tim?

24 MR. HARRIS: I guess, how - how is spent
25 fuel transported, particularly by the Department of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Energy. It's transported in huge casks that were
2 designed to withstand severe accidents. There's armed
3 guards involved. They follow certain routes. I think
4 they're tracked by GPS. It's a - it's a very
5 sophisticated system they use to - to safeguard the
6 material.

7 And I don't think I can address material
8 being diverted from Oak Ridge.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. If there are further
10 questions on this, we'll - we'll come back to them.
11 Let's get Dave up so you can get the whole picture on
12 this, and then we'll go back out to you for - for
13 questions again.

14 MR. BROWN: Thanks, Chip.

15 What I'd like to do is summarize the - two
16 of the major changes that DOE made early this year
17 that affected our environmental review. I'll also
18 discuss the environmental impacts that Duke Cogema
19 Stone & Webster presented to us in their environmental
20 report that deals with these changes. They issued a
21 revised environmental report in July of 2002, and
22 we've had - we may need to look at that.

23 The first change I'll discuss is the
24 cancellation of the plutonium immobilization plant.
25 We talked a little bit about that. The plutonium

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 immobilization plant had been part of a two-part
2 process where some of the plutonium was going to be
3 solidified and disposed of directly, and the rest of
4 the plutonium was going to be converted to MOX fuel
5 and go that route. The DOE did cancel that program
6 for budgetary reasons, so I'll describe how that
7 impacts the NRC's review in a moment.

8 Second change I'll talk about is a new
9 waste solidification building. This is a building
10 that would - that would be built by DOE, operated by
11 DOE near the MOX facility to handle and to treat
12 liquid waste coming from the facility and from another
13 nearby facility, the pit disassembly and conversion
14 facility.

15 These three facilities work together. The
16 pit disassembly and conversion facility helps to
17 convert the - the weapons components to plutonium
18 oxide that then would be fed into the mixed oxide fuel
19 plant. And the waste solidification building would
20 then handle waste from both of the processes.

21 The - the environmental impact of
22 canceling the plutonium immobilization plant is
23 derived from the fact that there was 8.4 metric tons
24 of plutonium that had been slated to go to that plant,
25 that will now have to have a new disposition path. To

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 be clear, the - of that 8.4 metric tons, two of the
2 metric tons DOE decided it still wasn't adequate or of
3 the right quality to go to the mixed oxide fuel plant.
4 So of the - the 6.4 metric tons from the cancelled
5 immobilization plant, that's proposed now to go to the
6 mixed oxide fuel plant.

7 That 6.4 metric tons is what's being
8 referred to as alternate feedstock, and that's just
9 material coming from another direction into the mixed
10 oxide fuel facility. And so the - the MOX facility
11 would have to be redesigned to accommodate this
12 material. It has some - some of it has impurities in
13 it, and so there would have to be additional process
14 steps at the MOX facility to handle those impurities.

15 As a part of this, also, the original
16 environmental review that we had started was
17 considering the processing of 33 metric tons. And
18 with the program change, we're not looking at the
19 proposal to process 34 metric tons; so one additional
20 ton.

21 The DCS has informed the NRC that DOE
22 plans to build this waste solidification building.
23 The DOE's described this as being - addressing public
24 concerns about using the Savannah River Site's high
25 level waste tanks to process this liquid waste stream

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 from the MOX project. So, instead of doing that,
2 instead of diverting liquid waste to the existing high
3 level waste tank, this waste solidification building
4 would solidify those waste.

5 The waste solidification building is
6 located on the pit disassembly and conversion facility
7 site. I think on the back of your handout there's a
8 site plan that shows the relative location of these
9 facilities.

10 Again, there's four liquid waste streams:
11 the two from the MOX facility, and two from the pit
12 disassembly and conversion facility. One from MOX and
13 one from the pit disassembly and conversion facility
14 are what we call transuranic waste. Those wastes
15 would be solidified, and the proposal is that those
16 would go - that solidified waste would go to the waste
17 isolation pilot plant in New Mexico.

18 A second waste stream from MOX and another
19 one from the pit disassembly and conversion facility
20 would be low level waste. Those wastes would also be
21 solidified, but those would be disposed of on the
22 Savannah River Site as low level waste in the E Area
23 or at another permanent low level waste site.

24 With respect to the environmental impacts,
25 these are some of the - the impacts that were

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 described in the environmental report. In order to
2 accommodate this alternate feedstock, the aqueous
3 polishing building, which is like the first step in
4 the MOX building, would have about 10% more floor area
5 to accommodate additional processes. Some of the
6 alternate feedstock contains salts of chloride. Those
7 would have to be removed. And the process to remove
8 those chlorides would generate a chlorine that may
9 come out as an emission - an air emission from the
10 plant. And this would also - the processing of
11 alternate feedstock would also change the waste
12 characteristics that come out of the plant. For
13 example, the amount of low level liquid radioactive
14 waste that would be produced by the plant would be
15 about 60%. The impurities that were in the alternate
16 feedstock would also be in that low level waste.
17 That's something we would consider in our EIS.

18 The liquid high alpha activity waste is a
19 waste that's generated as part of purifying the
20 plutonium. That would have what we're referring to as
21 the new strategy there. That's the waste
22 solidification building, to solidify that waste. That
23 waste would have a little bit more silver in it.
24 Silver is used in the process to help dissolve the
25 plutonium. There'd be a little bit more of that in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that waste. And the - there would be additional
2 volume to this waste.

3 With respect to the waste solidification
4 building, some of the environmental impacts DCS
5 described to NRC, and that we will evaluate, includes
6 the disposal impacts. For example, they're supposed
7 to generate transuranic waste, so it would have to go
8 to the waste isolation pilot plant. There are impacts
9 associated with, you know, how much can the waste
10 isolation pilot plant accommodate. Would this be a
11 burden on that capacity.

12 There'd be construction-related impacts.
13 This is a new facility, so we'd have to consider the
14 impacts of - of breaking ground out there and - and
15 trucks and that sort of thing moving earth.
16 Operation-related impacts, like the normal air and
17 liquid effluents, occupational radiation exposure to
18 workers in the plant. And finally, DCS also provided
19 us some information about the consequences of
20 potential accidents that could occur in the waste
21 solidification building.

22 That - that pretty well summarizes the
23 kinds of impacts and major changes that we'll be
24 looking at. I'll be happy to take any questions.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Dave. And

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 this is a lot of material to digest. Keep in mind
2 that when the NRC's draft environmental impact
3 statement comes out, it will go through all of these
4 impacts and you'll be able to - to read about that.

5 Are there questions? Sara? And then
6 we'll go over here.

7 MS. BARCZAK: Do I need to say my name
8 again?

9 MR. CAMERON: Sara Barczak. I'll say it
10 for you.

11 MS. BARCZAK: All right. I - Mr. Brown,
12 there are a lot of questions on this section, so I
13 don't want to hold things up. And perhaps some
14 people made comments - their public comments, maybe
15 it - it brings to light something that you could touch
16 base on and answer at that point. I mean, this whole
17 section could take like weeks to get through.

18 And so I just had a couple of quick ones
19 on that new waste solidification building that DOE is
20 slated to build.

21 MR. BROWN: Right.

22 MS. BARCZAK: Does the NRC have to okay
23 that?

24 MR. BROWN: That would be - no, it's not
25 an NRC license - it would not be an NRC licensed

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 facility.

2 MS. BARCZAK: Okay. So we're still sort
3 of back to - for those of us that were at the April
4 2001 scoping meeting, a lot of us brought up, you
5 know, how the waste is generated from this MOX plants
6 and/or the immobilization facility that no longer will
7 be here. And the waste goes out a pipe and it hits a
8 fence line and then it's out of the NRC's licensing
9 review because that's not your mission.

10 And so who's going to look at this
11 building, this new waste production - or new waste
12 solidification building? Is it going to be licensed
13 by the Department of Energy?

14 MR. BROWN: They would - they would
15 undergo for safety. And as Chip pointed out, there
16 was a - you know, I had a safety responsibility at the
17 NRC to - to review the - that aspect of the plant.
18 We're also doing an environmental review.

19 MS. BARCZAK: Okay. But you don't have
20 to...

21 MR. BROWN: But, from a safety aspect,
22 that's DOE's responsibility.

23 MS. BARCZAK: Right. Right. Okay.

24 MR. BROWN: To - to go through their
25 processes to get a plant authorized and all that sort

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of thing.

2 MS. BARCZAK: Okay.

3 MR. CAMERON: But can you - just if I can
4 borrow this back. But can you just go through the
5 other piece of it? Even though NRC does not license
6 the waste solidification building, it is something
7 that will be looked at in our environmental impact
8 statement?

9 MR. BROWN: Certainly. As we said here,
10 the...

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So it is going to
12 be...

13 MR. BROWN: ...because it's associated
14 with the mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, we
15 will look at the environmental impacts of constructing
16 and operating the waste solidification building.

17 MS. BARCZAK: Right. And depending on
18 what you come up with, is - let's say you say, "Oh, my
19 gosh, this building is going to be horrible, and it's
20 going to just be a disaster," is that grounds for also
21 not licensing the facility? The MOX facility?

22 MR. BROWN: The...

23 MS. BARCZAK: Or are you just charged
24 with, you know, evaluating what's going to happen?

25 MR. BROWN: Well, that's - we don't want

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to give the impression that the environmental review
2 is not important. It is part of the decision-making
3 pools to give that...

4 MS. BARCZAK: Yeah.

5 MR. BROWN: ...whether or not to issue a
6 license. And since we're going to be looking at the
7 impacts of this facility, if there are significant
8 impacts, those will be brought to light in the EIS.

9 MR. CAMERON: Let me just - can we just
10 get one - Tim, you wanted to add something to that?

11 MR. HARRIS: I think there's one
12 distinction that needs to be clarified, is - is what
13 you said is at the fence line, you're right, NRC
14 doesn't evaluate the safety. But the environmental
15 impact statement considers things that are beyond
16 NRC's direct control or authority. That is, you know,
17 we will look at the waste impacts. We were going to
18 look at them before; we're going to look at them now.

19 So it's - it's how far the waste goes, all
20 the environmental impacts associated with that, which
21 would include this facility and waste generated by
22 this facility. So the safety review stops at our -
23 our line of authority, but the environmental review is
24 - is larger in scope.

25 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Sara, why don't

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you ask one more question, and then we'll go to other
2 people, and then we'll - we'll come back. And if we
3 go through public comments and we have more time at
4 the end of the night, we can go to your - how many
5 weeks are we going to be here?

6 MS. BARCZAK: Not but a couple of weeks.

7 MR. CAMERON: All right.

8 (Laughter.)

9 MS. BARCZAK: All right, my second
10 question, then. When you mentioned that alternate
11 feedstock or, you know, dirty plutonium or whatever
12 isn't going to be used, does the NRC have to study,
13 and/or are you going to be told the different options
14 of what the DOE wants to do with that, you know, un-
15 MOX-able, unsalvageable plutonium?

16 MR. BROWN: No. The - the two metric
17 tons...

18 MS. BARCZAK: Yeah.

19 MR. BROWN: ...that DOE has removed...

20 MS. BARCZAK: Right.

21 MR. BROWN: ...from consideration in the
22 MOX program?

23 MS. BARCZAK: Right.

24 MR. BROWN: Would be outside the - the
25 scope of our - both our safety and our environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 review at that point. DOE would make a decision what
2 to do with that plutonium.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And, as I said, we
4 can come back for further questions. But let's go
5 here, and then we'll go back here, and then back over
6 there. And say your - it's - people, just state your
7 name clearly into the mic, because I think some people
8 are having trouble hearing. All right.

9 MS. JAY: My name is Cheryl Jay. I have
10 a question about the decision of the DOE to remove the
11 immobilization due to cost constraints. If we take
12 this plutonium, this plutonium - 8.4 metric tons of
13 plutonium that were - was slated for the
14 immobilization, and we put it back into the waste
15 stream, is - is the cost effect of this 8.4 tons going
16 into the waste stream for the next how many years,
17 depending on the half-life of the plutonium, 200,000
18 years, plus, is that taken into effect?

19 MR. BROWN: Well, I want to be sure I
20 understand your question. You're referring to that -
21 the plutonium that would have to go to the MOX
22 facility to be dispositioned? The cost of doing that
23 has been considered by DOE.

24 MS. JAY: Okay. But what I'm saying is,
25 we're - instead of taking that 8.4 metric tons and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 putting it away, now you're taking 6.4 of that 8.4
2 metric tons and you're putting it back into the waste
3 stream, which means we, as the taxpayers, are going to
4 have to pay for - you know, as long as we know, as
5 long as any of us in this room knows, we're going to
6 have to pay to keep that in - in some form, instead of
7 immobilizing it. So how can that be cost effective?

8 MR. BROWN: I think in either case, with
9 immobilizing or with converting that material into the
10 mixed oxide fuel and sending it to reactors, you're
11 creating a highly radioactive waste form that ends up
12 in the same place. So I want to be sure I'm
13 addressing your question. Both strategies would end
14 up in the same - same place with respect to waste
15 disposal in their - in their end point.

16 MS. JAY: Can I - can I ask one...

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's - let's give you
18 a follow-up here. And if we can get the citation to
19 the congressional report or any report that's public,
20 that was done by the Department of Energy or others
21 that might explain some of this, we'll - we'll try to
22 get you a citation for that.

23 MS. JAY: Besides the waste stream, the
24 MOX process, itself, is a dirty process. So this 6.4
25 tons that was slated for immobilization is now going

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to generate more waste to produce MOX than originally
2 it would have if it had been immobilized.

3 MR. BROWN: Right.

4 MS. JAY: So we're creating more waste in
5 the process. So we're taking this waste and making
6 more waste out of it, and eventually it's all going to
7 be waste that we're all, as taxpayers, are going to
8 have to deal with. So I don't see how that could be
9 cost effective, to put this 6.4 metric tons into the
10 MOX facility.

11 MR. BROWN: I think, so what we will do,
12 then, is we have, as part of the environmental impact
13 statement process, the - the comparison of the cost of
14 the different alternatives. So we would bring that to
15 light in our statement. That's...

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

17 MR. BROWN: ...but you're right, there are
18 problems associated with either action.

19 MR. CAMERON: We're going to go here, and
20 then here, and then here.

21 Yes, sir?

22 MR. JACKSON: Yes, my name is Lester
23 Jackson.

24 You mentioned earlier that the Department
25 of Energy will be looking at the safety and the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 environmental impact. And then you said they will
2 determine, you know, what's best for the environment.
3 Can you identify who "they" are? Do they have names?
4 Are they a team of experts, or where the experts come
5 from? And are they identified by names? And - and
6 what are their qualifications to determine what's safe
7 for this environment?

8 MR. CAMERON: And let me just make sure
9 everybody understands that before you answer it, is
10 that when you talk about the Department looking at the
11 safety and the environmental impacts, you were only
12 referring to the waste solidification building. I
13 don't want anybody to get the idea that - that the
14 Department is the one that's going to be looking at
15 the safety or the environmental impacts of this MOX
16 fuel fabrication facility, because that is the NRC
17 responsibility. It's only the waste solidification
18 building that's outside of our jurisdiction.

19 But very important question. If - if
20 either Dave or Tim can provide some start to an answer
21 to that. And I would just ask if there's anybody here
22 from - from DOE or DCS that might be able to give you
23 that information offline, so to speak, so that you
24 know what it is. But can you guys provide - like
25 who's the organization that will look at the waste

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 solidification building safety?

2 MR. BROWN: I don't have that information.
3 I'm sorry.

4 MR. CAMERON: Tim, anything?

5 MR. HARRIS: No.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We'll try to get you
7 an answer for that; okay?

8 MR. JACKSON: But there is an answer for
9 it, though? I mean, there is...

10 MR. CAMERON: Oh, yeah, there's got to be.
11 There's got to be.

12 MR. HULL: Chip,...

13 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

14 MR. HULL: ...I do have more of that
15 information.

16 MR. CAMERON: And, John, introduce
17 yourself to people.

18 MR. HULL: My name is John Hull. I'm an
19 attorney with the NRC. The Department of Energy does
20 have its own NEPA team which is looking at aspects of
21 the larger spent fuel disposition program. And they
22 published a notice in the *Federal Register* back in
23 April explaining they were still looking at this in -
24 to evaluate the environmental impacts of their
25 program. The - I forget the name of the people.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 There were two individuals at DOE that
2 were specified as being involved in the program, if
3 you're interested in specific names. I don't remember
4 what those names are, but I'd be happy, if you want to
5 give me your phone number, I could get back to you
6 later and give you the names and give you the
7 reference that you could look at it, if you're
8 interested. But the Department of Energy does - is
9 looking at this. And it's too bad nobody from DOE is
10 here to give you further specifics on it. But I
11 didn't want to leave the impression that it was not
12 being looked at at all.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay, that's helpful. And
14 if we can get the information on this *Federal Register*
15 notice that he mentioned, we'll get that to you. And
16 there may be someone here who, after the meeting's
17 over tonight, can provide more information on that.

18 Let's - let's go here for a question, and
19 then we're going to go back over to the other side.
20 Yes?

21 MS. JENNINGS: Judy Jennings again. I'm
22 looking at the sheet that says, "Reducing a clear and
23 present danger." And I asked the question before, and
24 you answered about the DC analysis. But what I'm
25 trying to get clear in my mind is the actual flow of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 this process whereby there was a proposal for a
2 project and - but this says, "Design of the MOX
3 facility to be located at SRS is now underway." So
4 I'm wondering who's funding that design, and did
5 Congress - I'm just trying to get the flow here.
6 Because I'm looking at a NEPA process that is supposed
7 to answer the environmental questions. But clearly
8 work on design is - is already being done, and I was
9 wondering who's - who is funding that.

10 MR. BROWN: I'll do my best. But I - to
11 give you some - maybe a bigger picture, is really what
12 you're asking for.

13 MR. CAMERON: Can you - are you going to
14 do that for us, Dave?

15 MR. BROWN: Yes.

16 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

17 MR. BROWN: But please cut me off if I,
18 you know, rattle on.

19 But what we're really looking at here is
20 an agreement between the Russian Federation and the
21 United States to get rid of - or to the disposition of
22 weapons grade plutonium to reduce stockpiles.
23 President Clinton and Yeltsin had begun some of those
24 point of negotiations. And so the DOE then had
25 responsibility to go ahead and implement whatever

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 strategy the Russian Federation and the U.S. came up
2 with.

3 And at the time, I'd say the late '90s or
4 so, there was - the U.S. proposed a two-part approach:
5 immobilize some of it, and turn the rest into MOX
6 fuel. And in September of 2000, Vice President Gore
7 signed an agreement for 34 metric tons. About 25.6
8 would be turned into MOX, and whatever the balance is,
9 8.4 would be immobilized. And that's - that's where
10 the 34 metric tons comes from, is this agreement
11 between - I forget the Russian officer and Vice
12 President Gore.

13 As that was - even as that was going on,
14 the Department of Energy was evaluating different
15 alternatives for - for doing this project, including
16 having an immobilization plant at any number of DOE
17 sites, having a MOX fuel fabrication facility at any
18 number of different sites. They - they selected the
19 Savannah River Site for all three facilities. I think
20 it was January 2000 or thereabouts.

21 So - so we had an agreement. We first
22 selected a site, and then we formalized an agreement
23 with the Russians for the quantity. And so that's how
24 we ended up with the Savannah River Site and the 34
25 tons. As all that was going on, DOE selected a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 contractor, Duke Cogema Stone & Webster, in 1999. So
2 they began the process of designing a MOX fuel plant
3 by selecting a contractor in about 1999, knowing that
4 that was probably one of the ways the U.S. and the
5 Russian Federation would choose to disposition
6 plutonium.

7 MR. CAMERON: And the - the last part of
8 that that goes to your question is that the - the
9 authorization of monies to pay for the design was
10 through the legislative congressional - federal
11 Congress authorization process, where the Department
12 came in and asked for money to fund the design. Okay,
13 that's where the money part comes in from - you know,
14 from all of us as - as taxpayers.

15 MS. JENNINGS: And - and what Congress
16 made that authorization?

17 MR. CAMERON: The question was: What
18 Congress made that authorization? I take it it's been
19 - there's been money appropriated by probably every
20 Congress since, you know...

21 MR. HARRIS: 1999.

22 MR. CAMERON: ...1999.

23 MS. JENNINGS: So the authorization
24 process started in 1999?

25 MR. CAMERON: Yes. Okay. Let's go to...

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. HARRIS: Okay, Chip - Chip, I think...

2 MR. CAMERON: Do you want to add something
3 else?

4 MR. HARRIS: Well, just - just a little
5 information. I think one of your concerns was, is why
6 are we designing the project when we haven't evaluated
7 the environmental impact. Was that - was that a part
8 of your question?

9 MS. JENNINGS: Yeah, part of it.

10 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. And the answer is you
11 have to do some design in order to know what your
12 facility looks like, what it - how - you know, what
13 kind of waste, what kind of processes you're going to
14 do. You know, it doesn't have to be detailed
15 construction design, but it has to be a conceptual
16 design so you know what your facility looks like, so
17 that you can evaluate the environmental impact. So
18 that's why that's going on.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you
20 very much.

21 Yes, ma'am? And then we'll go over here.

22 MS. JZAR: This is...

23 MR. CAMERON: And could you give us your
24 name.

25 MS. JZAR: Ranowell Jzar, Citizens for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Environmental Justice. This is more a personal
2 comment than a comment on the other. But what I'm
3 seeing here, it seems to me that cost has far
4 outweighed the safety of the environment and the
5 socioeconomic structure of - of our - of all of our
6 communities.

7 SRS is a Super Fund site, which means it's
8 a big, dirty plant. It is in the process right now of
9 cleaning up waste from the '50s, Cold War era. How
10 much of your EIS statement is dealing with the fact
11 that they are just now developing plans and ways of
12 cleaning up old waste, and now you're coming up with
13 something that is going to produce 60% more waste?
14 And efforts to handle that in a more effective manner
15 are cut down because of cost. And somehow to me that
16 does not compute.

17 MR. CAMERON: Thank you for that comment.
18 And - and Dave, you may be able to shed some light on
19 how the environmental impact statement looks at things
20 like cumulative effects from other cleanup efforts.
21 It really doesn't affect your major point that you're
22 - you're making. But does the environmental impact
23 statement look at how the impacts of this proposed
24 facility would - would interact with other things that
25 are going on at Savannah River?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. BROWN: Yes, that - one of the reasons
2 DOE describes for coming up with the waste
3 solidification building was the fact to address public
4 concern about the use of the existing high level waste
5 tanks, and the process they developed was solidifying
6 the waste in those tanks to accommodate MOX waste.
7 The original proposal was that liquid waste from the
8 MOX plant would go to the existing high level waste
9 tanks. The waste solidification building was what
10 they proposed to do this differently.

11 In either case, what we'll be looking at
12 is, as Chip described, a cumulative effects analysis,
13 is: What is the existing capacity for the site to
14 manage waste? How much can they handle, and how well
15 do they do it? And what impact would having a MOX
16 facility have on that capability?

17 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

18 Yes, ma'am? And just give us your name,
19 please.

20 MS. DANIELS: My name is Evelyn Daniels,
21 and I live in an area called Hudson Hills, and not too
22 far away from the Savannah River.

23 My question is I attended a class
24 previously, but somewhat like this one, and we were
25 told they were thinking about using the Savannah River

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 for the disposal of nuclear waste. Is that true?

2 MR. CAMERON: Let's see if we can get an
3 answer for that. We don't, you know, know the
4 particular event or class that you're talking about,
5 but, Tim, can you two shed any light on - on that?

6 MR. BROWN: Well, the - there are
7 processes at Savannah River Site to clean up the
8 water. For example, ground water that may be
9 contaminated, some of the industrial waste water, like
10 when a facility uses water, it causes it to become
11 contaminated. Savannah River Site has a facility that
12 can clean that up. Then that water does, in some
13 cases, go back into the creeks, back to the Savannah
14 River Site. In that - in that sense, then yes, water
15 that was low level liquid radioactive waste is treated
16 and then released back to the environment.

17 MS. DANIELS: But is the - does the water
18 become purified after?

19 MR. BROWN: Yes, it's cleaned up to - to
20 federal standards before it's released back into the
21 environment.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's go back. Mr.
23 Jackson?

24 MR. JACKSON: Yes, Lester Jackson.

25 Would you consider that water to be safe?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. BROWN: Yes.

2 MR. JACKSON: That's cleaned up, that's
3 shipped back into the Savannah River? I mean, you
4 said it was up to federal standards, and - and I
5 believe in the American government. In fact, I'm a
6 part of it. But...

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. JACKSON: ...but would you believe
9 that water to be safe that come out of the Savannah
10 River Site?

11 MR. BROWN: The - yes. Or it - if this
12 proposed MOX facility is built and operated, they'll
13 have to meet the NRC's regulations for liquid
14 effluents, for example, contamination that might be
15 present in water. And those are restrictive to be
16 protective of the environment and - and of the public.
17 So, you know, they have to meet those regulations in
18 order to operate, so the liquid effluents would be at
19 safe levels.

20 MR. JACKSON: Safe levels, but there would
21 still be some traces of radioactive material in the
22 water?

23 MR. BROWN: There would be trace levels of
24 radioactivity in the water.

25 MR. JACKSON: Trace levels. Right. Do

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you think those trace levels might - might increase
2 the cancer rate in this area or more than likely
3 contribute to higher infant mortality rate in this
4 area, those trace levels? Or has that been documented
5 or studied?

6 MR. BROWN: Well, that gets into the
7 analyses that - that's still before us in our - for
8 our environmental impact statement. We will look at
9 the different discharges associated with the project
10 and what the risks are, like cancer risks.

11 MR. JACKSON: Because in my reading it
12 seemed that the cancer rate in this area, as it flows
13 down from the Savannah River, seems to be higher than
14 in other areas of our great state and other areas of
15 our great nation. The infant mortality rate seem to
16 be higher. There seems to be a higher rate of cancer
17 in our area. And we're trying to find out where this
18 is contributing to. Some say maybe attributed to the
19 Savannah River Site, some say they contribute to other
20 facilities in our area. But we're trying to see do
21 you think that the high radioactive level of the water
22 might be - might be an added entity to all these high
23 levels of infant mortality and cancer in our area.

24 MR. BROWN: At this point we're going to
25 do our analysis to see what - what effects we would

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 expect. But...

2 MR. JACKSON: And what they say...

3 MR. CAMERON: And we got to get this on a
4 transcript. I'll come back to you, Mr. Jackson,
5 because I think someone over here might have some
6 information for you on your - your question. And give
7 us your name, please, sir.

8 MR. CHAPUT: My name is Ernie Chaput. I'm
9 - is this on?

10 MR. CAMERON: Yeah, it's on.

11 MR. CHAPUT: You can't tell by talking
12 into it.

13 I'm from Aiken. I work with a group
14 called Economic Development Partnership who does
15 industrial development. And we've - we've been
16 following the MOX program for about five years.

17 The only reason I'm speaking right now is
18 your question has come up several times over the last
19 month. And I just wanted to - to tell you that we've
20 done a little research and come up with basically two
21 things. There is a report issued by - the data was
22 gathered by the South Carolina Department of Health
23 and Environmental Control, the people responsible for
24 public safety in South Carolina.

25 They issued a report, in conjunction with

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the American Cancer Society, where they looked at
2 cancer incidents rates for all the counties in the
3 State of South Carolina. And the - the conclusions on
4 that is the incident - there's 47 counties in South
5 Carolina. The cancer rate in Aiken County, which is
6 the county that's the most populous county adjacent to
7 Savannah River is #41 out of 47. It's next - it's
8 sixth from the lowest. So it's well below the average
9 in the state. The other major county that borders
10 Savannah River Site is Barnwell County, and it's
11 slightly below the average for the state. So the
12 counties immediately - in South Carolina immediately
13 adjacent have cancer rates that are much lower than
14 the state averages.

15 There was another study that was done by
16 the Medical University of South Carolina. And I'm
17 sorry, I don't have the citation on it, but I think I
18 can get it for you, that - that I've only seen an
19 abstract on. And - and it was done in the late '90s,
20 and it looked at the counties surrounding Savannah
21 River Site, and on - and on both sides of the river,
22 to the - you know, from Savannah River, down river,
23 and it included the City of Savannah. And the - the
24 conclusion of that - of that study---and I'm going to
25 paraphrase it because it's been a while---was the -

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 there was no elevated cancer rates in total. Some
2 were up - individual cancers were up, some were down.
3 In total, it looked just like the - the balance of the
4 area. And the study concluded they could see no - no
5 relationship between cancers in those counties
6 studied, and the operation of the Savannah River Site.
7 I can get you citations on both of those studies, if
8 you'd like. Thank you.

9 MR. CAMERON: Thank you for - for that.
10 And if it's possible to get Mr. Jackson a copy of one
11 or both studies, I'm sure that would be helpful.

12 Do you have a follow-up?

13 MR. JACKSON: Yes, one follow-up. I'd
14 like to know who is actually - who is actually doing
15 the study, who is actually doing the research.
16 Because information I have is coming from other groups
17 giving me research that says the exact opposite. But
18 I'd like to also know what group and what are their
19 names and what are their credentials, and what do they
20 get their information from.

21 MR. CHAPUT: It was a South Carolina,
22 which was funded by the South Carolina Department of
23 Health and Environmental Control. They have a
24 statewide cancer registry.

25 MR. CAMERON: It's a state agency.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. CHAPUT: And that's what they - that's
2 what they used as a basis for their statistics.

3 MR. CAMERON: And if you get the studies,
4 I think they'll have the name of the researchers and
5 everything. And can you arrange to...

6 MR. CHAPUT: Sure. I'll be...

7 MR. CAMERON: ...to connect there?

8 I just would add one - one other data
9 point on this for people, is that there's - there's a
10 federal agency called the Center for Disease Control
11 and Prevention that's part of the agency for toxic
12 substances and disease registry. They do these types
13 of epidemiology studies on cancer rates around
14 particular facilities. I believe there is a Savannah
15 River Site Citizens Advisory Committee that is chaired
16 by someone from this Center for Disease Prevention and
17 Control. And I will be glad to get you the name of
18 this person if you want to follow up with more
19 information on it.

20 And, ma'am, did you have something you
21 wanted to say? And please give us your name, too.

22 MS. THOMAS: Regina Thomas.

23 I would just like to say that I am very
24 disappointed that - and it was alluded to earlier that
25 cost is more important than human lives. And I would

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 like to know, are we transporting MOX of any nuclear
2 waste to the Savannah River Site facility now?

3 MR. BROWN: I think what has occurred
4 recently is the DOE decision to consolidate storage of
5 plutonium from the Rocky Flats Site to the Savannah
6 River Site. I don't know the schedule of shipments.
7 I really don't know how many or if any have come to
8 the Savannah River Site.

9 MR. CAMERON: Tim?

10 MR. HARRIS: Can I add just a piece? I
11 think there's maybe a little confusion. We know that
12 cost was a reason why DOE made - part of the reason
13 why DOE made a decision to cancel the immobilization
14 project. I tried to state it within my presentation.
15 Our decision making considers both environmental
16 protection and the safety. Cost comes into it, but
17 the key drivers are environmental, public health and
18 safety, and safe operation of the facility.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay, I'm glad you...

20 MR. HARRIS: So cost is - is not a - it's
21 a consideration, but it's not the - the end-all to
22 that decision making. So I just wanted to make that
23 clear.

24 MR. CAMERON: And that's - that's great.
25 And I think that there was an opinion stated, okay,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that cost outweighed them. But in terms of the NRC's
2 analysis, we do look at the environmental and public
3 health impacts as primary consideration. Not cost.

4 MS. THOMAS: Given the fact that the
5 cleanup is still in process at the SRS, is it safe
6 that we should continue to receive any nuclear waste
7 at that site?

8 MR. CAMERON: That may go to the
9 cumulative impact analysis that you talked about
10 earlier, that we'll look at in deciding whether to
11 approve this or to deny it.

12 MR. BROWN: I think that's - that's
13 exactly right. One of the things we will look at is
14 what is already going on at the Savannah River Site,
15 what would be the additional impact of licensing a MOX
16 facility at the site. Would that be an acceptable
17 environmental impact or not. That's the evaluation
18 we're undertaking right now.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay, why don't we go to -
20 and hear from some of the people who wanted to give us
21 some formal comments. And then hopefully we'll have
22 time to - to answer some more questions for you. But
23 I want to make sure that everybody who wanted to talk
24 formally tonight gets an opportunity to - to do that.
25 And I would ask you to - to come up here, if you - if

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you would, to give us your comments.

2 And the first person I have is Jody - Jody
3 Lanier. Jody?

4 Jody, can you - can you use that lavalier?
5 I mean, if it's not - because, I'm sorry, we don't
6 have a - a standup mic there. If this gets too
7 unwieldy, then I'll just put this up there in a stand
8 and you can use it. Maybe that's what we should do.
9 Here, I'll tell you what, I'll...

10 Oh, we got one. All right, great. And,
11 as I said at the beginning of the meeting, if you
12 could try to keep it to five minutes; okay?

13 MR. LANIER: I won't - I hope not to take
14 up anywhere close to that.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, I'm - yeah. Go
16 ahead, Jody.

17 Well, the good news is we have a
18 microphone, but I guess the bad news is we don't know
19 where to plug it in. Jody, why don't you just use the
20 lavalier, and we'll see if we can get some technical
21 assistance here. Yeah, is there any way you can plug
22 it in behind the podium? Is there an amp there that
23 you can turn on? Okay, let's - let's not worry about
24 it. Use the lavalier if you can, and we get a - can
25 you see if the guy in the orange shirt can tell us

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 where to plug this thing in? Thank you.

2 MR. LANIER: Okay, I think I'm plugged
3 into that one there. Can you hear me now fine?

4 MR. CAMERON: Can everybody hear Mr.
5 Lanier?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just speak up and
7 go for it.

8 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead, Jody.

9 MR. LANIER: All right, well, everyone
10 talked - talked too loud, anyway. So hopefully it
11 won't be too loud with this mic here.

12 My name is Jody Lanier, and this is the
13 first time that I've been to any of these meetings
14 before. I'm just coming here as a private citizen.
15 I'd like to thank the NRC for having this meeting
16 tonight. And I just want to share with all of you
17 some reasons why I'm opposed to the MOX plant.

18 First one, some of the speakers have
19 already mentioned it. By making this MOX fuel it's
20 going to add to the overburdened waste stream that's
21 already at the Savannah River Site. And - and
22 especially with plutonium "waste" waste. Excuse me.
23 I don't think it makes any sense, whatsoever, to add
24 all this highly toxic waste when we got all of this
25 other waste from over 50 years being stored in these

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 leaky tanks that's still leaking out into the
2 environment and into the Savannah River now.

3 And this may be contaminating the upper
4 aquifer where, you know, we get our - our drinking
5 water from. And I really would not want to see that
6 happen. And especially if it means everyone has to
7 start buying their drinking water from the store. Of
8 course, the stores are going to love it.

9 And on the questions about the
10 immobilization process, I hope that the NRC would
11 consider that as the main option, either as a no-
12 action alternative or just any alternative to the MOX
13 facility. And personally I would not want to have any
14 of this plutonium at the Savannah River Site. You
15 know, Governor Jim Hodges, of South Carolina, tried to
16 keep it out of the - of the state, and I applaud him
17 for trying to keep it out. But if it has to be there,
18 with all the waste that's already there now, just
19 spend the money that it takes to perfect the
20 vitrification and immobilization process and just
21 immobilize the stuff so - so nobody can get onto - get
22 their hands onto it. That they should just treat
23 plutonium as a waste, not as a commodity.

24 Also, I've been reading about the Cogema
25 company, that it's their process that Duke and Stone

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and Webster are wanting to use as the model for making
2 a MOX at the Savannah River Site. And they have had
3 problems both with making and using MOX in France.
4 And if they want to use a flawed process here in the
5 United States to make MOX, they must not really take
6 the value of human life seriously. They want to put
7 all of us here in the - in Savannah, Chatham County,
8 Coastal Empire. And they're also putting the people
9 in their hometown, Charlotte, North Carolina, at risk
10 using it at the Catawba and McGuire Nuclear Power
11 Plants. Maybe you all will hear more about that
12 tomorrow night in Charlotte.

13 Also, I think that the MOX plant will be
14 a big waste of tax dollars. Anyone reads the *Savannah*
15 *Morning News* knows that use or misuse of tax dollars,
16 that's a really big concern here. I'm not a member of
17 Stop Taxing our People or any of those other taxing
18 groups. But I just submit to you that using the -
19 excuse me, making the MOX at the Savannah River Site,
20 that's going to send billions of dollars of our tax
21 dollars, flush it right down the toilet.

22 (Laughter.)

23 MR. LANIER: Also I think that - that this
24 is going to give us a big problem as far as terrorist
25 risk goes. Some people have already talked about

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that. As far as I know, I guess we can assume that
2 there's still more secret shipments of plutonium from
3 Rocky Flats in Colorado, going out to the Savannah
4 River Site. Well, they're coming in by truck now, but
5 what if the MOX plant goes through and the energy
6 department, Duke Cogema Stone & Webster, they have to
7 start importing plutonium from France, England,
8 Belgium, or other countries that use that, and they
9 have to send it in by ship, and the most convenient
10 place to send it in would be through the Savannah
11 Port, Ocean and - and Garden City terminals.

12 So then, if that happens, we won't just
13 have a - a terrorist target in our backyard, it'll be
14 right at our front door. And I don't think the
15 International Longshoremen, unsung heroes they are, I
16 don't believe they would be too comfortable having to
17 offload the most toxic substance known to man, if that
18 comes in on - on a ship.

19 Also, if the plant is built, what happens
20 if - if they have an accident or there's a leak or,
21 God forbid after 9/11, if some crazy terrorist wants
22 to fly a plane into this plant after it's built and
23 end up turning it into a big dirty bomb. But how are
24 - are we going to evacuate? What is the process if
25 that happens?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 This is a wheel I picked up at the Earth
2 Day festivities. It was done by the Chatham Emergency
3 Management Agency. It has things like lightning,
4 fire, tornadoes, and hazardous material incident. But
5 if you read this, it seems like it's written for a
6 standard chemical emergency, not a nuclear emergency
7 of any kind. I tried calling SEMA, and the people I
8 spoke to, they didn't seem to be all that helpful.
9 And there's no...

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. LANIER: ...mention in the telephone
12 book about evacuation for a nuclear disaster, just a
13 hurricane. And anyone remembers the Hurricane Floyd
14 evacuation, it took me and my family five hours just
15 to get from Savannah to Pembroke. And in that case,
16 evacuating from the hurricane, we had about a day,
17 day-and-a-half, maybe two days of notice that the
18 hurricane was coming. Well, if there's a terrorist
19 attack at the MOX plant, we're not going to have
20 anything close to that. Could happen in the middle of
21 the night when we're all - all asleep. So, if that
22 happens, where are we going to go? North into the
23 Carolinas? South into Florida? Probably couldn't go
24 west, since that would be closer to the Savannah River
25 Site.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 (Laughter.)

2 MR. LANIER: So I think that there needs
3 to be an evacuation plan. Now, Duke Cogema Stone &
4 Webster or the energy department, they need to come up
5 with a - an evacuation plan, test it, have the NRC
6 certify it. And if they can't get a plan together or
7 it's proven that it's not really feasible to evacuate
8 all of us from the area, just deny the application.
9 Don't have a MOX plant.

10 MR. CAMERON: I'm going to have to ask you
11 to - to wrap up, Mr. Lanier.

12 MR. LANIER: Okay. Shouldn't take maybe
13 another minute.

14 But no, we've had to deal with all the
15 waste problems from the site for - for over 50 years,
16 making plutonium for nuclear weapons. Now, with the
17 MOX plant, I'd just like to know when is the madness
18 going to end? That Duke Cogema Stone & Webster and
19 even the energy department, they're trying to shove a
20 giant pupu platter down our throat. And for the
21 benefit of the stenographer, that's spelled p-u-p-u.

22 (Laughter.)

23 MR. LANIER: And I don't know about anyone
24 else here, but I want a pupu platter, I want it from
25 an honorable Chinese restaurant, not a dishonorable

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MOX plant. So please deny the application.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
3 Lanier, for bringing the emergency plan issue on - on
4 the plate here. And we're working to - to get a -
5 another mic here.

6 And Cheryl Jay?

7 MS. JAY: Okay, my name is Cheryl Jay, and
8 I'd just like to make a few comments about the
9 feasibility of MOX in our area.

10 The MOX plant to me is a big ripoff for
11 the taxpayers of the entire nation. We are taking
12 this weapons grade plutonium, which should be taken
13 out of the waste stream, as you've heard my comments
14 before. I feel it should be taken out of the waste
15 stream and not be given as a gift to the nuclear power
16 industry. This is a pilot project, and it is
17 supported not only by Duke Power, but by all the
18 nuclear power industry, and there's a great lobbying
19 effort in Congress because of this, trying to - to get
20 our Congress to back this.

21 When this occurs, we are bringing all the
22 waste to the most - the dirtiest radioactive place
23 that we know of in the world, which is here on the
24 Georgia border. Obviously, the people in South
25 Carolina are very concerned about all the plutonium

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 coming here because Governor Hodges suggested he would
2 lay down in the road to stop the trucks from coming
3 into his state.

4 When this MOX facility is built, which, as
5 we have already seen, it's sort of a done deal, it
6 will create more waste from this waste that they're
7 bringing in. So they're bringing in more waste to
8 produce more waste to give the nuclear power industry
9 our - our waste back in a form that they can use to
10 sell to their ratepayers. Somehow this doesn't make
11 sense.

12 We, as taxpayers, are going to pay for the
13 facility that - that Duke Stone Cogema is building.
14 We, as taxpayers, are going to pay for the increased
15 waste stream at the Savannah River Site. We, as
16 taxpayers, are going to pay for the increased waste
17 stream at the power plant. And, meanwhile, the
18 nuclear power industry is going to turn around and
19 sell it to their ratepayers. The taxpayers are
20 getting shafted here. We don't need anymore waste at
21 Savannah River Site, and we don't need to generate
22 anymore waste at Savannah River Site by this
23 particular process. Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Cheryl.

2 We're going to go to - we're going to go
3 to Sara Barczak, and then we'll go to Mr. William
4 Pleasant. Sara?

5 MS. BARCZAK: Yes. My name is Sara
6 Barczak, and I'm starting my watch. But I have
7 already timed this, and it's ten minutes. And I'm
8 going to respectfully go beyond the five minute time
9 frame because the opposition has had years in the
10 planning. And I'm sorry about that, but I feel
11 strongly about that. And I know two people here who
12 aren't speaking, and I'm going to take their time.

13 MR. CAMERON: Well, I - I'm not sure who
14 the opposition is, since we only have had two
15 speakers, and they were...

16 MS. BARCZAK: I'm talking about the folks
17 that have...

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. I'm not - but - but,
19 Sara, I - you know...

20 MS. BARCZAK: ...formulated this plan, et
21 cetera, that should have...

22 MR. CAMERON: ...I respect what you're
23 saying and...

24 MS. BARCZAK: Right.

25 MR. CAMERON: ...you know, just take a few

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 more minutes.

2 MS. BARCZAK: Okay. Thank you very much.

3 I do have handouts that are circulating
4 the room. So if you glaze over, you can just read
5 that handout as I'm going through this, starting now.

6 My name is Sara Barczak, as I said. I'm
7 a Safe Energy Director of Georgians for Clean Energy
8 in our Savannah field office. We're a statewide, non-
9 profit conservation organization, and we have members
10 throughout Georgia. We have been around for 18 years,
11 and we focus on energy policy and also nuclear energy
12 concerns.

13 We've already submitted formal comments
14 that were just due at the end of August, so these are
15 a supplement to those comments, and are more general
16 in nature, but do provide some recommendations for the
17 NRC.

18 As most of us know, the Department of
19 Energy's Savannah River Site is about 90 miles
20 upstream from Savannah, and it is a federally listed
21 Super Fund site with more than 500 separate hazardous
22 sites on the site. And, as we've been told, it was
23 designed to produce plutonium starting out in the '50s
24 during the Cold War.

25 We'd like to make it clear from the outset

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that we strongly oppose the production of any type of
2 plutonium bomb fuel for a variety of reasons. It's an
3 experimental program that has never been pursued at
4 this industrial scale. It poses a risk to workers and
5 the surrounding community at both the production
6 location and at the reactor location sites. It will
7 increase, as we have heard time and time again, the
8 volumes of hazardous radioactive waste streams at a
9 location that is already plagued by contamination. It
10 raises complex consumer and ratepayer concerns over
11 government subsidies that we feel - we feel are
12 unfairly favoring a destructive type of energy
13 production over environmentally friendly and safe
14 alternatives. It increases the negative impacts to
15 communities in cases of severe accidents at reactor
16 locations, and another major factor is that it blurs
17 the division established between both military and
18 civilian nuclear programs.

19 We believe that the U.S. NRC has only one
20 option that would truly protect the public health, and
21 we've stated it before. We would like you to deny the
22 license application for this facility. We urge that
23 the pursuit of developing a plutonium fuel economy be
24 ceased in all sectors of government and private
25 enterprise, as this will allow plutonium, which is a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 dangerous material, highly sought after for use in
2 nuclear weapons, to enter civilian commerce and the
3 international marketplace.

4 We were told earlier about significant
5 changes in the plutonium program. We, along with many
6 others, are very concerned about a number of
7 significant changes. And we're heartened to see that
8 the NRC says that they're going to be fully
9 investigating these concerns, and we hope they go
10 forward with that. I think someone asked for the
11 citation earlier, so I'll state it now. A record of
12 decision was filed by the Department of Energy in the
13 *Federal Register* on April 19th of 2002. And in the
14 DOE - in that, the DOE canceled the immobilization
15 portion of the program, and then selected immediate
16 implementation of long-term storage at SRS for surplus
17 weapons plutonium, now stored at Rocky Flats in
18 Colorado. Now, here's the citation that was listed.

19 Additionally, the Department of Energy's
20 February 15th report, entitled, "Report to Congress,
21 disposition of surplus defense plutonium at Savannah
22 River Site," essentially recommends the need to add at
23 least two additional unnamed nuclear reactors for
24 plutonium bomb fuel use. Our nearby Southern Nuclear
25 owned Plant Vogtle---that's right across from the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Savannah River Site here in Georgia--- expressed
2 interest in the plutonium fuel program back in 1996,
3 and we are concerned about the implications of the
4 need for more nuclear reactors. How will the NRC
5 address this need for more nuclear power plants? How
6 will additional reactor sites be selected? And will
7 the - will the public be involved in this process?

8 Okay, furthermore---and this is getting
9 kind of the bigger picture that David had talked about
10 earlier---even though our nation is supposedly engaged
11 in a program being performed under the guise of
12 disposition of surplus weapons plutonium in a supposed
13 parallel venture with Russia to reduce our nuclear
14 weapons stockpiles, the Department of Energy's
15 National Nuclear Security Administration issued a
16 press release, which you guys have circulated, on May
17 31st, 2002, announcing that it would begin design work
18 for a facility that manufactured plutonium pellets,
19 also known as "triggers" for nuclear weapons, a
20 critical component.

21 Rocky Flats, the site in Colorado that is
22 now shipping its plutonium to SRS, has carried out
23 this function of plutonium 289, and it's now closing.
24 SRS is believed to be the first site for the plutonium
25 "trigger" plant that will cost of billions of dollars.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham actually stated,
2 quote, "We need to have the capacity to manufacture a
3 certified pits to maintain the safety, security, and
4 reliability of the U.S. nuclear deterrent in the
5 future," end quote. What is really going on? We
6 would like to answer - that press release is of
7 record, and I have a packet here for the NRC.

8 And then, on the back of that press
9 release that was passed around, just last Friday in an
10 article in the *Augusta Chronicle*, it was reported that
11 the DOE is officially announcing its plans to build a
12 nuclear weapons "trigger" plant, and that public
13 meetings could be beginning as early as October 29th
14 of this year. A president of the division of The
15 Washington Group, parent company of Westinghouse
16 Savannah River Company, who is the contractor charged
17 with managing the site, stated that SRS is the best
18 location for the plutonium "trigger" production
19 facility, and that the community support is, quote,
20 "crucial." According to the paper, after meeting in
21 Aiken last Friday - or Thursday night, he said, quote,
22 "Trust me, the community that embraces it more likely
23 - is more likely to get it than the community that
24 embraces it less," end quote. We request that article
25 be imprinted in the record, as well.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Now, getting on to the nuclear waste
2 concerns. It's been stated that the NRC, through the
3 EIS, is going to look at broader concerns that are
4 like outside of its mandate. But we really need to
5 clear this up. SRS has a severe nuclear waste
6 problem. The site currently has the second largest
7 volume of high level liquid nuclear waste, about 38
8 million gallons of it, and wins the Gold Medal for
9 having the most amount of radioactivity of any DOE
10 site in the nation. The future is less than
11 encouraging, as the DOE projects that 95% of future
12 high level radioactive waste generation will occur at
13 SRS. And that's on the other side of the hand - the
14 second handout that I handed to you.

15 The plutonium fuel program is going to
16 bring more dangerous nuclear waste to the site in some
17 instances waste streams at the site have never seen
18 before or handled before. There's not enough space
19 onsite. This building that has been designated is not
20 necessarily - you know, hasn't been used before, no -
21 basically they've never had this waste stream before.
22 There's a lot of questions.

23 We are including---and that's in the
24 handout, and I'll give it to the NRC as well---a
25 resolution from the City of Savannah from 1992 that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 requested that, quote, "A full-scale cleanup operation
2 of the Savannah River Site begin immediately." It is
3 ten years since that resolution came out, and we are
4 no cleaner at that site than we were before. In fact,
5 we are now wanting to wake up the bomb plant again.

6 Now, adding to this - I mean, the DOE is
7 just handing you guys all kinds of good information
8 this last month. The U.S. energy department inspector
9 general - general actually publicly recommended
10 burying millions of gallons of radioactive waste in
11 underground vaults at the Savannah River Site, which
12 could essentially create a national nuclear sacrifice
13 zone over one of the most important water recharge
14 areas on the East Coast. In his recommendation, he
15 cited that this was supposedly due, in part, to the
16 cancellation of the immobilization plant. The NRC
17 therefore should still address immobilization as an
18 alternative to plutonium fuel production.

19 We would encourage the NRC to contact the
20 DOE, as well, on research that Georgians for Clean
21 Energy did on past nuclear waste storage proposal -
22 proposals at SRS. We found in these documents from
23 the '50s and the '60s that decades ago several deep
24 rock boreholes were drilled on site, some as deep as
25 4,000 feet, which could potentially serve as pathways

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 for contamination to pass in the deep aquifers that
2 the region relies on for drinking water. The ultimate
3 reason for these boreholes? You guessed it. To
4 assess whether or not the site could store highly
5 radioactive waste underground.

6 A special meeting was actually called with
7 the DOE to address our concerns. And all this,
8 including the bore hole map, can be found on our
9 website, or you can contact the Georgia Environmental
10 Protection Division and talk to Jim Setser and Jim
11 Hardeman who were present with us at the meeting. And
12 I included a copy of all that correspondence,
13 including the EPA's letter of concern to us for the
14 NRC. The NRC should study that further.

15 In part, the proposed plutonium fuel
16 facility is near a number of these boreholes that have
17 been drilled. So if there are leaks from the
18 facility, you could potentially have a 4,000 foot
19 hole, and though they state that they're capped, et
20 cetera, it's been over a year and we have not gotten
21 any studies back from the DOE, not - nor has Georgia
22 EPD.

23 So, from what has already occurred, it
24 appears that the Department of Energy has decided that
25 SRS will be the centralized, long-term plutonium

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 storage dump, using the plutonium disposition plan as
2 justification to bring the plutonium here. The
3 storage of plutonium at SRS could create one potential
4 source of feed for any new pit plant. Georgians for
5 Clean Energy believe that the NRC, even though you
6 probably don't want to---I mean, I wouldn't, either---
7 must address the full impacts of the plutonium bomb
8 fuel program, how this scheme is likely contributing
9 to the eventual production of nuclear weapons
10 components at the Savannah River Nuclear Site, and the
11 use of the site for permanent nuclear waste burial.
12 A full accounting of what and how much plutonium is
13 coming from where and being used for what project,
14 when it arrives, should be done and made public.

15 These substantial changes, among others,
16 underscore the need, under the *National Environmental*
17 *Policy Act*, NEPA regulations, for the Department of
18 Energy to prepare a supplemental environmental impact
19 statement. This statement needs to be completed prior
20 to the shipment of anymore plutonium to South
21 Carolina. And we urge the NRC to request that the DOE
22 submit a supplemental environmental impact statement
23 before the NRC attempts to issue its version of the
24 draft environmental impact statement. The DOE should
25 conduct their own SEIS to figure out exactly what

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 they're actually doing and why, and then fill the rest
2 of us in, including the NRC staff.

3 I think that's about it. And the other
4 points that I have were addressed in my written
5 statement touching on additional water use that's
6 already done at the site which is - is approximately
7 37 billion gallons of surface water, tons of ground
8 water. I would like to see actual documentation of
9 how much additional water these - the MOX facility is
10 going to require, is it going to come from the ground
11 water or from the Savannah River Site or from treated
12 waste water. And also I'd really want to stress the
13 need for HEPA and sand filters being used in the
14 facility for worker protection, the combination of
15 both, instead of one or the other. It's - it's very
16 important.

17 So, wrapping up, because I'm at 11
18 minutes, and I apologize for that, we appreciate that
19 the NRC has extended the public comment period to
20 September 30th. We appreciate that you are holding a
21 meeting in the epitome of a downwind, downstream
22 community, which is Savannah, because you're not going
23 to hear a lot of positive stuff from a community like
24 ours, and we really do appreciate that.

25 We also want to make it very clear to the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 folks in the audience, too, that there are people in
2 NRC that are doing what they can to listen to us. And
3 though it's very easy to criticize both the NRC and
4 the DOE, we have to realize the difficult role they
5 must do right now, and make any recommendations that
6 we can and any support that we can to make the best
7 possible decision. Thank you very much.

8 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Sara, for all of
9 the information. And we'll make sure that it's
10 attached, any material.

11 Mr. Pleasant?

12 MR. PLEASANT: Hello. I'll be much
13 shorter. My name is William Pleasant. I represent
14 The Green Party of Chatham County.

15 We want to raise two things. One,
16 directly to do with the Savannah River Plant and the
17 MOX program; and the other having to do with the
18 methodology through which this meeting was publicized.

19 I don't think that there was enough public
20 notice in terms of organizing this meeting. This
21 meeting is very important to - to us in Savannah. We
22 propose in the future that the NRC actively publicize
23 this meeting, and that means that maybe a week or two
24 weeks before the meeting the NRC will send out media
25 teams that would go to the newspapers, some radio and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 television, but also go into the neighborhoods and
2 interface with neighborhood organizations, labor
3 organizations, political organizations, et cetera.
4 This room should have been packed here tonight, and
5 this room should have been representative of all the
6 different communities in Savannah.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. PLEASANT: Okay, now to the Savannah
9 River Site. Okay, the Savannah River Plant has been
10 run sloppily for 50 years, okay, in terms of the
11 environment, in terms of health and safety of the
12 workers. It transported plutonium on our rails and
13 upon our roads and on our waters. It's a nightmare
14 here, whether it has to do with terrorist threats or
15 with accidents that can happen; okay?

16 Basically, building this MOX program is
17 like pouring gasoline on an atomic fire. Okay, we
18 have to look at this for what it is politically. This
19 is just a welfare program for Duke electric and the
20 rest of the atomic energy corporations in this
21 country; okay? This does nothing to alleviate the
22 fact that here in the U.S. we are like burdned with
23 all of this very, very hazardous poison; okay? And
24 they're maybe immobilizing it, maybe pouring it into
25 concrete. There are different solutions to it. But

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 one solution to it shouldn't be to in a sense recycle
2 this mess. It should be gotten rid of; okay?

3 So the position of The Green Party of
4 Chatham County is that we oppose this MOX factory,
5 this nuclear waste, whether it's plutonium or whether
6 it's waste that comes from other nuclear processes,
7 it's got to be dealt with, okay, in a safe way. So we
8 urge the NRC to, you know, categorically reject this
9 license. Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Pleasant.
12 And thank you for the suggestion on community
13 organizations. We will, in the future, make sure that
14 everybody who's at this meeting will be notified. And
15 if you do have a list of community organizations that
16 you think we should contact, we would appreciate that,
17 also.

18 All right, and let's go to Mr. - Mr.
19 Nadelman now.

20 MR. NADELMAN: I'll try to keep this
21 short.

22 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

23 MR. NADELMAN: As an alternative to being
24 a producer of MOX, the Savannah River Site, still
25 unregulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 should be shut down, cleaned - cleaned up of its
2 deadly radioactive pollution, and be converted into a
3 national or state park emphasizing the benefits of the
4 natural environment of the area. This is my
5 suggestion alone. I do not rule out other
6 constructive purposes.

7 MOX fuel is of an unproved benefit to the
8 nation's energy needs, and definitely dangerous. We
9 are talking about the use of weapons grade plutonium
10 converted - converted at the Savannah River Site and
11 sent to every nuclear power plant in the country
12 eventually. Beginning with only a couple of plants,
13 eventually the government wants to be - to provide
14 welfare to the private nuclear industry throughout the
15 country. This we do not want. This I do not want.

16 The process of conversion of the - of
17 uranium and plutonium material into pellets is
18 dangerous due to accidents - due to accidents, and the
19 accidents are due to human error which cannot be
20 totally eliminated. And - and the possession of the
21 dangerous genie of nuclear power can have far more
22 disastrous consequences, surpassing even the disaster
23 of 9/11 potentially.

24 The storage of the pellets at the Savannah
25 River Site in capsules, while seemingly safer than

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 what is in the ground now, does not eliminate - does
2 not totally eliminate the possibility of leakage into
3 the environment, such as the Savannah River and the
4 ground water, as well as the air, to be carried
5 downstream to Savannah and elsewhere. Everybody in
6 the world does live downstream, so no one is safe from
7 this - from this highly dangerous material.

8 The transportation of MOX fuel to power
9 plants throughout the nation presents a huge safety
10 problem in relation to stowage and sabotage and theft
11 by hijacking by terrorists. While the MOX pellets are
12 harder to convert back into the weapons grade
13 plutonium, the ability to - the ability to do this
14 remains definite. So remember that, please.

15 If the road to hell is paved with good
16 intentions, the proposal to make and transport a
17 different form of nuclear power right in Savannah's
18 back yard is likely to get us there. The U.S.
19 government is playing with a new and dangerous toy
20 that we are being duped into believing is perfectly
21 safe. Please do not believe that. I ask you not to
22 believe that.

23 I'm not a nuclear physicist, I'm a social
24 worker. But I do read the papers and I do read the
25 views of responsible scientists who are opposed to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 what the scientists and the Department of Energy
2 (sic). The DOE would more profitably spend its
3 efforts in developing solar energy and the renewable
4 - other renewable resources to meet the nation's
5 energy needs.

6 Furthermore, the storage of MOX can still
7 be used by the government to make nuclear weapons. We
8 are - we were in the process of reducing nuclear
9 weapons. But this is likely to accelerate the Cold
10 War with nation - with small nations less - who are
11 less industrial than we are, who are in - who are in
12 the possession of the same toys and are now
13 threatening us. Take this into consideration. This
14 seriously compromises international efforts to destroy
15 nuclear stockpiles, and they must be destroyed for the
16 benefit - for the future of human kind and this very
17 planet, as well, as we know it.

18 Praise the environment and deny the
19 application. Thank you.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. CAMERON: And thank you very much, Mr.
22 Nadelman.

23 We're going to go next to - to Ernie
24 Chaput.

25 MR. HARRIS: Sorry, the - the mic was on.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So I turned it off.

2 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

3 MR. HARRIS: I don't intend to make a
4 formal comment.

5 MR. CAMERON: Good. Thank you.

6 MR. CHAPUT: Thank you. And my name is
7 Ernie Chaput. As I mentioned before, I am from Aiken.
8 I am a MOX supporter.

9 I'm here for two reasons. Number one, I
10 wanted to listen to what the folks down here had to
11 say. So I think that's important. I learned - I
12 learned a lot. You've brought up some new points.

13 Secondly, I wanted to explain to you why
14 I support MOX and why I think this project should go
15 forward. I always go back to basics. Why - why are
16 we talking about disposing of surplus weapons grade
17 plutonium? As the United States and Russia take apart
18 their nuclear stockpile, they're taking the bombs
19 apart today as we speak, you've got to do something
20 with that plutonium to make sure that either nations,
21 us or the Russians, or terrorist groups who can get
22 their hands on the material cannot use that same
23 material to remake some kind of a bomb or a weapon of
24 mass destruction.

25 So the question that - that was posed to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 people several years ago is: What's the best way to
2 make sure that this material can, to the greatest
3 extent possible, be made incapable of making another
4 bomb? The question was really addressed most - most
5 in-depth by the National Academy of Scientists, which
6 is a group of very eminent academicians, scientists
7 throughout - from throughout the country.

8 And they came up with basically what they
9 call the spent fuel standard. And they said the best
10 thing you can do with plutonium is you can, number
11 one, do what you can to change the characteristics of
12 the plutonium so it is less attractive for use in a
13 bomb. In other words, change it isotopically, is the
14 technical term.

15 Number two, make it radioactive so people
16 can't get close to it. And number three, bury it in
17 the Yucca Mountain, where you're going to bury all the
18 other spent nuclear fuel. They said make it look like
19 spent nuclear fuel, because that stuff is really very
20 devilish to work with. If you're going to get the
21 plutonium, you've got to have six-foot concrete walls,
22 you've got to have chemical separation to detect all
23 that stuff. You - it's a very expensive type of
24 technical process. And they said that's the safest
25 way to make sure that this stuff never gets used in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 weapons. What they recommended is that you burn the
2 plutonium in reactors as MOX fuel, take that spent MOX
3 fuel from the reactors, and move it to Yucca Mountain,
4 the national repository. That's what this program is
5 all about.

6 It's not about economics. It's not about
7 is it cheaper to babysit plutonium for 50,000 years,
8 and eventually you're still going to have to do
9 something with it. It's not about is it cheaper to
10 immobilize it. The question is: How can you get this
11 stuff out of circulation to the best of your ability?
12 MOX is the answer. That's why I support MOX, and
13 that's why I think that this application should -
14 should go forward.

15 The NRC, as somebody said, has a difficult
16 job. And they do. And I've got a lot of respect for
17 the NRC and their technical capabilities. Their job
18 is to look at the applications that Duke Cogema has -
19 has given to them and say: Can the facility be
20 constructed and operated in a manner that's consistent
21 with worker safety, public safety, and the
22 environment, and the applicable rules and regulations
23 that they'll have to live by? And that's the job they
24 ought to be doing. I've got confidence they will do
25 that. A lot of people are going to tell them make

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 sure you look at this and look at this, I don't agree
2 with that number. And they'll do their own
3 independent study. And that's what their job is. But
4 if that application passes that muster, that indeed
5 the facility can be built and operated in accordance
6 with applicable public safety, environmental, worker
7 safety types of regulations, the application ought to
8 be approved.

9 And the other point is that MOX is not
10 new. MOX has been used - made and used primarily in
11 Europe, to some extent in Asia, for about 15 years.
12 It is not a new process. It's new in the United
13 States, at least that's being done now. There was
14 some test irradiations done, I understand, back in the
15 '50s or '60s or '70s. But this is really the first
16 time the U.S. is doing anything in a - in a large-
17 scale sense with regard to MOX. But the rest of the
18 world has been using MOX for many, many years, and
19 been doing it safely.

20 Regarding the questions that I think have
21 been - that the NRC posted and put up here, I guess
22 I've got two - two comments. Number one,
23 immobilization should not be considered. I've got two
24 reasons for that. One, NRC's a regulatory agency.
25 People come in and make application and say, "I want

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to do this." And they are the regulators, and they're
2 supposed to say, "Can this thing be done in accordance
3 with the applicable regulations?" The application
4 that DCS has come in for is to build and operate a MOX
5 facility, and they ought to vote up or down on the -
6 on the application, the request. Up or down, based
7 upon their technical analysis and the standards that
8 they have to review that with. For them to do
9 otherwise confuses them and puts them in the role of
10 an operating organization who sort of assumes some of
11 the responsibility of DOE for program management, when
12 really they're supposed to be the regulatory. You
13 don't want to mix the operator and the regulator. If
14 they want DOE - if they think MOX will not adequately
15 protect the environmental safety, they ought to
16 disapprove it. That would cause DOE to go back and
17 look at other options, how are we going to get rid of
18 this stuff. But they ought to focus on the question
19 at hand. I've got an application. Should that
20 application be approved or not.

21 I think that was - that was probably about
22 all I wanted to say. Just to follow up and just to
23 summarize and say that irradiated plutonium in Yucca
24 Mountain is a lot safer, a lot less costly, and
25 certainly safer from a - from an environmental and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 public health standpoint, and certainly safer from a
2 non-proliferating standpoint, than leaving that
3 plutonium in storage above ground where you've got to
4 watch it with guns and guards and gates for many,
5 many, many, many hundreds of years. Thank you very
6 much.

7 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. We're going to
8 go next to Judy Jennings.

9 MS. JENNINGS: Thank you. Judy Jennings.

10 Actually, I think I can start by going
11 back to your last statement and saying that I agree
12 with it strongly. I - my one comment to the NRC is
13 that they look at this application and judge it on the
14 merits, with what you have in front of you at this
15 very point in time, and try hard not to think about
16 the politics and the lobbyists of 1999 and 2000 and
17 whenever money was appropriated in Congress. If you
18 can do that, if you can look at - if you can look at
19 the application and judge it totally non-politically
20 from yesterday or tomorrow, then I probably will be
21 pleased with the process.

22 But I have to say that I am a little bit
23 concerned about the politics that brought us to that.
24 I honestly don't start my day reading Sara's work. I
25 get to that later in the day. I actually start by

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 reading the *Wall Street Journal*. And yesterday
2 actually this was making the wires today, but the West
3 Coast *Wall Street* printed it yesterday. "Generators
4 Refute California Findings on Withholding Power."

5 So, a part of the point I'm going to say
6 here is that even if - I'm concerned about the
7 government subsidy, and I planned to stay here tonight
8 and make these comments on the record now, because I
9 honestly think that when I sit down at my desk later,
10 though, I'm going to spend my time writing to my
11 congressman and my senators and say, "Please don't put
12 another penny onto this project." Because what - my
13 concern about the headlines in the *Wall Street Journal*
14 for the last year-and-a-half is that even if we build
15 the facility and even if we make MOX and even if we
16 give it to Duke or Dynagy or Merit or Williams to make
17 power with it, I can't trust them - California
18 regulators don't trust them to put the fuel in the
19 machine and pump out power and then sell it to you at
20 a reasonable price.

21 So it - but all I can ask the NRC is that
22 the application be judged on its merits, without the
23 politics of yesterday or today. Thank you.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Judy.

25 Our next speaker is Regina Thomas.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. THOMAS: I'm Regina Thomas, and I'm a
2 Georgia State Senator for District 2. In the last
3 state session I introduced, as well as Representative
4 Nan Orrock from Atlanta, a resolution urging the State
5 of Georgia and Governor Barnes to work along with
6 Governor Hodges from South Carolina so that we can
7 stop any more waste from coming to the Savannah River
8 Site. I agree, something need to be done with it, but
9 not at the Savannah River Site. We have too much
10 nuclear waste there now with the ground water
11 contamination. If the Yucca Mountain is the best
12 place for it, then let's build a plant there and then
13 have everything there. We won't have to worry about
14 it.

15 But the larger picture is the ground water
16 contamination of the aquifer and of the drinking
17 water. We're going into the next session talking
18 about water, privatizing water, and possibly Atlanta
19 controlling the water for the state. We cannot afford
20 to have our water privatized. And I would hate to
21 have to vote to privatize our water and deny some of
22 our citizens from having enough water. Something need
23 to be done. And I urge the NRC to closely look at the
24 Savannah River Site with all the contamination, with
25 all the waste that's already there, and exclude that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 site from any additional transportations of any
2 nuclear waste.

3 We need to start thinking about people.
4 We're downstream from Aiken, South Carolina. So our
5 cancer rate and our percentages of respiratory, upper
6 respiratory diseases or what have you, it's going to
7 be stronger here. Let's think about what we're doing,
8 what we have been doing, and let's do the right thing
9 and the fair thing. Yes, let's take politics out of
10 it and think about the people. SRS have too much. We
11 cannot take anymore there. Thank you.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Senator
13 Thomas.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. CAMERON: Next, we hear Mr. Dunham,
16 Chester Dunham.

17 MR. DUNHAM: Good evening. My name is
18 Chester Dunham, and I'm the President of Local A.
19 Philip Randolph Chapter here in Savannah, Georgia,
20 which is a national organization. And The Randolph
21 Institute is a part of organized - it's a part of the
22 AFofL-CIO.

23 I didn't come here to - to speak tonight
24 at all. Just come to look and observe. Well, matter
25 of fact, I wouldn't have known anything about this

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 meeting. As important as it is, I wouldn't know
2 anything about it if it weren't for Mr. Pleasant here.

3 I agree that this building, not this room
4 here, but next door where we was last week talking
5 about another situation here in Savannah, because
6 Savannah should be involved. I do have information
7 concerning organizations, religious group, community
8 organization, everybody, that we can make sure that we
9 get that information to us on - the next time we got
10 a meeting, you know, and part of this one gets - can
11 be - not this room, but a larger place.

12 The reason I'm up here, because I'm - this
13 thing is frightening, you know. Listening to the
14 experts, and - and they are experts, because I'm just
15 looking at some of this stuff right here. It is
16 frightening. I remember about this resolution here
17 and the situation in the Savannah River. And then,
18 looking at this, and I - I mean, I read the paper and
19 saw information on television with Governor Hodges of
20 South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina. I agree
21 with what the senator just got through saying about
22 the situation here in Savannah.

23 Let me tell you something about. The
24 young man was talking about - again, I - my occupation
25 is longshoreman. I work on the water, Savannah River.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 We deal with world trade, import and export, these
2 ships that come up the river. The situation dealing
3 with shippers throughout the - the free world is that
4 America has maybe less than 5% company that own ships
5 in the United States. So in the global world,
6 countries - most of the ships that coming in, 90-some-
7 odd percent of the ship that comes in come from
8 foreign countries. They're in business to make money,
9 so therefore they deal with world trade.

10 Chemical that comes in the river, I mean,
11 on - aboard the ships, some of this - you know, some
12 ships come in sometimes with containers with all type
13 of - of cargo. And you never know, unless you look at
14 the bill of lading or something, that's how you can
15 tell what's supposed to be in the container. Nuclear
16 stuff comes in. And we have certain type of label on
17 those things to tell you different type of - of
18 danger, you know, different type of chemical that
19 comes in, what type of explosion - explosive there is.
20 And what - I also am the safety director with our -
21 our union, so I deal with a lot of stuff dealing with
22 safety. And it's some type of stuff that comes in,
23 might come in a container, and you don't have time
24 enough to look at a bill of lading or something like
25 that. It tells you this, that if you see a leak or

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 something, a drop or something that - on this
2 container or what-have-you, just tell everybody to go.
3 Don't ask no question. Evacuate that whole area.
4 Just go in the car, whatever, and leave.

5 And the only thing I'm saying here is that
6 it is frightening. And I'm not - because the experts
7 have already talked. I'm going to be looking at all
8 of this information and reading up on a lot of this
9 information. But the key thing is, what I'm saying is
10 that I agree that we should take politics out of it.
11 We should get it away from the Savannah River and take
12 it somewhere else, as the young lady said, the
13 mountains or somewhere, I think I read something in
14 here.

15 But the key thing right here, what I'm
16 trying to say, that I'm in support of what is best for
17 the citizens and what-have-you in Chatham County. Not
18 only Chatham County but, you know, this whole area.
19 Because this is - and this is serious. And I was with
20 Mr. Pleasant, what-have-you, think that we ought to
21 give you some information so we can have another
22 meeting to make sure that you get in touch with the
23 community and get them here where they can listen to
24 all this information. Thank you very much.

25 (Applause.)

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. CAMERON: And thank you for those
2 remarks, Mr. Dunham. And thank you for the offer to
3 give us some - some contacts, too. And we'll - we'll
4 work with you on that.

5 Is there anybody that I - that I missed
6 who wanted to - to say something at this point?

7 MS. DANIELS: I would like to make a
8 comment.

9 MR. CAMERON: All right. And if you
10 could, it's - it's Evelyn?

11 MS. DANIELS: Yeah, Evelyn Daniels.

12 MR. CAMERON: Evelyn Daniels. Okay.

13 MS. DANIELS: I notice the water that's in
14 my kitchen seems to be much clearer. I was wondering
15 if everyone else noticed that. It's much clearer and
16 it looks more drinkable. And I certainly appreciate
17 it. That's all.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. If any of you who
19 live in this area have noticed the same thing, you
20 might want to share that with - with Evelyn.

21 Any - any other - we have some - a little
22 bit more time, and I know we are getting sort of
23 tired, probably. But are there any questions that -
24 anybody who might have a question who didn't talk
25 before, first of all? Give you an opportunity to ask

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 a - a question, and then we'll go to - we'll go to
2 Sara, for one.

3 Okay, Sara, you have a question for the -
4 for the NRC?

5 MS. BARCZAK: Yeah. And I - I didn't get
6 to this earlier, but Mr. Dunham's comments made me
7 think of it.

8 Is the NRC going to study the transport by
9 ship, most likely, of the lead test assembly that is
10 going to be possibly constructed in Belgium? And, you
11 know, is that coming in...

12 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I'm not
13 getting you. I'm just not hearing you.

14 MS. BARCZAK: Okay, no problem.

15 MR. CAMERON: It's on. I think we just
16 need to really speak forcefully into it.

17 MS. BARCZAK: Okay, can you hear me now?
18 All right.

19 MR. CAMERON: That's that commercial
20 thing.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MS. BARCZAK: Starting over, and I'll
23 hopefully say it in a more succinct way. The lead
24 test assembly that's going to be - or the lead test
25 assemblies that are going to be made - that are likely

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to be made in a European country, possibly Belgium,
2 how are those assemblies going to be shipped?

3 And in conjunction with that question, is
4 there an assessment of all the nuclear materials that
5 will be coming into the Atlantic ports for the
6 plutonium disposition program? Because a lot of
7 people don't think about the ports as an entry point.

8 MR. CAMERON: This is Dave - Dave Brown.
9 Go ahead.

10 MR. BROWN: Yeah. At this point there
11 hasn't been a decision about where to manufacture the
12 lead test assemblies. To give folks a feel, the lead
13 test assemblies would be the first few MOX assemblies
14 that would be constructed for testing. They would be
15 used at the McGuire and Catawba stations, and then be
16 tested to see how they performed. So we - we don't
17 have enough information at this point about the
18 shipments, because we don't know where the assemblies
19 will be manufactured.

20 You had a second question?

21 MS. BARCZAK: What about this...

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay, we need to get you on
23 the transcript, Sara, if you have a follow-up.

24 MS. BARCZAK: Well, no, it was a second...

25 MR. BROWN: The second question was on the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 transportation of the plutonium?

2 MS. BARCZAK: Into the - any materials
3 going through the Port of Savannah for the plutonium
4 disposition program, is that studied by the NRC?

5 MR. BROWN: We would - we're studying the
6 transportation risks associated with bringing
7 plutonium to the Savannah River Site for the purpose
8 of making MOX fuel. So, yes, we would - and the - and
9 I just don't know whether Savannah port is one of the
10 ports of entry for that material. I think they'd be
11 more likely truck shipments.

12 The DOE has what they call safeguards to
13 transport, safe and secure transport for this type of
14 material. I think we referred to it earlier as an
15 armed transport, highly secure, tracked by the
16 Department of Energy. They know where it is all the
17 time, that sort of thing.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Let's go
19 over here to Mr. Lanier. You have a question for us?
20 Jody Lanier.

21 MR. LANIER: Yes. I just want to follow
22 up on that question, on transporting materials into
23 the port. How much are you considering the factor of
24 terrorists after 9/11 into the decision?

25 MR. BROWN: The question was related to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 terrorism attacks and whether we should evaluate these
2 as part of our environmental impact.

3 MR. LANIER: As far as shipping it into
4 the port, no matter if it's going into here or
5 Charleston or wherever.

6 MR. BROWN: Okay, this is a question that
7 is currently before the Commission, and the five-
8 member Commission, which we have a brief description
9 in the back, is considering this right now. So the
10 staff at this point is awaiting their decision.

11 MR. CAMERON: Just as a clarification on
12 that, the Commission has security and safeguard
13 regulations in effect for transportation of nuclear
14 materials and for any facilities that we have. And
15 what - what Dave is referring to is a overall (sic)
16 evaluation that the Commission has studied to see if
17 those regulations for transportation of individual
18 facilities should be made stricter because of 9/11.

19 And let's go back to Mr. Jackson. Thank
20 you.

21 MR. JACKSON: No, I want to ask a
22 question, please.

23 MR. CAMERON: Let me get - let me get the
24 mic to. Okay, go ahead, Mr. Jackson.

25 MR. JACKSON: Lester Jackson. My question

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 is...

2 MR. CAMERON: Dave - is the question for
3 Dave or...

4 MR. JACKSON: For Dave.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay, go ahead.

6 MR. JACKSON: Dave, you mentioned this
7 five-man Commission. And you mentioned these
8 commissioners. Do these - does the five man
9 Commission - do all these guys have names or people
10 have names?

11 MR. BROWN: They've all got names, and
12 they're not all guys.

13 MR. JACKSON: Right. Are these - are
14 those - are the names available? Are the names
15 available? What's their titles, their credentials to
16 give us the information; all right? Are those names
17 available?

18 MR. BROWN: Yes.

19 MR. JACKSON: Another thing is about the
20 nuclear project, in case of some terrorist group.
21 What would you do, all right, if - if a terrorist
22 invade this area from a ship or - or planes coming to
23 the Savannah River Site, what would you do, because
24 you're the expert here tonight, and talking as a lay
25 person, would - would you get in your car and drive

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 south or get in your car and drive north, go to a bomb
2 shelter, would you go to a - would you go to the
3 basement of your home? What would we do as a common
4 citizen? And I want to speak for - and you remember,
5 we're talking about 250,000 constituents of just
6 Chatham County.

7 MR. BROWN: Okay, let me address the first
8 question. The description of the five commissioners
9 is right behind you on a poster with their names. And
10 generally these folks are nominated by the President,
11 confirmed by the Senate for their positions. And we
12 currently have all five commissioners seated on the
13 Commission.

14 With respect to your second question, how
15 would I respond. I would listen to federal
16 authorities. We have, at the NRC, requirements for
17 emergency plans for facilities where that could be a
18 hazard, for a nuclear power plant, for example. And
19 the best thing you can do is to make sure you've got
20 a radio or television to listen for instructions on
21 what to do.

22 MR. CAMERON: And I think that, isn't it
23 true - and my colleagues from the NRC can correct me
24 on this. But the - the local authorities around the
25 facility really have been given much of the planning

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and implementation responsibility for emergency
2 preparation. So look to those local authorities,
3 okay, rather - who know the situation, perhaps. Not
4 necessarily the - the federal wing. I don't know,
5 Dave, do you want to clarify anything?

6 MR. BROWN: I think that's excellent
7 clarification, because you're right, it's...

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's - let's ask Mr.
9 Dunham, and then we'll go back to you, Mr. Jackson.
10 This is Mr. Dunham.

11 MR. DUNHAM: Dave, let me ask you
12 something else. I saw in the paper - I didn't see it,
13 but it happened on the port yesterday. I think they
14 - the paper had four or five stowaway (sic) on a ship
15 that came here. But the stowaways was from - they was
16 harmless, I think, because they came from the island
17 of Panama or something close here.

18 MR. LANIER: I think they came from the
19 Dominican Republic.

20 MR. DUNHAM: Okay, somewhere close. But
21 what I'm saying is that that could have - easily could
22 have been some terrorists stowed that way, too, coming
23 into a port - into the port. Since 9/11, the port
24 have changed, security have changed somewhat, and it's
25 going to get tougher, it's going to get a lot, you

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 know, more tighter and everything else.

2 And in a situation like that, what do you
3 - can you elaborate on something like that in a port
4 that - and, Dave, looking at this thing, because
5 they're tightening up on all ports, because they're -
6 they're afraid now that something like this could
7 happen. And they could trigger something here if they
8 came in on the ship and blow up the port or what-have-
9 you. They could do that, you know.

10 And another thing, and this is the last
11 thing, is that I don't know what type of chemical or
12 a particular type of ship that comes into the port
13 every now and then on a rare occasion. But what would
14 happen is that when that ship comes in, they stop all
15 traffic of all other ships, you know. Basically, all
16 the ships would - would pass each other and come in
17 back and forth. But when this particular ship comes
18 in, they close the river just for that particular
19 vessel until it comes all the way up. I don't know
20 where it goes or what-have-you, but it comes in like
21 that. Thank you.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Dunham.

23 The question I think you're asking about
24 the - about port security is - generally, I think, is
25 - is in the hands of other federal agencies, although

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I think the - the NRC would advise the other federal
2 agencies and the local port about any particular
3 shipment of radioactive material...

4 MR. DUNHAM: Right.

5 MR. CAMERON: ...that were - that were
6 coming in there. And, again, I would just ask my
7 colleagues if they would have anything more to - to
8 offer on Mr. Dunham's general concern there.

9 MR. BROWN: I think the - and you've
10 touched on it, Chip, the concept of the federal
11 emergency response. Who takes the lead, depending on
12 the kind of emergency that might evolve. And the
13 federal government has planned that out, so that if
14 it's - if we know what kind of hazard or threat has
15 been posed, then we know who takes the lead. And for
16 radiological emergencies in the United States, that
17 would - we would be the lead federal agency helping to
18 coordinate the response.

19 MR. CAMERON: If it's one just - since
20 we're sort of talking in - more informally here, there
21 was a situation that you may have read about off the
22 coast of New York where there was a ship, it was a
23 container ship coming into New York City about a week
24 ago, and they detected - when it got in, they detected
25 high radiation levels that might have been consistent

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 with some type of nuclear device.

2 MR. BROWN: Right.

3 MR. CAMERON: The Department of Energy has
4 a special team called NEST. And I do not know what
5 that acronym stands for. But they came in to deal
6 with that situation. But the EPA regional office in
7 Manhattan, Region 2, they were in charge of that
8 incident, not the - not the NRC. The NRC was
9 consulted. But in that particular case---and I would
10 imagine it would be the same here---the EPA would be
11 involved. Okay.

12 All right, I think Mr. Jackson, and then
13 Mr. Nadelman, and let's go over to Mr. Cobb.

14 MR. COBB: Yes.

15 MR. CAMERON: And we'll do - finish up
16 with some questions here, and then we'll - we'll
17 adjourn. Mr. Jackson?

18 MR. JACKSON: I was just - my question was
19 answered.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Judy, do you want to
21 go? And - and then we'll go over here, and then we'll
22 go over to this section. Judy?

23 MS. JENNINGS: Judy Jennings. Thank you.
24 I'm not sure that I quite understood it's the
25 situation. The story with Russia - the story with

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Russia, is the plan to use - to use Russian plutonium
2 at the same facility?

3 MR. BROWN: No. The - at this project
4 with surplus plutonium, the - the Russians will take
5 a parallel approach, but independently, with their own
6 plant on their own territory.

7 MR. HARRIS: With their own plutonium.

8 MR. BROWN: Right.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Go ahead, sir. And
10 give us your name again, please.

11 MR. JERNIGAN: Anthony Jernigan. Just a
12 quick question. Forgive my skept - I can't talk about
13 - scepticism. I can't talk. Sorry.

14 Just out of curiosity---I know you're not
15 going to be able to give me direct numbers---say in
16 the past five or ten years - I just want to make sure
17 we're not jumping through hoops here for no reason.
18 How many licenses in general of all sorts has the NRC
19 actually denied? Just rough percentage.

20 MR. HARRIS: I'm not sure I can give you
21 a rough percentage. We have denied licenses in the pa

22 MR. JERNIGAN: Was that mainly for
23 environmental and safety reasons or...

24 MR. HARRIS: A number of reasons. A lot
25 of times what happens is the NRC goes through rounds

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and rounds of questions trying to resolve technical
2 issues that don't get resolved and - and the applicant
3 just withdraws their application. That's probably
4 more routinely - routine than an actual denial. But,
5 yeah, we don't grant licenses every time somebody asks
6 for them.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

8 Mr. Nadelman?

9 MR. NADELMAN: Yes. I'd just like to know
10 why a nuclear disaster worse scenario emergency plan
11 is not widely circulated in Savannah. That it - it
12 seems to me that if we're going - if by some chance
13 the application is approved, we should - we got to
14 accept the - quote, "the good and the bad that goes
15 with it." And I'd like to know why everybody is so
16 reluctant to widely publicize what we should do in the
17 worse - in the worse scenario, should - should a
18 disaster occur at the Savannah River Site. It will
19 affect Savannah.

20 MR. HARRIS: Correct me if I'm wrong here,
21 but I think those plans are available for a specific
22 site. And - and they do do exercises at say nuclear
23 power plants that involve the entire surrounding
24 communities to periodically test the emergency
25 response.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And there was some -
2 there's - usually the emergency plans are available -
3 publicly available. There's been some changes, I
4 think, or reevaluation after 9/11 about whether - how
5 much security information is there. But I'm going to
6 come back to you, Mr. Cobb. I just want to see if -
7 do you have some information to give him, Ernie?

8 MR. CHAPUT: Yeah. Ernie Chaput.

9 I don't know if this will help or hurt,
10 but I understand that in the environmental reviews and
11 safety analysis that was done, normal operating
12 condition in a - in an accident, my understanding is
13 - is that in the accident condition there are no
14 impacts that reach the borders of the Savannah River
15 Site as a result of the MOX facility. Now, I don't
16 know what - I don't know what particular scenarios
17 were looked at. But they - you know, they deal with
18 what they call maximum credible accident. I don't
19 know what the maximum credible was, but I understand
20 that it had no impact beyond the boundaries of the
21 site.

22 MR. HARRIS: And can I just state the
23 information that Ernie is referring to is from the DCS
24 environmental report, and the NRC hasn't made any
25 determination...

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. CHAPUT: But did I characterize - that
2 was the input that you got?

3 MR. HARRIS: That's - I believe that's
4 right.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's - let's go to
6 Mr. Cobb. Right?

7 MR. COBB: Kirk.

8 MR. CAMERON: Kirk Cobb.

9 MR. COBB: I've written a few notes here,
10 just random ideas and thoughts as I listened to
11 everybody.

12 First of all, I'm a chemical engineer
13 myself. I have a Master's degree in Chemical
14 Engineering. I don't say that to brag, I just say
15 that because I sit here as an average public and I'm
16 kind of frustrated and I'm kind of confused about some
17 of the things you're saying. I'll get back to that in
18 a minute.

19 I'm probably more qualified to understand
20 some things you're talking about than some of the
21 people in this room, and yet I'm still frustrated and
22 - and I don't feel there's a clear description of what
23 you're talking about. I'll get back to that in a
24 minute.

25 The other thing I wanted to say, I was

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 studying chemical engineering in the late 1960s when
2 the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland, Ohio, caught on fire.
3 I mean, we had an environmental disaster in this
4 country going on.

5 We've done a lot of things to improve on
6 that over the last 40 years. But I challenge you
7 guys, because you're the technical experts, and
8 technology can do tremendously good things in our
9 society, but there's risks as well.

10 And I challenge you guys, who are the
11 technical experts, to be socially responsible,
12 whatever the hell you decide, you better make damn
13 sure that you're comfortable in your own mind
14 ethically that you've made the right decision. And so
15 I think it's real important for technical people, for
16 engineering people to - yeah, companies have to make
17 money to survive and things like that. But we have to
18 be socially responsible, too.

19 Yeah, we've got Russia now, they probably
20 have more plutonium than we do. I don't know who has
21 more plutonium. Somehow I do feel that if the
22 plutonium is controlled by the United States, that
23 maybe the future of the world is better than if it's
24 controlled by the Russians, you know. Why don't we
25 build these plants over in Russia, let them deal with

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 it, you know? Maybe - but maybe it's more responsible
2 for us to bring this stuff here and handle it here.
3 It's a tremendous responsibility that our country has
4 if we're going to handle this stuff; all right?

5 Just another thought. If we're going to
6 handle this kind of stuff, plutonium, we've got to
7 keep it away from population centers. We got to keep
8 - keep it away from - from water. I mean, what's
9 wrong with Rocky Mountain Flats area? It's dry - it's
10 a dry desert, for god sakes. You've got to build a
11 new plant to handle this stuff in - somewhere, for god
12 sakes, why are we building it next to the Savannah
13 River? Why don't we build it out in Rocky Mountain
14 Flats in - where it's a - we don't have a population
15 center there? We have a - a much more controlled
16 environment out there, I would think, from an
17 engineering standpoint.

18 Plutonium - if the plutonium is safer
19 immobilized, you know, if it's pure plutonium, somehow
20 immobilized, is it safer that way? Can someone get
21 their hands on it and still convert it back to a
22 weapons grade material? I don't know. Maybe it is
23 better off to have it diluted down to 4% in - in a
24 mixed oxide fuel. Maybe it's less vulnerable that
25 way. I don't know. We got to count on you guys to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 make that decision. And these are just general
2 comments.

3 Public understanding. This - this meeting
4 is - we're here for public understanding. I'd like to
5 see a process flow diagram. I want to see how many
6 tons are going in, how many tons are going out, every
7 process stream that's going in and out of this plant,
8 characterize it, what's the nature of the material
9 that's left. If you have nuclear waste in a - in an
10 aqueous stream, in a water stream, are there nuclear
11 materials in there, even though they're low grade?
12 Are they filterable solids that you can filter out?
13 Are they dissolved solids? Are they salt? You know,
14 nuclear materials that are salts, that are dissolved
15 in water? You can't filter them, you know.

16 Maybe - maybe somehow or other we can -
17 this stuff gets converted to D₂O, you know, deuterium
18 oxide, you know, heavy water. Is that a concern? I
19 don't know what these things look like, but I think if
20 you guys stand up here in front of the public and you
21 had a process flow diagram and you said, "This is how
22 many tons are going to go through here," or how many
23 gallons a minute, or whatever basis, "and this is how
24 many years this plant's going to run," and you show us
25 what these streams look like and the nature of these

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 materials that are coming out of this plant, the
2 public will have a better understanding of what the
3 risks are of this whole thing.

4 Okay, that's all I have to say. Thank
5 you.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Mr. Cobb.
7 And thanks for that...

8 MR. COBB: And be socially responsible,
9 too.

10 MR. CAMERON: And there may be some of
11 these process flow questions that people in the
12 audience, NRC people, after we're done, perhaps you
13 could talk to...

14 MR. HARRIS: Sure.

15 MR. CAMERON: ...Mr. Cobb about that.

16 And I think what I'd like to do now is -
17 is to thank you all for - for the great comments and
18 for your - for your patience tonight.

19 Picking up on something that Mr. Cobb
20 said, there's lots of good materials back there from
21 Georgians for Clean Air. We do have some copies of
22 our scoping study if someone wants to see that. The
23 DCS people have documents back there about various
24 parts of that - their process. So pick up all of the
25 material that you can get, and try to get as - you

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 know, as many viewpoints on this as possible.

2 And I would just thank our presenters,
3 Dave Brown, Tim Harris, tonight, and the rest of the
4 NRC staff that - that are here. Take some time - we
5 have people from our regional office, people from our
6 Office of General Counsel. Please take some time, if
7 you can tonight after we're done, to talk with them.

8 And I'm going to ask our senior manager
9 here, Cheryl Trottier, to just close the meeting - the
10 formal part of the meeting for us. Cheryl?

11 MS. TROTTIER: Thanks, Chip. Well, we're
12 very small in numbers now, so I'll be very brief.

13 I want to just thank everybody for taking
14 their evening to come in and share your ideas and your
15 thoughts and your concerns with us. It's very
16 important to us. We have a big decision. We are just
17 embarking on this review. I want to encourage you
18 that at the time that we develop our draft
19 environmental impact statement, we'll be sending it
20 out for comment, we'll be having additional meetings.
21 Please try to attend. Please try to provide us
22 comments. I will remind you about the process that
23 we're in right now, which is to take a look at the
24 environmental report. And we did specifically extend
25 that comment period.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Now, Tim did not mention this tonight, but
2 I want to just say that September 30th is not a drop-
3 dead date. So try to get your comments in by
4 September 30th. If you have some problem and you're
5 a few days late or a week late, we always have the
6 policy of addressing whatever comments we can, if it
7 doesn't impact our ability to do so by, you know,
8 waiting six months, of course. That's a little too
9 long. But try to be as timely as possible, but we
10 encourage you to provide us comments. That is the way
11 that we have an informed decision process.

12 And with that, I think that's enough.
13 I'll end here. Thank you.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. We're -
15 we're adjourned.

16 (Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at
17 9:47 p.m.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

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