

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

1		
2	<u>SPEAKERS</u>	<u>Page</u>
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

1		
2	<u>SPEAKERS</u>	<u>Page</u>
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 the
4 Public Liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And
5 I'd like to welcome all of you to the NRC's public
6 meeting tonight.

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

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

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 for construction of a MOX facility, and specifically, to
2 clearly explain what the environmental review process is.

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

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

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

19 In terms of ground rules, if you have a
20 question, when we're in the question-answer session after
21 each presentation and we'll go out to you to - for
22 questions, just signal me and I'll bring you this talking
23 stick. And please give us your name and affiliation, if
24 appropriate. Second ground rule is please only one
25 person speaking at a time. That will not only help us to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 get a clean transcript - we are transcribing it. Melanie
2 is our stenographer tonight. But most importantly, only
3 having one person speak at a time allows us to give our
4 full attention to whomever has the floor at the time.

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

15 (Laughter.)

16 MR. CAMERON: But try to keep it to - to
17 five minutes.

18 In terms of agenda for tonight's meeting,
19 the first topic that the NRC is going to present is an
20 overview of the NRC's environmental review process. And
21 we have Mr. Tim Harris right over here who is going to do
22 that for us. Tim is the Project Manager for the
23 environmental review on the construction authorization
24 request. He's in the Environmental and Performance
25 Assessment Branch at the NRC, which is in our Office of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards. And Tim has
2 been involved in numerous activities at the NRC: uranium
3 recovery, low level waste disposal, decommissioning.
4 He's been with the NRC for about nine years, and he has
5 a Bachelor's in Civil Engineering.

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

15 So we have someone here from the
16 environmental review side, which is - is Tim Harris, and
17 someone here from the safety evaluation side, Dave Brown.
18 And Tim, in a few minutes, is going to talk about how
19 those two evaluations---environmental and safety---come
20 together to form the basis for an NRD decision - NRC
21 decision on whether to grant or deny the application for
22 a construction authorization. And Dave, I should say, is
23 a health physicist. He's been with the NRC for two
24 years. He was with the West Valley demonstration project
25 before that for about five years. He has a - a Master's

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 in Health Physics from Clemson, and a Bachelor's in - in
2 Physics.

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

10 And the second point about relevance is that
11 we know that there's a lot of issues connected to the
12 national MOX program. A lot of them fall outside of
13 NRC's jurisdiction. We're always glad to listen to any
14 public concerns and comments and try to answer questions,
15 but we are focusing on the NRC responsibilities tonight.

16 And one other person I want to introduce
17 before we get started is Cheryl Trottier. Cheryl is the
18 Branch Chief, NRC manager of the Environmental and
19 Performance Assessment Branch where this environmental
20 review is being prepared, and she's with us here tonight
21 to listen to your comments.

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. HARRIS: I think so. Can - can you all
2 hear me?

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

12 This meeting is one of a series of meetings
13 that we have planned to engage the public in NRC's
14 environmental review which consists of preparation of an
15 environmental impact statement. And I'll go into that in
16 a little bit more detail. We're also here to solicit
17 your - your input on how changes in the Department of
18 Energy's program might affect our environmental review.
19 And I'll get to that in just a little bit.

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 As Chip said, the purpose of tonight's
2 meeting is to get your comments on how the changes the
3 DOE has made in the surplus disposition program might
4 affect NRC's review - environmental review. We'll
5 provide some background information on our role in the
6 project, the EIS process. Dave will describe the changes
7 in some detail.

8 And then specifically we're going to be
9 looking for you to provide comments on the changes and
10 how they affect the environmental impact statement. DOE
11 announced earlier this year that they were going to
12 cancel the immobilization facility, and that facilitated
13 some changes in the proposed MOX facility. And also the
14 immobilization alternative was identified by the public
15 in our scoping as one of the alternatives to the proposed
16 MOX project. And since DOE has decided not to construct
17 that facility, we want to get your opinion tonight on how
18 we should consider that facility in the environmental
19 impact statement. And I'll try to go into some more
20 detail in a minute to lay that out.

21 I'd also like to note that there were some
22 - some feedback forms that I think Betty provided to you.
23 And that's one of the ways that you can let us know how
24 we're doing at the meetings. And we really value those
25 - those - the input that you provide us. We read those

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 carefully and use those to plan future interactions.
2 Next slide.

3 Because of the changes in the DOE program,
4 NRC decided to delay issuance of its draft environmental
5 impact statement. We issued a *Federal Register* notice
6 announcing that delay, and in that notice we requested
7 comments on two questions. And that's what we're here to
8 discuss tonight. So I put the questions early in the
9 presentation so that you can look at them. I think
10 they're also in the agenda, if you want to refer to them
11 if they're not up on the screen. And these are the
12 issues we want you to comment on tonight.

13 Specifically:

14 How the immobilization alternative
15 should be treated in the NRC's draft
16 environmental impact statement.

17 And second:

18 Whether there are any additional
19 reasonable alternatives that weren't
20 identified during scoping that should
21 be included.

22 We announced that we would accept comments
23 in the *Federal Register* until August 30th. However, due
24 to public concerns, we decided to extend that comment
25 period to September 30th. So we're going to take your

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 comments, you here tonight; plus, if you decide to
2 provide written comments, we'd like to have those, as
3 well.

4 And now I'd like to describe NRC's role.
5 Congress, in the *Defense Authorization Act of 1999*, gave
6 NRC a specific role in the proposed MOX project.
7 Specifically, Congress gave us licensing authority over
8 this facility. So our role is to make a licensing
9 decision regarding the proposed MOX project.

10 NRC is an independent government agency, and
11 our mission is to protect the public health and safety,
12 and the environment, from commercial uses of radioactive
13 material. Our role is different than the Department of
14 Energy. The Department of Energy's role in this project
15 relates to implementing nuclear non-proliferation policy,
16 including the disposition of surplus weapons plutonium.
17 As we discussed, DOE's made changes, and they will
18 describe those in the second part of the - the meeting.

19 There were some questions at the last
20 meeting about the - the process, the licensing process,
21 so I'd like to take some time to describe that. And I
22 think it'll - it'll help put in context how the
23 environmental impact statement that we're talking about
24 here tonight will be used by NRC in its decision making.

25 Specifically, NRC has two decisions to make

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 for the proposed MOX project. And those are listed in
2 the middle of the slide. They are: decision whether to
3 authorize construction of the proposed facility; and
4 later, whether to license the facility.

5 DCS, which is the - the applicant, which
6 stands for Duke Cogema Stone & Webster, submitted an
7 environmental report in December of 2000, and a
8 construction authorization request in February 2001. Due
9 to the changes that were announced by DOE earlier this
10 year, Duke Cogema Stone & Webster submitted a revised
11 environmental report in July of 2002. We are currently
12 reviewing those documents, and will prepare two documents
13 of our own. The first is the environmental impact
14 statement. And I'll describe the environmental impact
15 statement process after this slide.

16 Our draft, as I stated, was initially
17 planned to be published in February. However, due to the
18 cancellation of the plutonium immobilization facility, we
19 thought it would be a good idea to seek the public's
20 input on - on how that should be treated in the
21 environmental impact statement before we published it.

22 The top part of the slide, NRC will prepare
23 a safety evaluation report for the construction
24 authorization request. We had a public meeting on that
25 topic in North Augusta last month. The safety evaluation

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 report's different from the environmental impact
2 statement, in that it focuses on a safety assessment of
3 the design bases to determine if it meets NRC's
4 requirements. The environmental impact statement
5 documents environmental impacts for the proposed action,
6 which in this case is the proposed MOX facility, and
7 compares those with alternatives to the proposed action.
8 And as I stated earlier, one of the alternatives that was
9 identified by the public was immobilization of plutonium,
10 rather than converting it to MOX fuel. So we're here
11 tonight to solicit your input on whether we should still
12 consider that as an alternative.

13 After we public the draft environmental
14 impact statement and the safety evaluation report for the
15 construction authorization, those will be the basis for
16 making a decision on whether or not to construct the
17 proposed MOX facility. And we anticipate making a
18 decision in September of 2003.

19 Duke Cogema Stone & Webster plans to submit
20 a license application, on the bottom of the slide, in
21 October of 2003. NRC will review that document and
22 prepare a second safety evaluation report. And that
23 safety evaluation report will focus on the operational
24 safety of the facility.

25 The second safety evaluation report and the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 final environmental impact statement that was used to
2 support the construction authorization decision will be
3 used to support the decision on whether or not to license
4 the proposed MOX facility.

5 There are also two opportunities for
6 hearings, adjudicatory processes. And John Hull, from
7 our General Counsel, is here if you have any questions on
8 those. But, as I said, the purpose of this discussion
9 here is to put in context of how the environmental impact
10 statement is used in NRC's decision-making process. And
11 just to summarize, a single EIS will be used to support
12 the decisions on whether to authorize construction, and
13 later whether also to authorize operation of the
14 facility.

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

25 Note that the shaded portions are areas for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 public involvement. And we consider that to be a very
2 important part of the process and one of the reasons
3 we're back out here tonight, just to - to seek your
4 input. NEPA has some statutory requirements for public
5 involvement. This is not one of them. We felt strongly
6 that we needed to be back in the community to hear your
7 views, so - so we're here.

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

15 We're in the process of reviewing the
16 environmental report, and that review process will
17 include requests for additional information. And this is
18 information that the NRC feels is important to complete
19 its review. And then those requests are made publicly
20 available.

21 The next step of the process is to publish
22 the draft environmental impact statement. And we
23 anticipate to do that in February of 2003. After the
24 publication, there'll be a 45 day comment period, and
25 we'll hold public meetings in March. So we'll be back

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 down here in March to hear your views on that draft. If
2 you provided your mailing address to Betty at this
3 meeting or other meetings, we're going to mail you a copy
4 of the draft environmental impact statement. So if - if
5 you didn't include your full mailing address, please do
6 so if you'd like a copy. Lastly, after we hear your
7 comments, we will revise the document and publish it as
8 final.

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

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

25 I think the scoping process was very

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 successful, and I think that could be contributed -
2 attributed to the public's involvement. And I know Sara
3 has been very active down here, and I think she provided
4 quite a few new comments.

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

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

25 And that concludes my explanation of the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 NRC's role in the environmental impact statement process.
2 I'd be happy to answer questions.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much,
4 Tim. Tim gave you an overview of the - the entire NRC
5 process that's used to help us to make this decision. So
6 a lot of ground was - was covered there, and we want to
7 make sure that you understand what the process is. So
8 are there - are there questions about the process at this
9 point? Or about the specific questions that the NRC is
10 asking for a comment on at this point?

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

14 MS. JENNINGS: Judy Jennings. About the...

15 AUDIENCE: Can't hear you.

16 COURT REPORTER: I'm not sure - I'm not sure
17 your microphone is on.

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

20 COURT REPORTER: I'm not sure the mic is
21 turned on.

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

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just hold it closer
25 to you.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

3 MS. JENNINGS: About the - about the EIS
4 process, the facility would be for the Department of
5 Energy by Duke Cogema Stone & Webster?

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

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

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

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

17 MR. HARRIS: There will be...

18 MR. CAMERON: ...the answer is there will be
19 an economic analysis in that.

20 MR. HARRIS: ...there will be a discussion
21 in...

22 MR. CAMERON: Sara?

23 MS. BARCZAK: My name is Sara Barczak.

24 Will the economic analysis, though, keep -
25 will it do an economic analysis for the no-action

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 alternatives that the NRC intends to study, or is it just
2 doing the economic analysis for the MOX building?

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

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

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Sara.
11 Judy, did - is that...

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

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

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

18 MR. HARRIS: Yes, ma'am.

19 MR. CAMERON: Great.

20 Yes, sir?

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

22 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 country, is it up in Washington?

2 MR. HARRIS: It's - it's at various DOE
3 sites.

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

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

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

13 MR. HARRIS: That's correct.

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

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

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

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

20 MR. COBB: Okay. And - and when that fuel
21 is spent, chemically the plutonium is filled air, pretty
22 much? How long is it going to be until it dissipates?
23 Most of the plutonium, when you're done, this fuel is
24 spent, the plutonium will still be in the fuel. So you
25 haven't gotten rid of the plutonium; 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 purpose
4 of DOE's program is to make the weapons grade plutonium
5 unusable, so that the plutonium is still there, but now
6 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 not
11 pure enough to be used for...

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

14 MR. COBB: Yeah.

15 MR. HARRIS: ...material.

16 MR. COBB: Okay. I'm starting to understand
17 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 dropped?

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good question.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 And, Sara, a question?

25 MS. BARCZAK: Just a - a quick comment. If

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you don't want to write that down and you can't see it,
2 you can grab one of the pink flyers that's back by the
3 colorful tri-fold display that has it all written out.

4 MR. CAMERON: Thank Georgians for Clean
5 Energy for providing that to us. Thank you.

6 Yes, ma'am?

7 MS. JZAR: Ranowell Jzar with Citizens for
8 Environmental Justice.

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

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

18 MS. JZAR: Yes.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Tim, do you understand
20 the question?

21 MR. HARRIS: I think so. I think - I think
22 the answer is that NRC doesn't have a means to - to make
23 DOE construct the facility. The question here tonight is
24 whether we should still consider that in the
25 environmental impact statement as an alternative and as

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 a reasonable...

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

7 MR. HARRIS: As a - as an alternative to the
8 proposed MOX facility.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Do you have a question
10 on that?

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

19 MR. HARRIS: I don't - I don't think it's
20 immobilized. I think it's disposed of.

21 MR. COBB: I mean, it's a vitrification type
22 of process; right? Would - would then the spent fuel
23 that might have plutonium in it, with uranium, eventually
24 when it's spent and it's immobilized or vitrified and
25 gets buried some - in a mountain somewhere, then the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 plutonium winds up there; is that right? So, in essence,
2 it would be immobilized?

3 I just - I don't know. I'm just asking
4 questions. Thank you.

5 MR. BROWN: The answer to your question is:
6 No, the - the spent fuel would not receive any further
7 treatment to it...

8 MR. COBB: It would just be immobilized?

9 MR. BROWN: ...further immobilize plutonium.

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

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

21 MR. BROWN: Okay.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay?

23 MR. BROWN: Okay. Am I being heard pretty
24 well? Okay.

25 The spent MOX fuel would be handled much the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

9 One of the things you sort of alluded to was
10 this concept of reprocessing the fuel to maybe remove
11 things, to solidify waste. And that's not part of the
12 nation's program at this point.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's - let's go over
14 here and - right here, and then let's go to your
15 presentation, and we can open it up for some more
16 questions.

17 Go ahead, sir.

18 MR. JERNIGAN: My name's Anthony Jernigan.
19 I don't know if you can hear me or not. Hypothetically
20 - hype - I'm sorry, I can't talk. Hypothetically
21 speaking, if immobilization is included in the EIS and
22 it's found to be a better alternative than MOX, would
23 that be grounds for denial of the license?

24 MR. HARRIS: I think the answer is - I don't
25 know whether it's yes or - it's a - yeah, you're right,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 it's a potential grounds for denying the license.

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

4 Yes, sir?

5 MR. NADELMAN: It's my understanding that
6 the...

7 MR. CAMERON: If you could give us your
8 name.

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

14 Now, my question is: Although it's going to
15 Yucca Mountains, it's also my understanding that it will
16 be used in nuclear power - private nuclear power plants
17 throughout the country, the pellets. It's also my
18 understanding that not every nuclear power plant that we
19 - we know is capable of processing or - or - I'd rather
20 - I'll restate that.

21 We don't know if every nuclear power plant
22 is capable of handling weapons grade plutonium and
23 uranium that these pellets - of which these pellets will
24 be composed. Has a thorough - has this been thoroughly
25 researched? And if it has not, why not? And I would

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 also like to know what precautions will be used to
2 prevent a terrorist - terrorist attacks during the -
3 against the vehicles transporting the fuel to the -
4 throughout the country to these plants? Also, terrorist
5 attacks as well as accidents, we need precautions
6 against, and I'm sure you acknowledge that. And this is
7 - remains a possibility, and it's a definite danger to
8 the public. I'll stop here.

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

14 MR. HARRIS: That was his - one of his first
15 questions was: Is this stuff proposed to be used
16 everywhere in the country? And the answer is: No. The
17 current program would be to utilize it in two reactors at
18 Catawba and two reactors at the McGuire station, one in
19 South Carolina and one in North Carolina near Charlotte.
20 So those are the only two reactors that are currently
21 proposed to use the proposed MOX fuel.

22 The second question was: Are we looking at
23 the safety and environmental impacts of that? And the
24 answer is: In order for those reactors to use that fuel,
25 they would have to have a license, and then - and that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 would be the step - the process for NRC to go into
2 detailed review of the safety of the use of - of this
3 type of fuel. The...

4 MR. CAMERON: The terrorism, transportation.

5 MR. HARRIS: ...the last question was - was
6 terrorism. And I think there are - there are procedures,
7 regulations, policies in place to - to safeguard this
8 type of material.

9 MR. NADELMAN: I ask that question
10 because...

11 MR. CAMERON: Fred, Fred, Fred. I'm sorry,
12 you know, I hate to - to take away from the spontaneity
13 here, but we really do need to get this on the
14 transcript. And if you - do you have a follow-up? I
15 take it you do.

16 MR. NADELMAN: Yes. In view of the - of the
17 fact that nuclear material has been hijacked from Oak
18 Ridge and - it's been hijacked and it's - that is, it's
19 been stolen, it could be more - probably be more easily
20 stolen from a truck or a train, just as Jesse James did
21 in his days.

22 (Laughter.)

23 MR. CAMERON: Let me just - let me make sure
24 that we've set the record straight on - on this. Can you
25 just describe how this fuel is - is shipped, so that you

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 can give people an idea of what the actual risk is of
2 things like it being - being stolen? And I don't - you
3 know, obviously we don't have any - we're not necessarily
4 agreeing that - that material's been stolen from - from
5 Oak Ridge. But...

6 MR. NADELMAN: It has.

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

10 MR. NADELMAN: Fred, yes.

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

14 Tim?

15 MR. HARRIS: I guess, how - how is spent
16 fuel transported, particularly by the Department of
17 Energy. It's transported in huge casks that were
18 designed to withstand severe accidents. There's armed
19 guards involved. They follow certain routes. I think
20 they're tracked by GPS. It's a - it's a very
21 sophisticated system they use to - to safeguard the
22 material.

23 And I don't think I can address material
24 being diverted from Oak Ridge.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. If there are further

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 questions on this, we'll - we'll come back to them.
2 Let's get Dave up so you can get the whole picture on
3 this, and then we'll go back out to you for - for
4 questions again.

5 MR. BROWN: Thanks, Chip.

6 What I'd like to do is summarize the - two
7 of the major changes that DOE made early this year that
8 affected our environmental review. I'll also discuss the
9 environmental impacts that Duke Cogema Stone & Webster
10 presented to us in their environmental report that deals
11 with these changes. They issued a revised environmental
12 report in July of 2002, and we've had - we may need to
13 look at that.

14 The first change I'll discuss is the
15 cancellation of the plutonium immobilization plant. We
16 talked a little bit about that. The plutonium
17 immobilization plant had been part of a two-part process
18 where some of the plutonium was going to be solidified
19 and disposed of directly, and the rest of the plutonium
20 was going to be converted to MOX fuel and go that route.
21 The DOE did cancel that program for budgetary reasons, so
22 I'll describe how that impacts the NRC's review in a
23 moment.

24 Second change I'll talk about is a new waste
25 solidification building. This is a building that would

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 - that would be built by DOE, operated by DOE near the
2 MOX facility to handle and to treat liquid waste coming
3 from the facility and from another nearby facility, the
4 pit disassembly and conversion facility.

5 These three facilities work together. The
6 pit disassembly and conversion facility helps to convert
7 the - the weapons components to plutonium oxide that then
8 would be fed into the mixed oxide fuel plant. And the
9 waste solidification building would then handle waste
10 from both of the processes.

11 The - the environmental impact of canceling
12 the plutonium immobilization plant is derived from the
13 fact that there was 8.4 metric tons of plutonium that had
14 been slated to go to that plant, that will now have to
15 have a new disposition path. To be clear, the - of that
16 8.4 metric tons, two of the metric tons DOE decided it
17 still wasn't adequate or of the right quality to go to
18 the mixed oxide fuel plant. So of the - the 6.4 metric
19 tons from the cancelled immobilization plant, that's
20 proposed now to go to the mixed oxide fuel plant.

21 That 6.4 metric tons is what's being
22 referred to as alternate feedstock, and that's just
23 material coming from another direction into the mixed
24 oxide fuel facility. And so the - the MOX facility would
25 have to be redesigned to accommodate this material. It

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 has some - some of it has impurities in it, and so there
2 would have to be additional process steps at the MOX
3 facility to handle those impurities.

4 As a part of this, also, the original
5 environmental review that we had started was considering
6 the processing of 33 metric tons. And with the program
7 change, we're not looking at the proposal to process 34
8 metric tons; so one additional ton.

9 The DCS has informed the NRC that DOE plans
10 to build this waste solidification building. The DOE's
11 described this as being - addressing public concerns
12 about using the Savannah River Site's high level waste
13 tanks to process this liquid waste stream from the MOX
14 project. So, instead of doing that, instead of diverting
15 liquid waste to the existing high level waste tank, this
16 waste solidification building would solidify those waste.

17 The waste solidification building is located
18 on the pit disassembly and conversion facility site. I
19 think on the back of your handout there's a site plan
20 that shows the relative location of these facilities.

21 Again, there's four liquid waste streams:
22 the two from the MOX facility, and two from the pit
23 disassembly and conversion facility. One from MOX and
24 one from the pit disassembly and conversion facility are
25 what we call transuranic waste. Those wastes would be

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 solidified, and the proposal is that those would go -
2 that solidified waste would go to the waste isolation
3 pilot plant in New Mexico.

4 A second waste stream from MOX and another
5 one from the pit disassembly and conversion facility
6 would be low level waste. Those wastes would also be
7 solidified, but those would be disposed of on the
8 Savannah River Site as low level waste in the E Area or
9 at another permanent low level waste site.

10 With respect to the environmental impacts,
11 these are some of the - the impacts that were described
12 in the environmental report. In order to accommodate
13 this alternate feedstock, the aqueous polishing building,
14 which is like the first step in the MOX building, would
15 have about 10% more floor area to accommodate additional
16 processes. Some of the alternate feedstock contains
17 salts of chloride. Those would have to be removed. And
18 the process to remove those chlorides would generate a
19 chlorine that may come out as an emission - an air
20 emission from the plant. And this would also - the
21 processing of alternate feedstock would also change the
22 waste characteristics that come out of the plant. For
23 example, the amount of low level liquid radioactive waste
24 that would be produced by the plant would be about 60%.
25 The impurities that were in the alternate feedstock would

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 also be in that low level waste. That's something we
2 would consider in our EIS.

3 The liquid high alpha activity waste is a
4 waste that's generated as part of purifying the
5 plutonium. That would have what we're referring to as
6 the new strategy there. That's the waste solidification
7 building, to solidify that waste. That waste would have
8 a little bit more silver in it. Silver is used in the
9 process to help dissolve the plutonium. There'd be a
10 little bit more of that in that waste. And the - there
11 would be additional volume to this waste.

12 With respect to the waste solidification
13 building, some of the environmental impacts DCS described
14 to NRC, and that we will evaluate, includes the disposal
15 impacts. For example, they're supposed to generate
16 transuranic waste, so it would have to go to the waste
17 isolation pilot plant. There are impacts associated
18 with, you know, how much can the waste isolation pilot
19 plant accommodate. Would this be a burden on that
20 capacity.

21 There'd be construction-related impacts.
22 This is a new facility, so we'd have to consider the
23 impacts of - of breaking ground out there and - and
24 trucks and that sort of thing moving earth. Operation-
25 related impacts, like the normal air and liquid

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 effluents, occupational radiation exposure to workers in
2 the plant. And finally, DCS also provided us some
3 information about the consequences of potential accidents
4 that could occur in the waste solidification building.

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

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Dave. And this
9 is a lot of material to digest. Keep in mind that when
10 the NRC's draft environmental impact statement comes out,
11 it will go through all of these impacts and you'll be
12 able to - to read about that.

13 Are there questions? Sara? And then we'll
14 go over here.

15 MS. BARCZAK: Do I need to say my name
16 again?

17 MR. CAMERON: Sara Barczak. I'll say it for
18 you.

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And so I just had a couple of quick ones on
2 that new waste solidification building that DOE is slated
3 to build.

4 MR. BROWN: Right.

5 MS. BARCZAK: Does the NRC have to okay
6 that?

7 MR. BROWN: That would be - no, it's not an
8 NRC license - it would not be an NRC licensed facility.

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

17 And so who's going to look at this building,
18 this new waste production - or new waste solidification
19 building? Is it going to be licensed by the Department
20 of Energy?

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. BARCZAK: Okay. But you don't have
2 to...

3 MR. BROWN: But, from a safety aspect,
4 that's DOE's responsibility.

5 MS. BARCZAK: Right. Right. Okay.

6 MR. BROWN: To - to go through their
7 processes to get a plant authorized and all that sort of
8 thing.

9 MS. BARCZAK: Okay.

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

15 MR. BROWN: Certainly. As we said here,
16 the...

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So it is going to be...

18 MR. BROWN: ...because it's associated with
19 the mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, we will look
20 at the environmental impacts of constructing and
21 operating the waste solidification building.

22 MS. BARCZAK: Right. And depending on what
23 you come up with, is - let's say you say, "Oh, my gosh,
24 this building is going to be horrible, and it's going to
25 just be a disaster," is that grounds for also not

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 licensing the facility? The MOX facility?

2 MR. BROWN: The...

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

5 MR. BROWN: Well, that's - we don't want to
6 give the impression that the environmental review is not
7 important. It is part of the decision-making pools to
8 give that...

9 MS. BARCZAK: Yeah.

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

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

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

24 So it's - it's how far the waste goes, all
25 the environmental impacts associated with that, which

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 would include this facility and waste generated by this
2 facility. So the safety review stops at our - our line
3 of authority, but the environmental review is - is larger
4 in scope.

5 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Sara, why don't
6 you ask one more question, and then we'll go to other
7 people, and then we'll - we'll come back. And if we go
8 through public comments and we have more time at the end
9 of the night, we can go to your - how many weeks are we
10 going to be here?

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

12 MR. CAMERON: All right.

13 (Laughter.)

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

21 MR. BROWN: No. The - the two metric
22 tons...

23 MS. BARCZAK: Yeah.

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

25 MS. BARCZAK: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. BROWN: ...from consideration in the MOX
2 program?

3 MS. BARCZAK: Right.

4 MR. BROWN: Would be outside the - the scope
5 of our - both our safety and our environmental review at
6 that point. DOE would make a decision what to do with
7 that plutonium.

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

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

24 MR. BROWN: Well, I want to be sure I
25 understand your question. You're referring to that - the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 plutonium that would have to go to the MOX facility to be
2 dispositioned? The cost of doing that has been
3 considered by DOE.

4 MS. JAY: Okay. But what I'm saying is,
5 we're - instead of taking that 8.4 metric tons and
6 putting it away, now you're taking 6.4 of that 8.4 metric
7 tons and you're putting it back into the waste stream,
8 which means we, as the taxpayers, are going to have to
9 pay for - you know, as long as we know, as long as any of
10 us in this room knows, we're going to have to pay to keep
11 that in - in some form, instead of immobilizing it. So
12 how can that be cost effective?

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

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

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's - let's give you
23 a follow-up here. And if we can get the citation to the
24 congressional report or any report that's public, that
25 was done by the Department of Energy or others that might

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 explain some of this, we'll - we'll try to get you a
2 citation for that.

3 MS. JAY: Besides the waste stream, the MOX
4 process, itself, is a dirty process. So this 6.4 tons
5 that was slated for immobilization is now going to
6 generate more waste to produce MOX than originally it
7 would have if it had been immobilized.

8 MR. BROWN: Right.

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

16 MR. BROWN: I think, so what we will do,
17 then, is we have, as part of the environmental impact
18 statement process, the - the comparison of the cost of
19 the different alternatives. So we would bring that to
20 light in our statement. That's...

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

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

24 MR. CAMERON: We're going to go here, and
25 then here, and then here.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Yes, sir?

2 MR. JACKSON: Yes, my name is Lester
3 Jackson.

4 You mentioned earlier that the Department of
5 Energy will be looking at the safety and the
6 environmental impact. And then you said they will
7 determine, you know, what's best for the environment.
8 Can you identify who "they" are? Do they have names?
9 Are they a team of experts, or where the experts come
10 from? And are they identified by names? And - and what
11 are their qualifications to determine what's safe for
12 this environment?

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

24 But very important question. If - if either
25 Dave or Tim can provide some start to an answer to that.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And I would just ask if there's anybody here from - from
2 DOE or DCS that might be able to give you that
3 information offline, so to speak, so that you know what
4 it is. But can you guys provide - like who's the
5 organization that will look at the waste solidification
6 building safety?

7 MR. BROWN: I don't have that information.
8 I'm sorry.

9 MR. CAMERON: Tim, anything?

10 MR. HARRIS: No.

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

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

15 MR. CAMERON: Oh, yeah, there's got to be.
16 There's got to be.

17 MR. HULL: Chip,...

18 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

19 MR. HULL: ...I do have more of that
20 information.

21 MR. CAMERON: And, John, introduce yourself
22 to people.

23 MR. HULL: My name is John Hull. I'm an
24 attorney with the NRC. The Department of Energy does
25 have its own NEPA team which is looking at aspects of the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 larger spent fuel disposition program. And they
2 published a notice in the *Federal Register* back in April
3 explaining they were still looking at this in - to
4 evaluate the environmental impacts of their program. The
5 - I forget the name of the people.

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

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

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

24 MS. JENNINGS: Judy Jennings again. I'm
25 looking at the sheet that says, "Reducing a clear and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 present danger." And I asked the question before, and
2 you answered about the DC analysis. But what I'm trying
3 to get clear in my mind is the actual flow of this
4 process whereby there was a proposal for a project and -
5 but this says, "Design of the MOX facility to be located
6 at SRS is now underway." So I'm wondering who's funding
7 that design, and did Congress - I'm just trying to get
8 the flow here. Because I'm looking at a NEPA process
9 that is supposed to answer the environmental questions.
10 But clearly work on design is - is already being done,
11 and I was wondering who's - who is funding that.

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

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

17 MR. BROWN: Yes.

18 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

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

21 But what we're really looking at here is an
22 agreement between the Russian Federation and the United
23 States to get rid of - or to the disposition of weapons
24 grade plutonium to reduce stockpiles. President Clinton
25 and Yeltsin had begun some of those point of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 negotiations. And so the DOE then had responsibility to
2 go ahead and implement whatever strategy the Russian
3 Federation and the U.S. came up with.

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

13 As that was - even as that was going on, the
14 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 it
20 was January 2000 or thereabouts.

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

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

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

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

20 MR. HARRIS: 1999.

21 MR. CAMERON: ...1999.

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

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

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

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

8 MS. JENNINGS: Yeah, part of it.

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

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you
18 very much.

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

20 MS. JZAR: This is...

21 MR. CAMERON: And could you give us your
22 name.

23 MS. JZAR: Ranowell Jzar, Citizens for
24 Environmental Justice. This is more a personal comment
25 than a comment on the other. But what I'm seeing here,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 it seems to me that cost has far outweighed the safety of
2 the environment and the socioeconomic structure of - of
3 our - of all of our communities.

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

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

22 MR. BROWN: Yes, that - one of the reasons
23 DOE describes for coming up with the waste solidification
24 building was the fact to address public concern about the
25 use of the existing high level waste tanks, and the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 process they developed was solidifying the waste in those
2 tanks to accommodate MOX waste. The original proposal
3 was that liquid waste from the MOX plant would go to the
4 existing high level waste tanks. The waste
5 solidification building was what they proposed to do this
6 differently.

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

13 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

14 Yes, ma'am? And just give us your name,
15 please.

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

19 My question is I attended a class
20 previously, but somewhat like this one, and we were told
21 they were thinking about using the Savannah River for the
22 disposal of nuclear waste. Is that true?

23 MR. CAMERON: Let's see if we can get an
24 answer for that. We don't, you know, know the particular
25 event or class that you're talking about, but, Tim, can

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you two shed any light on - on that?

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

13 MS. DANIELS: But is the - does the water
14 become purified after?

15 MR. BROWN: Yes, it's cleaned up to - to
16 federal standards before it's released back into the
17 environment.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's go back. Mr.
19 Jackson?

20 MR. JACKSON: Yes, Lester Jackson.

21 Would you consider that water to be safe?

22 MR. BROWN: Yes.

23 MR. JACKSON: That's cleaned up, that's
24 shipped back into the Savannah River? I mean, you said
25 it was up to federal standards, and - and I believe in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the American government. In fact, I'm a part of it.
2 But...

3 (Laughter.)

4 MR. JACKSON: ...but would you believe that
5 water to be safe that come out of the Savannah River
6 Site?

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

15 MR. JACKSON: Safe levels, but there would
16 still be some traces of radioactive material in the
17 water?

18 MR. BROWN: There would be trace levels of
19 radioactivity in the water.

20 MR. JACKSON: Trace levels. Right. Do you
21 think those trace levels might - might increase the
22 cancer rate in this area or more than likely contribute
23 to higher infant mortality rate in this area, those trace
24 levels? Or has that been documented or studied?

25 MR. BROWN: Well, that gets into the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 analyses that - that's still before us in our - for our
2 environmental impact statement. We will look at the
3 different discharges associated with the project and what
4 the risks are, like cancer risks.

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

18 MR. BROWN: At this point we're going to do
19 our analysis to see what - what effects we would expect.
20 But...

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

22 MR. CAMERON: And we got to get this on a
23 transcript. I'll come back to you, Mr. Jackson, because
24 I think someone over here might have some information for
25 you on your - your question. And give us your name,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 please, sir.

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

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

5 MR. CHAPUT: You can't tell by talking into
6 it.

7 I'm from Aiken. I work with a group called
8 Economic Development Partnership who does industrial
9 development. And we've - we've been following the MOX
10 program for about five years.

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

19 They issued a report, in conjunction with
20 the American Cancer Society, where they looked at cancer
21 incidents rates for all the counties in the State of
22 South Carolina. And the - the conclusions on that is the
23 incident - there's 47 counties in South Carolina. The
24 cancer rate in Aiken County, which is the county that's
25 the most populous county adjacent to Savannah River is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 #41 out of 47. It's next - it's sixth from the lowest.
2 So it's well below the average in the state. The other
3 major county that borders Savannah River Site is Barnwell
4 County, and it's slightly below the average for the
5 state. So the counties immediately - in South Carolina
6 immediately adjacent have cancer rates that are much
7 lower than the state averages.

8 There was another study that was done by the
9 Medical University of South Carolina. And I'm sorry, I
10 don't have the citation on it, but I think I can get it
11 for you, that - that I've only seen an abstract on. And
12 - and it was done in the late '90s, and it looked at the
13 counties surrounding Savannah River Site, and on - and on
14 both sides of the river, to the - you know, from Savannah
15 River, down river, and it included the City of Savannah.
16 And the - the conclusion of that - of that study---and
17 I'm going to paraphrase it because it's been a while---
18 was the - there was no elevated cancer rates in total.
19 Some were up - individual cancers were up, some were
20 down. In total, it looked just like the - the balance of
21 the area. And the study concluded they could see no - no
22 relationship between cancers in those counties studied,
23 and the operation of the Savannah River Site. I can get
24 you citations on both of those studies, if you'd like.
25 Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

4 Do you have a follow-up?

5 MR. JACKSON: Yes, one follow-up. I'd like
6 to know who is actually - who is actually doing the
7 study, who is actually doing the research. Because
8 information I have is coming from other groups giving me
9 research that says the exact opposite. But I'd like to
10 also know what group and what are their names and what
11 are their credentials, and what do they get their
12 information from.

13 MR. CHAPUT: It was a South Carolina, which
14 was funded by the South Carolina Department of Health and
15 Environmental Control. They have a statewide cancer
16 registry.

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

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

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

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

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

25 I just would add one - one other data point

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 on this for people, is that there's - there's a federal
2 agency called the Center for Disease Control and
3 Prevention that's part of the agency for toxic substances
4 and disease registry. They do these types of
5 epidemiology studies on cancer rates around particular
6 facilities. I believe there is a Savannah River Site
7 Citizens Advisory Committee that is chaired by someone
8 from this Center for Disease Prevention and Control. And
9 I will be glad to get you the name of this person if you
10 want to follow up with more information on it.

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

13 MS. THOMAS: Regina Thomas.

14 I would just like to say that I am very
15 disappointed that - and it was alluded to earlier that
16 cost is more important than human lives. And I would
17 like to know, are we transporting MOX of any nuclear
18 waste to the Savannah River Site facility now?

19 MR. BROWN: I think what has occurred
20 recently is the DOE decision to consolidate storage of
21 plutonium from the Rocky Flats Site to the Savannah River
22 Site. I don't know the schedule of shipments. I really
23 don't know how many or if any have come to the Savannah
24 River Site.

25 MR. CAMERON: Tim?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. HARRIS: Can I add just a piece? I
2 think there's maybe a little confusion. We know that
3 cost was a reason why DOE made - part of the reason why
4 DOE made a decision to cancel the immobilization project.
5 I tried to state it within my presentation. Our decision
6 making considers both environmental protection and the
7 safety. Cost comes into it, but the key drivers are
8 environmental, public health and safety, and safe
9 operation of the facility.

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

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

14 MR. CAMERON: And that's - that's great.
15 And I think that there was an opinion stated, okay, that
16 cost outweighed them. But in terms of the NRC's
17 analysis, we do look at the environmental and public
18 health impacts as primary consideration. Not cost.

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

22 MR. CAMERON: That may go to the cumulative
23 impact analysis that you talked about earlier, that we'll
24 look at in deciding whether to approve this or to deny
25 it.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. BROWN: I think that's - that's exactly
2 right. One of the things we will look at is what is
3 already going on at the Savannah River Site, what would
4 be the additional impact of licensing a MOX facility at
5 the site. Would that be an acceptable environmental
6 impact or not. That's the evaluation we're undertaking
7 right now.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay, why don't we go to - and
9 hear from some of the people who wanted to give us some
10 formal comments. And then hopefully we'll have time to
11 - to answer some more questions for you. But I want to
12 make sure that everybody who wanted to talk formally
13 tonight gets an opportunity to - to do that. And I would
14 ask you to - to come up here, if you - if you would, to
15 give us your comments.

16 And the first person I have is Jody - Jody
17 Lanier. Jody?

18 Jody, can you - can you use that lavalier?
19 I mean, if it's not - because, I'm sorry, we don't have
20 a - a standup mic there. If this gets too unwieldy, then
21 I'll just put this up there in a stand and you can use
22 it. Maybe that's what we should do. Here, I'll tell you
23 what, I'll...

24 Oh, we got one. All right, great. And, as
25 I said at the beginning of the meeting, if you could try

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to keep it to five minutes; okay?

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

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, I'm - yeah. Go
5 ahead, Jody.

6 Well, the good news is we have a microphone,
7 but I guess the bad news is we don't know where to plug
8 it in. Jody, why don't you just use the lavalier, and
9 we'll see if we can get some technical assistance here.
10 Yeah, is there any way you can plug it in behind the
11 podium? Is there an amp there that you can turn on?
12 Okay, let's - let's not worry about it. Use the lavalier
13 if you can, and we get a - can you see if the guy in the
14 orange shirt can tell us where to plug this thing in?
15 Thank you.

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

18 MR. CAMERON: Can everybody hear Mr. Lanier?

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just speak up and go
20 for it.

21 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead, Jody.

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

25 My name is Jody Lanier, and this is the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 first time that I've been to any of these meetings
2 before. I'm just coming here as a private citizen. I'd
3 like to thank the NRC for having this meeting tonight.
4 And I just want to share with all of you some reasons why
5 I'm opposed to the MOX plant.

6 First one, some of the speakers have already
7 mentioned it. By making this MOX fuel it's going to add
8 to the overburdened waste stream that's already at the
9 Savannah River Site. And - and especially with plutonium
10 "waste" waste. Excuse me. I don't think it makes any
11 sense, whatsoever, to add all this highly toxic waste
12 when we got all of this other waste from over 50 years
13 being stored in these leaky tanks that's still leaking
14 out into the environment and into the Savannah River now.

15 And this may be contaminating the upper
16 aquifer where, you know, we get our - our drinking water
17 from. And I really would not want to see that happen.
18 And especially if it means everyone has to start buying
19 their drinking water from the store. Of course, the
20 stores are going to love it.

21 And on the questions about the
22 immobilization process, I hope that the NRC would
23 consider that as the main option, either as a no-action
24 alternative or just any alternative to the MOX facility.
25 And personally I would not want to have any of this

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 plutonium at the Savannah River Site. You know, Governor
2 Jim Hodges, of South Carolina, tried to keep it out of
3 the - of the state, and I applaud him for trying to keep
4 it out. But if it has to be there, with all the waste
5 that's already there now, just spend the money that it
6 takes to perfect the vitrification and immobilization
7 process and just immobilize the stuff so - so nobody can
8 get onto - get their hands onto it. That they should
9 just treat plutonium as a waste, not as a commodity.

10 Also, I've been reading about the Cogema
11 company, that it's their process that Duke and Stone and
12 Webster are wanting to use as the model for making a MOX
13 at the Savannah River Site. And they have had problems
14 both with making and using MOX in France. And if they
15 want to use a flawed process here in the United States to
16 make MOX, they must not really take the value of human
17 life seriously. They want to put all of us here in the
18 - in Savannah, Chatham County, Coastal Empire. And
19 they're also putting the people in their hometown,
20 Charlotte, North Carolina, at risk using it at the
21 Catawba and McGuire Nuclear Power Plants. Maybe you all
22 will hear more about that tomorrow night in Charlotte.

23 Also, I think that the MOX plant will be a
24 big waste of tax dollars. Anyone reads the *Savannah*
25 *Morning News* knows that use or misuse of tax dollars,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that's a really big concern here. I'm not a member of
2 Stop Taxing our People or any of those other taxing
3 groups. But I just submit to you that using the - excuse
4 me, making the MOX at the Savannah River Site, that's
5 going to send billions of dollars of our tax dollars,
6 flush it right down the toilet.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. LANIER: Also I think that - that this
9 is going to give us a big problem as far as terrorist
10 risk goes. Some people have already talked about that.
11 As far as I know, I guess we can assume that there's
12 still more secret shipments of plutonium from Rocky Flats
13 in Colorado, going out to the Savannah River Site. Well,
14 they're coming in by truck now, but what if the MOX plant
15 goes through and the energy department, Duke Cogema Stone
16 & Webster, they have to start importing plutonium from
17 France, England, Belgium, or other countries that use
18 that, and they have to send it in by ship, and the most
19 convenient place to send it in would be through the
20 Savannah Port, Ocean and - and Garden City terminals.

21 So then, if that happens, we won't just have
22 a - a terrorist target in our backyard, it'll be right at
23 our front door. And I don't think the International
24 Longshoremen, unsung heroes they are, I don't believe
25 they would be too comfortable having to offload the most

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 toxic substance known to man, if that comes in on - on a
2 ship.

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

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

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. LANIER: ...mention in the telephone
19 book about evacuation for a nuclear disaster, just a
20 hurricane. And anyone remembers the Hurricane Floyd
21 evacuation, it took me and my family five hours just to
22 get from Savannah to Pembroke. And in that case,
23 evacuating from the hurricane, we had about a day, day-
24 and-a-half, maybe two days of notice that the hurricane
25 was coming. Well, if there's a terrorist attack at the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MOX plant, we're not going to have anything close to
2 that. Could happen in the middle of the night when we're
3 all - all asleep. So, if that happens, where are we
4 going to go? North into the Carolinas? South into
5 Florida? Probably couldn't go west, since that would be
6 closer to the Savannah River Site.

7 (Laughter.)

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

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

17 MR. LANIER: Okay. Shouldn't take maybe
18 another minute.

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 stenographer, that's spelled p-u-p-u.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. LANIER: And I don't know about anyone
4 else here, but I want a pupu platter, I want it from an
5 honorable Chinese restaurant, not a dishonorable MOX
6 plant. So please deny the application.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Lanier,
8 for bringing the emergency plan issue on - on the plate
9 here. And we're working to - to get a - another mic
10 here.

11 And Cheryl Jay?

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

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

25 When this occurs, we are bringing all the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 waste to the most - the dirtiest radioactive place that
2 we know of in the world, which is here on the Georgia
3 border. Obviously, the people in South Carolina are very
4 concerned about all the plutonium coming here because
5 Governor Hodges suggested he would lay down in the road
6 to stop the trucks from coming into his state.

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

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

25 (Applause.)

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much,
2 Cheryl.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

25 MS. BARCZAK: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. CAMERON: ...you know, just take a few
2 more minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

24 We'd like to make it clear from the outset
25 that we strongly oppose the production of any type of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

15 Additionally, the Department of Energy's
16 February 15th report, entitled, "Report to Congress,
17 disposition of surplus defense plutonium at Savannah
18 River Site," essentially recommends the need to add at
19 least two additional unnamed nuclear reactors for
20 plutonium bomb fuel use. Our nearby Southern Nuclear
21 owned Plant Vogtle---that's right across from the
22 Savannah River Site here in Georgia--- expressed interest
23 in the plutonium fuel program back in 1996, and we are
24 concerned about the implications of the need for more
25 nuclear reactors. How will the NRC address this need for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 more nuclear power plants? How will additional reactor
2 sites be selected? And will the - will the public be
3 involved in this process?

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

16 Rocky Flats, the site in Colorado that is
17 now shipping its plutonium to SRS, has carried out this
18 function of plutonium 289, and it's now closing. SRS is
19 believed to be the first site for the plutonium "trigger"
20 plant that will cost of billions of dollars. Secretary
21 of Energy Spencer Abraham actually stated, quote, "We
22 need to have the capacity to manufacture a certified pits
23 to maintain the safety, security, and reliability of the
24 U.S. nuclear deterrent in the future," end quote. What
25 is really going on? We would like to answer - that press

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 release is of record, and I have a packet here for the
2 NRC.

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

20 Now, getting on to the nuclear waste
21 concerns. It's been stated that the NRC, through the
22 EIS, is going to look at broader concerns that are like
23 outside of its mandate. But we really need to clear this
24 up. SRS has a severe nuclear waste problem. The site
25 currently has the second largest volume of high level

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 liquid nuclear waste, about 38 million gallons of it, and
2 wins the Gold Medal for having the most amount of
3 radioactivity of any DOE site in the nation. The future
4 is less than encouraging, as the DOE projects that 95% of
5 future high level radioactive waste generation will occur
6 at SRS. And that's on the other side of the hand - the
7 second handout that I handed to you.

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

16 We are including---and that's in the
17 handout, and I'll give it to the NRC as well---a
18 resolution from the City of Savannah from 1992 that
19 requested that, quote, "A full-scale cleanup operation of
20 the Savannah River Site begin immediately." It is ten
21 years since that resolution came out, and we are no
22 cleaner at that site than we were before. In fact, we
23 are now wanting to wake up the bomb plant again.

24 Now, adding to this - I mean, the DOE is
25 just handing you guys all kinds of good information this

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 last month. The U.S. energy department inspector general
2 - general actually publicly recommended burying millions
3 of gallons of radioactive waste in underground vaults at
4 the Savannah River Site, which could essentially create
5 a national nuclear sacrifice zone over one of the most
6 important water recharge areas on the East Coast. In his
7 recommendation, he cited that this was supposedly due, in
8 part, to the cancellation of the immobilization plant.
9 The NRC therefore should still address immobilization as
10 an alternative to plutonium fuel production.

11 We would encourage the NRC to contact the
12 DOE, as well, on research that Georgians for Clean Energy
13 did on past nuclear waste storage proposal - proposals at
14 SRS. We found in these documents from the '50s and the
15 '60s that decades ago several deep rock boreholes were
16 drilled on site, some as deep as 4,000 feet, which could
17 potentially serve as pathways for contamination to pass
18 in the deep aquifers that the region relies on for
19 drinking water. The ultimate reason for these boreholes?
20 You guessed it. To assess whether or not the site could
21 store highly radioactive waste underground.

22 A special meeting was actually called with
23 the DOE to address our concerns. And all this, including
24 the bore hole map, can be found on our website, or you
25 can contact the Georgia Environmental Protection Division

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and talk to Jim Setser and Jim Hardeman who were present
2 with us at the meeting. And I included a copy of all
3 that correspondence, including the EPA's letter of
4 concern to us for the NRC. The NRC should study that
5 further.

6 In part, the proposed plutonium fuel
7 facility is near a number of these boreholes that have
8 been drilled. So if there are leaks from the facility,
9 you could potentially have a 4,000 foot hole, and though
10 they state that they're capped, et cetera, it's been over
11 a year and we have not gotten any studies back from the
12 DOE, not - nor has Georgia EPD.

13 So, from what has already occurred, it
14 appears that the Department of Energy has decided that
15 SRS will be the centralized, long-term plutonium storage
16 dump, using the plutonium disposition plan as
17 justification to bring the plutonium here. The storage
18 of plutonium at SRS could create one potential source of
19 feed for any new pit plant. Georgians for Clean Energy
20 believe that the NRC, even though you probably don't want
21 to---I mean, I wouldn't, either---must address the full
22 impacts of the plutonium bomb fuel program, how this
23 scheme is likely contributing to the eventual production
24 of nuclear weapons components at the Savannah River
25 Nuclear Site, and the use of the site for permanent

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 nuclear waste burial. A full accounting of what and how
2 much plutonium is coming from where and being used for
3 what project, when it arrives, should be done and made
4 public.

5 These substantial changes, among others,
6 underscore the need, under the *National Environmental*
7 *Policy Act*, NEPA regulations, for the Department of
8 Energy to prepare a supplemental environmental impact
9 statement. This statement needs to be completed prior to
10 the shipment of anymore plutonium to South Carolina. And
11 we urge the NRC to request that the DOE submit a
12 supplemental environmental impact statement before the
13 NRC attempts to issue its version of the draft
14 environmental impact statement. The DOE should conduct
15 their own SEIS to figure out exactly what they're
16 actually doing and why, and then fill the rest of us in,
17 including the NRC staff.

18 I think that's about it. And the other
19 points that I have were addressed in my written statement
20 touching on additional water use that's already done at
21 the site which is - is approximately 37 billion gallons
22 of surface water, tons of ground water. I would like to
23 see actual documentation of how much additional water
24 these - the MOX facility is going to require, is it going
25 to come from the ground water or from the Savannah River

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Site or from treated waste water. And also I'd really
2 want to stress the need for HEPA and sand filters being
3 used in the facility for worker protection, the
4 combination of both, instead of one or the other. It's
5 - it's very important.

6 So, wrapping up, because I'm at 11 minutes,
7 and I apologize for that, we appreciate that the NRC has
8 extended the public comment period to September 30th. We
9 appreciate that you are holding a meeting in the epitome
10 of a downwind, downstream community, which is Savannah,
11 because you're not going to hear a lot of positive stuff
12 from a community like ours, and we really do appreciate
13 that.

14 We also want to make it very clear to the
15 folks in the audience, too, that there are people in NRC
16 that are doing what they can to listen to us. And though
17 it's very easy to criticize both the NRC and the DOE, we
18 have to realize the difficult role they must do right
19 now, and make any recommendations that we can and any
20 support that we can to make the best possible decision.
21 Thank you very much.

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

25 Mr. Pleasant?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. PLEASANT: Hello. I'll be much shorter.
2 My name is William Pleasant. I represent The Green Party
3 of Chatham County.

4 We want to raise two things. One, directly
5 to do with the Savannah River Plant and the MOX program;
6 and the other having to do with the methodology through
7 which this meeting was publicized.

8 I don't think that there was enough public
9 notice in terms of organizing this meeting. This meeting
10 is very important to - to us in Savannah. We propose in
11 the future that the NRC actively publicize this meeting,
12 and that means that maybe a week or two weeks before the
13 meeting the NRC will send out media teams that would go
14 to the newspapers, some radio and television, but also go
15 into the neighborhoods and interface with neighborhood
16 organizations, labor organizations, political
17 organizations, et cetera. This room should have been
18 packed here tonight, and this room should have been
19 representative of all the different communities in
20 Savannah.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. PLEASANT: Okay, now to the Savannah
23 River Site. Okay, the Savannah River Plant has been run
24 sloppily for 50 years, okay, in terms of the environment,
25 in terms of health and safety of the workers. It

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 transported plutonium on our rails and upon our roads and
2 on our waters. It's a nightmare here, whether it has to
3 do with terrorist threats or with accidents that can
4 happen; okay?

5 Basically, building this MOX program is like
6 pouring gasoline on an atomic fire. Okay, we have to
7 look at this for what it is politically. This is just a
8 welfare program for Duke electric and the rest of the
9 atomic energy corporations in this country; okay? This
10 does nothing to alleviate the fact that here in the U.S.
11 we are like burdned with all of this very, very hazardous
12 poison; okay? And they're maybe immobilizing it, maybe
13 pouring it into concrete. There are different solutions
14 to it. But one solution to it shouldn't be to in a sense
15 recycle this mess. It should be gotten rid of; okay?

16 So the position of The Green Party of
17 Chatham County is that we oppose this MOX factory, this
18 nuclear waste, whether it's plutonium or whether it's
19 waste that comes from other nuclear processes, it's got
20 to be dealt with, okay, in a safe way. So we urge the
21 NRC to, you know, categorically reject this license.
22 Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Pleasant. And
25 thank you for the suggestion on community organizations.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 We will, in the future, make sure that everybody who's at
2 this meeting will be notified. And if you do have a list
3 of community organizations that you think we should
4 contact, we would appreciate that, also.

5 All right, and let's go to Mr. - Mr.
6 Nadelman now.

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

8 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

9 MR. NADELMAN: As an alternative to being a
10 producer of MOX, the Savannah River Site, still
11 unregulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, should
12 be shut down, cleaned - cleaned up of its deadly
13 radioactive pollution, and be converted into a national
14 or state park emphasizing the benefits of the natural
15 environment of the area. This is my suggestion alone.
16 I do not rule out other constructive purposes.

17 MOX fuel is of an unproved benefit to the
18 nation's energy needs, and definitely dangerous. We are
19 talking about the use of weapons grade plutonium
20 converted - converted at the Savannah River Site and sent
21 to every nuclear power plant in the country eventually.
22 Beginning with only a couple of plants, eventually the
23 government wants to be - to provide welfare to the
24 private nuclear industry throughout the country. This we
25 do not want. This I do not want.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 The process of conversion of the - of
2 uranium and plutonium material into pellets is dangerous
3 due to accidents - due to accidents, and the accidents
4 are due to human error which cannot be totally
5 eliminated. And - and the possession of the dangerous
6 genie of nuclear power can have far more disastrous
7 consequences, surpassing even the disaster of 9/11
8 potentially.

9 The storage of the pellets at the Savannah
10 River Site in capsules, while seemingly safer than what
11 is in the ground now, does not eliminate - does not
12 totally eliminate the possibility of leakage into the
13 environment, such as the Savannah River and the ground
14 water, as well as the air, to be carried downstream to
15 Savannah and elsewhere. Everybody in the world does live
16 downstream, so no one is safe from this - from this
17 highly dangerous material.

18 The transportation of MOX fuel to power
19 plants throughout the nation presents a huge safety
20 problem in relation to stowage and sabotage and theft by
21 hijacking by terrorists. While the MOX pellets are
22 harder to convert back into the weapons grade plutonium,
23 the ability to - the ability to do this remains definite.
24 So remember that, please.

25 If the road to hell is paved with good

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 intentions, the proposal to make and transport a
2 different form of nuclear power right in Savannah's back
3 yard is likely to get us there. The U.S. government is
4 playing with a new and dangerous toy that we are being
5 duped into believing is perfectly safe. Please do not
6 believe that. I ask you not to believe that.

7 I'm not a nuclear physicist, I'm a social
8 worker. But I do read the papers and I do read the views
9 of responsible scientists who are opposed to what the
10 scientists and the Department of Energy (sic). The DOE
11 would more profitably spend its efforts in developing
12 solar energy and the renewable - other renewable
13 resources to meet the nation's energy needs.

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

25 Praise the environment and deny the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 application. Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. CAMERON: And thank you very much, Mr.
4 Nadelman.

5 We're going to go next to - to Ernie Chaput.

6 MR. HARRIS: Sorry, the - the mic was on.
7 So I turned it off.

8 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

9 MR. HARRIS: I don't intend to make a formal
10 comment.

11 MR. CAMERON: Good. Thank you.

12 MR. CHAPUT: Thank you. And my name is
13 Ernie Chaput. As I mentioned before, I am from Aiken.
14 I am a MOX supporter.

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

19 Secondly, I wanted to explain to you why I
20 support MOX and why I think this project should go
21 forward. I always go back to basics. Why - why are we
22 talking about disposing of surplus weapons grade
23 plutonium? As the United States and Russia take apart
24 their nuclear stockpile, they're taking the bombs apart
25 today as we speak, you've got to do something with that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 plutonium to make sure that either nations, us or the
2 Russians, or terrorist groups who can get their hands on
3 the material cannot use that same material to remake some
4 kind of a bomb or a weapon of mass destruction.

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

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

20 Number two, make it radioactive so people
21 can't get close to it. And number three, bury it in the
22 Yucca Mountain, where you're going to bury all the other
23 spent nuclear fuel. They said make it look like spent
24 nuclear fuel, because that stuff is really very devilish
25 to work with. If you're going to get the plutonium,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you've got to have six-foot concrete walls, you've got to
2 have chemical separation to detect all that stuff. You
3 - it's a very expensive type of technical process. And
4 they said that's the safest way to make sure that this
5 stuff never gets used in weapons. What they recommended
6 is that you burn the plutonium in reactors as MOX fuel,
7 take that spent MOX fuel from the reactors, and move it
8 to Yucca Mountain, the national repository. That's what
9 this program is all about.

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

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 live by? And that's the job they ought to be doing.
2 I've got confidence they will do that. A lot of people
3 are going to tell them make sure you look at this and
4 look at this, I don't agree with that number. And
5 they'll do their own independent study. And that's what
6 their job is. But if that application passes that
7 muster, that indeed the facility can be built and
8 operated in accordance with applicable public safety,
9 environmental, worker safety types of regulations, the
10 application ought to be approved.

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

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 standpoint, than leaving that plutonium in storage above
2 ground where you've got to watch it with guns and guards
3 and gates for many, many, many, many hundreds of years.
4 Thank you very much.

5 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. We're going to go
6 next to Judy Jennings.

7 MS. JENNINGS: Thank you. Judy Jennings.

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

19 But I have to say that I am a little bit
20 concerned about the politics that brought us to that. I
21 honestly don't start my day reading Sara's work. I get
22 to that later in the day. I actually start by reading
23 the *Wall Street Journal*. And yesterday actually this was
24 making the wires today, but the West Coast *Wall Street*
25 printed it yesterday. "Generators Refute California

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Findings on Withholding Power."

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

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

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

21 Our next speaker is Regina Thomas.

22 MS. THOMAS: I'm Regina Thomas, and I'm a
23 Georgia State Senator for District 2. In the last state
24 session I introduced, as well as Representative Nan
25 Orrock from Atlanta, a resolution urging the State of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Georgia and Governor Barnes to work along with Governor
2 Hodges from South Carolina so that we can stop any more
3 waste from coming to the Savannah River Site. I agree,
4 something need to be done with it, but not at the
5 Savannah River Site. We have too much nuclear waste
6 there now with the ground water contamination. If the
7 Yucca Mountain is the best place for it, then let's build
8 a plant there and then have everything there. We won't
9 have to worry about it.

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

22 We need to start thinking about people.
23 We're downstream from Aiken, South Carolina. So our
24 cancer rate and our percentages of respiratory, upper
25 respiratory diseases or what have you, it's going to be

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 stronger here. Let's think about what we're doing, what
2 we have been doing, and let's do the right thing and the
3 fair thing. Yes, let's take politics out of it and think
4 about the people. SRS have too much. We cannot take
5 anymore there. Thank you.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Senator
7 Thomas.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. CAMERON: Next, we hear Mr. Dunham,
10 Chester Dunham.

11 MR. DUNHAM: Good evening. My name is
12 Chester Dunham, and I'm the President of Local A. Philip
13 Randolph Chapter here in Savannah, Georgia, which is a
14 national organization. And The Randolph Institute is a
15 part of organized - it's a part of the AFofL-CIO.

16 I didn't come here to - to speak tonight at
17 all. Just come to look and observe. Well, matter of
18 fact, I wouldn't have known anything about this meeting.
19 As important as it is, I wouldn't know anything about it
20 if it weren't for Mr. Pleasant here.

21 I agree that this building, not this room
22 here, but next door where we was last week talking about
23 another situation here in Savannah, because Savannah
24 should be involved. I do have information concerning
25 organizations, religious group, community organization,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 everybody, that we can make sure that we get that
2 information to us on - the next time we got a meeting,
3 you know, and part of this one gets - can be - not this
4 room, but a larger place.

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

16 Let me tell you something about. The young
17 man was talking about - again, I - my occupation is
18 longshoreman. I work on the water, Savannah River. We
19 deal with world trade, import and export, these ships
20 that come up the river. The situation dealing with
21 shippers throughout the - the free world is that America
22 has maybe less than 5% company that own ships in the
23 United States. So in the global world, countries - most
24 of the ships that coming in, 90-some-odd percent of the
25 ship that comes in come from foreign countries. They're

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 in business to make money, so therefore they deal with
2 world trade.

3 Chemical that comes in the river, I mean, on
4 - aboard the ships, some of this - you know, some ships
5 come in sometimes with containers with all type of - of
6 cargo. And you never know, unless you look at the bill
7 of lading or something, that's how you can tell what's
8 supposed to be in the container. Nuclear stuff comes in.
9 And we have certain type of label on those things to tell
10 you different type of - of danger, you know, different
11 type of chemical that comes in, what type of explosion -
12 explosive there is. And what - I also am the safety
13 director with our - our union, so I deal with a lot of
14 stuff dealing with safety. And it's some type of stuff
15 that comes in, might come in a container, and you don't
16 have time enough to look at a bill of lading or something
17 like that. It tells you this, that if you see a leak or
18 something, a drop or something that - on this container
19 or what-have-you, just tell everybody to go. Don't ask
20 no question. Evacuate that whole area. Just go in the
21 car, whatever, and leave.

22 And the only thing I'm saying here is that
23 it is frightening. And I'm not - because the experts
24 have already talked. I'm going to be looking at all of
25 this information and reading up on a lot of this

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 information. But the key thing is, what I'm saying is
2 that I agree that we should take politics out of it. We
3 should get it away from the Savannah River and take it
4 somewhere else, as the young lady said, the mountains or
5 somewhere, I think I read something in here.

6 But the key thing right here, what I'm
7 trying to say, that I'm in support of what is best for
8 the citizens and what-have-you in Chatham County. Not
9 only Chatham County but, you know, this whole area.
10 Because this is - and this is serious. And I was with
11 Mr. Pleasant, what-have-you, think that we ought to give
12 you some information so we can have another meeting to
13 make sure that you get in touch with the community and
14 get them here where they can listen to all this
15 information. Thank you very much.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. CAMERON: And thank you for those
18 remarks, Mr. Dunham. And thank you for the offer to give
19 us some - some contacts, too. And we'll - we'll work
20 with you on that.

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

23 MS. DANIELS: I would like to make a
24 comment.

25 MR. CAMERON: All right. And if you could,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 it's - it's Evelyn?

2 MS. DANIELS: Yeah, Evelyn Daniels.

3 MR. CAMERON: Evelyn Daniels. Okay.

4 MS. DANIELS: I notice the water that's in
5 my kitchen seems to be much clearer. I was wondering if
6 everyone else noticed that. It's much clearer and it
7 looks more drinkable. And I certainly appreciate it.
8 That's all.

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

12 Any - any other - we have some - a little
13 bit more time, and I know we are getting sort of tired,
14 probably. But are there any questions that - anybody who
15 might have a question who didn't talk before, first of
16 all? Give you an opportunity to ask a - a question, and
17 then we'll go to - we'll go to Sara, for one.

18 Okay, Sara, you have a question for the -
19 for the NRC?

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

23 Is the NRC going to study the transport by
24 ship, most likely, of the lead test assembly that is
25 going to be possibly constructed in Belgium? And, you

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 know, is that coming in...

2 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I'm not getting
3 you. I'm just not hearing you.

4 MS. BARCZAK: Okay, no problem.

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

7 MS. BARCZAK: Okay, can you hear me now?
8 All right.

9 MR. CAMERON: That's that commercial thing.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MS. BARCZAK: Starting over, and I'll
12 hopefully say it in a more succinct way. The lead test
13 assembly that's going to be - or the lead test assemblies
14 that are going to be made - that are likely to be made in
15 a European country, possibly Belgium, how are those
16 assemblies going to be shipped?

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

22 MR. CAMERON: This is Dave - Dave Brown. Go
23 ahead.

24 MR. BROWN: Yeah. At this point there
25 hasn't been a decision about where to manufacture the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 lead test assemblies. To give folks a feel, the lead
2 test assemblies would be the first few MOX assemblies
3 that would be constructed for testing. They would be
4 used at the McGuire and Catawba stations, and then be
5 tested to see how they performed. So we - we don't have
6 enough information at this point about the shipments,
7 because we don't know where the assemblies will be
8 manufactured.

9 You had a second question?

10 MS. BARCZAK: What about this...

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

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

14 MR. BROWN: The second question was on the
15 transportation of the plutonium?

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

19 MR. BROWN: We would - we're studying the
20 transportation risks associated with bringing plutonium
21 to the Savannah River Site for the purpose of making MOX
22 fuel. So, yes, we would - and the - and I just don't
23 know whether Savannah port is one of the ports of entry
24 for that material. I think they'd be more likely truck
25 shipments.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 The DOE has what they call safeguards to
2 transport, safe and secure transport for this type of
3 material. I think we referred to it earlier as an armed
4 transport, highly secure, tracked by the Department of
5 Energy. They know where it is all the time, that sort of
6 thing.

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

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

14 MR. BROWN: The question was related to
15 terrorism attacks and whether we should evaluate these as
16 part of our environmental impact.

17 MR. LANIER: As far as shipping it into the
18 port, no matter if it's going into here or Charleston or
19 wherever.

20 MR. BROWN: Okay, this is a question that is
21 currently before the Commission, and the five-member
22 Commission, which we have a brief description in the
23 back, is considering this right now. So the staff at
24 this point is awaiting their decision.

25 MR. CAMERON: Just as a clarification on

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that, the Commission has security and safeguard
2 regulations in effect for transportation of nuclear
3 materials and for any facilities that we have. And what
4 - what Dave is referring to is a overall (sic) evaluation
5 that the Commission has studied to see if those
6 regulations for transportation of individual facilities
7 should be made stricter because of 9/11.

8 And let's go back to Mr. Jackson. Thank
9 you.

10 MR. JACKSON: No, I want to ask a question,
11 please.

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

14 MR. JACKSON: Lester Jackson. My question
15 is...

16 MR. CAMERON: Dave - is the question for
17 Dave or...

18 MR. JACKSON: For Dave.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay, go ahead.

20 MR. JACKSON: Dave, you mentioned this five-
21 man Commission. And you mentioned these commissioners.
22 Do these - does the five man Commission - do all these
23 guys have names or people have names?

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. JACKSON: Right. Are these - are those
2 - are the names available? Are the names available?
3 What's their titles, their credentials to give us the
4 information; all right? Are those names available?

5 MR. BROWN: Yes.

6 MR. JACKSON: Another thing is about the
7 nuclear project, in case of some terrorist group. What
8 would you do, all right, if - if a terrorist invade this
9 area from a ship or - or planes coming to the Savannah
10 River Site, what would you do, because you're the expert
11 here tonight, and talking as a lay person, would - would
12 you get in your car and drive south or get in your car
13 and drive north, go to a bomb shelter, would you go to a
14 - would you go to the basement of your home? What would
15 we do as a common citizen? And I want to speak for - and
16 you remember, we're talking about 250,000 constituents of
17 just Chatham County.

18 MR. BROWN: Okay, let me address the first
19 question. The description of the five commissioners is
20 right behind you on a poster with their names. And
21 generally these folks are nominated by the President,
22 confirmed by the Senate for their positions. And we
23 currently have all five commissioners seated on the
24 Commission.

25 With respect to your second question, how

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 would I respond. I would listen to federal authorities.
2 We have, at the NRC, requirements for emergency plans for
3 facilities where that could be a hazard, for a nuclear
4 power plant, for example. And the best thing you can do
5 is to make sure you've got a radio or television to
6 listen for instructions on what to do.

7 MR. CAMERON: And I think that, isn't it
8 true - and my colleagues from the NRC can correct me on
9 this. But the - the local authorities around the
10 facility really have been given much of the planning and
11 implementation responsibility for emergency preparation.
12 So look to those local authorities, okay, rather - who
13 know the situation, perhaps. Not necessarily the - the
14 federal wing. I don't know, Dave, do you want to clarify
15 anything?

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

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

21 MR. DUNHAM: Dave, let me ask you something
22 else. I saw in the paper - I didn't see it, but it
23 happened on the port yesterday. I think they - the paper
24 had four or five stowaway (sic) on a ship that came here.
25 But the stowaways was from - they was harmless, I think,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 because they came from the island of Panama or something
2 close here.

3 MR. LANIER: I think they came from the
4 Dominican Republic.

5 MR. DUNHAM: Okay, somewhere close. But
6 what I'm saying is that that could have - easily could
7 have been some terrorists stowed that way, too, coming
8 into a port - into the port. Since 9/11, the port have
9 changed, security have changed somewhat, and it's going
10 to get tougher, it's going to get a lot, you know, more
11 tighter and everything else.

12 And in a situation like that, what do you -
13 can you elaborate on something like that in a port that
14 - and, Dave, looking at this thing, because they're
15 tightening up on all ports, because they're - they're
16 afraid now that something like this could happen. And
17 they could trigger something here if they came in on the
18 ship and blow up the port or what-have-you. They could
19 do that, you know.

20 And another thing, and this is the last
21 thing, is that I don't know what type of chemical or a
22 particular type of ship that comes into the port every
23 now and then on a rare occasion. But what would happen
24 is that when that ship comes in, they stop all traffic of
25 all other ships, you know. Basically, all the ships

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 would - would pass each other and come in back and forth.
2 But when this particular ship comes in, they close the
3 river just for that particular vessel until it comes all
4 the way up. I don't know where it goes or what-have-you,
5 but it comes in like that. Thank you.

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

7 The question I think you're asking about the
8 - about port security is - generally, I think, is - is in
9 the hands of other federal agencies, although I think the
10 - the NRC would advise the other federal agencies and the
11 local port about any particular shipment of radioactive
12 material...

13 MR. DUNHAM: Right.

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

18 MR. BROWN: I think the - and you've touched
19 on it, Chip, the concept of the federal emergency
20 response. Who takes the lead, depending on the kind of
21 emergency that might evolve. And the federal government
22 has planned that out, so that if it's - if we know what
23 kind of hazard or threat has been posed, then we know who
24 takes the lead. And for radiological emergencies in the
25 United States, that would - we would be the lead federal

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 agency helping to coordinate the response.

2 MR. CAMERON: If it's one just - since we're
3 sort of talking in - more informally here, there was a
4 situation that you may have read about off the coast of
5 New York where there was a ship, it was a container ship
6 coming into New York City about a week ago, and they
7 detected - when it got in, they detected high radiation
8 levels that might have been consistent with some type of
9 nuclear device.

10 MR. BROWN: Right.

11 MR. CAMERON: The Department of Energy has
12 a special team called NEST. And I do not know what that
13 acronym stands for. But they came in to deal with that
14 situation. But the EPA regional office in Manhattan,
15 Region 2, they were in charge of that incident, not the
16 - not the NRC. The NRC was consulted. But in that
17 particular case---and I would imagine it would be the
18 same here---the EPA would be involved. Okay.

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

21 MR. COBB: Yes.

22 MR. CAMERON: And we'll do - finish up with
23 some questions here, and then we'll - we'll adjourn. Mr.
24 Jackson?

25 MR. JACKSON: I was just - my question was

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 answered.

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

5 MS. JENNINGS: Judy Jennings. Thank you.
6 I'm not sure that I quite understood it's the situation.
7 The story with Russia - the story with Russia, is the
8 plan to use - to use Russian plutonium at the same
9 facility?

10 MR. BROWN: No. The - at this project with
11 surplus plutonium, the - the Russians will take a
12 parallel approach, but independently, with their own
13 plant on their own territory.

14 MR. HARRIS: With their own plutonium.

15 MR. BROWN: Right.

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

18 MR. JERNIGAN: Anthony Jernigan. Just a
19 quick question. Forgive my skept - I can't talk about -
20 scepticism. I can't talk. Sorry.

21 Just out of curiosity---I know you're not
22 going to be able to give me direct numbers---say in the
23 past five or ten years - I just want to make sure we're
24 not jumping through hoops here for no reason. How many
25 licenses in general of all sorts has the NRC actually

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 denied? Just rough percentage.

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

4 MR. JERNIGAN: Was that mainly for
5 environmental and safety reasons or...

6 MR. HARRIS: A number of reasons. A lot of
7 times what happens is the NRC goes through rounds and
8 rounds of questions trying to resolve technical issues
9 that don't get resolved and - and the applicant just
10 withdraws their application. That's probably more
11 routinely - routine than an actual denial. But, yeah, we
12 don't grant licenses every time somebody asks for them.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

14 Mr. Nadelman?

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

25 MR. HARRIS: Correct me if I'm wrong here,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 but I think those plans are available for a specific
2 site. And - and they do do exercises at say nuclear
3 power plants that involve the entire surrounding
4 communities to periodically test the emergency response.

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

12 MR. CHAPUT: Yeah. Ernie Chaput.

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

25 MR. HARRIS: And can I just state the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 information that Ernie is referring to is from the DCS
2 environmental report, and the NRC hasn't made any
3 determination...

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

6 MR. HARRIS: That's - I believe that's
7 right.

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

10 MR. COBB: Kirk.

11 MR. CAMERON: Kirk Cobb.

12 MR. COBB: I've written a few notes here,
13 just random ideas and thoughts as I listened to
14 everybody.

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

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

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

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

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

6 Just another thought. If we're going to
7 handle this kind of stuff, plutonium, we've got to keep
8 it away from population centers. We got to keep - keep
9 it away from - from water. I mean, what's wrong with
10 Rocky Mountain Flats area? It's dry - it's a dry desert,
11 for god sakes. You've got to build a new plant to handle
12 this stuff in - somewhere, for god sakes, why are we
13 building it next to the Savannah River? Why don't we
14 build it out in Rocky Mountain Flats in - where it's a -
15 we don't have a population center there? We have a - a
16 much more controlled environment out there, I would
17 think, from an 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 their
21 hands on it and still convert it back to a weapons grade
22 material? I don't know. Maybe it is better off to have
23 it diluted down to 4% in - in a mixed oxide fuel. Maybe
24 it's less vulnerable that way. I don't know. We got to
25 count on you guys to make that decision. And these are

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 just general comments.

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

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 better understanding of what the risks are of this whole
2 thing.

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

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Mr. Cobb.
5 And thanks for that...

6 MR. COBB: And be socially responsible, too.

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

10 MR. HARRIS: Sure.

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

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

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

23 And I would just thank our presenters, Dave
24 Brown, Tim Harris, tonight, and the rest of the NRC staff
25 that - that are here. Take some time - we have people

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 from our regional office, people from our Office of
2 General Counsel. Please take some time, if you can
3 tonight after we're done, to talk with them.

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

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

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

21 Now, Tim did not mention this tonight, but
22 I want to just say that September 30th is not a drop-dead
23 date. So try to get your comments in by September 30th.
24 If you have some problem and you're a few days late or a
25 week late, we always have the policy of addressing

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 whatever comments we can, if it doesn't impact our
2 ability to do so by, you know, waiting six months, of
3 course. That's a little too long. But try to be as
4 timely as possible, but we encourage you to provide us
5 comments. That is the way that we have an informed
6 decision process.

7 And with that, I think that's enough. I'll
8 end here. Thank you.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. We're -
10 we're adjourned.

11 (Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at
12 9:47 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

NEAL R. GROSS

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