U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE ACCEPTANCE AND DISPOSITION OF USED NUCLEAR FUEL CONTAINING U.S.-ORIGIN HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM FROM THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

DATE: JUNE 24, 2014

7:00 p.m.

North Augusta Community Center

495 Brookside Avenue

North Augusta, SC 29841

Holmes Brown, Facilitator

Maxcine Maxted, Department of Energy, EA Document Manager

REPORTED BY: Claire R. Netzler, CCR

ATKINSON-BAKER, INC.
COURT REPORTERS
(800) 288-3376
www.depo.com
FILE NO.: A806F0C

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

INDEX

	Page Number
Introduction by Mr. Brown	4
Dr. David Moody	6
Dr. Andy Cwalina	8
Mr. Tom Clements	11
Mr. Sam Booher	14
Mr. Ernest Chaput	15
Mr. Jack Edlow	15
Mr. MJ Plodinec	20
Ms. Sue Parr	21
Mr. Chuck Georgen	24
Ms. Marolyn Parson	26
Mr. Clint Wolfe	26
Mr. Gerald Rudolph	28
Ms. Susan Corbett	29
Ms. Joanne Williams	31
Mr. William Johnson	31
Mr. R. Keith Sloan	34
Mr. Tom Coleman	38
Ms. Pamela Greenlaw	38
Mr. Charles Utley	40
Mr. Wayne Rickman	42

Mr. Donald Bridges 44

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

INDEX - continued

Page Number

Ms. Suzanne Rhodes 46

Ms. Laura Lance 49

Ms. Glenn Carroll 51

Ms. Gloria Tatum 53

Ms. Courtney Hanson 55

Ms. Betsy Rivard 56

Ms. Elizabeth Witham 58

Mr. Rick Berry 59

Mr. Harry Harmon 61

Ms. Connie Young 63

Ms. Jesse Colin Young 64

Ms. Denice Traina 65

Closing Remarks by Mr. Brown 66

FORMAL COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC HEARING ON JUNE 24, 2014

(In session at 7:30 p.m.)

MR. BROWN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the public scoping meeting on the proposed project to accept used nuclear fuel from the Federal Republic of Germany at the Savannah River Site. I hope you've had the opportunity to browse the display at the back of the room and talk to staff during the just-concluded open house. My name is Holmes Brown. I will serve as a facilitator for tonight's meeting. I'm not employed with DOE or an advocate for any position. My role this evening is to ensure that the meeting runs on time and that everybody has an opportunity to speak. I'll now explain the format and ground rules to ensure timely participation. There are three parts to this meeting: The just-concluded open house, the DOE slide presentation, and the formal comment period. Those who wish to submit comments and have not yet signed up to do so, may sign up at the desk in the front office. The -- a number of things are listed. The ways in which you can submit comments is listed on a comment poster in the back of the room and also on the comment poster hand out. This information is also available in the Federal Register notice. The public information period began

with the just-concluded the 30 minute open house and continues with a presentation by the EA Document Manager, Maxcine Maxted. She also serves as the Used Nuclear Fuel Program Manager at the Savannah River Site. Ms. Maxted will discuss the origins of the used fuel, the potential transportation modes and casks, and the processing and disposition of the highly enriched uranium. She will also explain the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA that governs the EA process. Please refrain from questions during the slide presentation.

The formal comment period will follow the slide presentation. During this segment, members of the public will provide comments on the scope of the EA. The court reporter will transcribe your comments verbatim and they will be included in the permanent record. A DOE official will be present to hear your comments. Again, if you have not yet signed up, you can do so at the registration table. I will call the speakers in the order in which they've signed up on the sign-up sheet. Based on the number of people signing up, each speaker will be allotted a specified amount of time. Speakers may not defer or yield their assigned minutes to another person.

We will now resume the information period. I would like to introduce -- I would like to introduce Dr. David Moody, manager of Savannah River Site. He will offer

welcoming remarks and will introduce Maxcine Maxted, EA Document Manager for DOE.

DR. MOODY: First of all, I would like to thank you for taking your time this busy time of the year to participate in this public scoping meeting and I encourage you to comment. The Department of Energy values public opinions and factors those into the decision making process, and that's the reason we're here tonight. We want to hear from you. So we are seeking public input on proposed receipt and disposition of German highly enriched uranium fuel. The Savannah River Site is a unique asset that provides tremendous capability in the realm of nuclear materials research and disposition. And as you'll hear in Maxcine's presentation, Savannah River National Laboratory research has made removal of the fuel kernels from the graphite spheres feasible, which has been a disposition challenge in the past. This activity would support the U.S. policy for highly enriched uranium minimization, removing this material from any sort of weapons use in the future. With that being said, I would like to introduce Ms. Maxcine Maxted from my staff. She's the Savannah River Site Spent Fuel Program Manager and has the lead for the German HEU fuel at the site, and she will be presenting tonight.

(Slide presentation was given from 7:05 to 7:23 p.m.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. Alright. Thanks very much. Thanks, Ms. Maxted. This concludes the information period. We will take a five minute break to set up the court reporter and then also to review the sign-up sheet for speakers. When we return we will start the public comments on the environmental assessment. So give us just a few minutes. Thanks very much.

(Brief break from 7:24 to 7:30 p.m.)

MR. BROWN: This is now your opportunity to provide DOE with comments on the proposed scope of the environmental assessment. The court reporter tonight is Claire Netzler, who will transcribe your comments. Let me review a few ground rules for formal comments. Please step up to the microphone over there when your name is called. Introduce yourself providing your organizational affiliation where appropriate. Please speak directly into the microphone, so that the court reporter and the participants present can hear you. If you have a written version of your statement, please hand it to the court reporter after your comments. I will call two names at a time. The first is the speaker and the second is the person to follow. In view of the number of people who've indicated an interest in speaking tonight, please confine

your public statement to three minutes and I will let you know when you have a minute left. If you have a statement longer than three minutes, please summarize the key points in the allotted time and submit the rest in the various forms that were listed on the material in back. All comments have equal weight whether they're verbal or provided in writing at the meeting, by e-mail, fax free fax, or by the US mail. This meeting is scheduled to end at nine p.m. but I would like to give everybody at least three minutes to speak, and we may run a little bit over time. But I want to urge everybody in the interest of reaching the meeting at the end at the right time, and also to allow folks who signed up at the end to get their say in, to confine their statements to three minutes. I notice that you, as you near the end of the meeting, often you have an attrition rate and lose some of the folks who've indicated an interest in wanting to speak. Maxcine Maxted with DOE will be serving as Hearing Officer during this formal comment period. Again, DOE will not be responding to comments or questions during this comment period, but comments and questions will be addressed during the preparation of the environmental assessment. So, with that by way of introduction, let me call on our first speaker. It's Dr. Andy Cwalina, and he will be followed by Tom Clements.

DR. CWALINA: Thank you, I'm Andy Cwalina. I'm currently doing post-doc research with Southeastern University, particularly in the area of industrial safety and occupational health. Maxcine, Dr. Moody, my comments, opinions, and conclusions which follow, regarding the safety performance and the ongoing safety culture at the Savannah River Site are critical factors in the environmental assessment required by NEPA. My discussion and analysis will conclude that these factors clearly support a finding of no significant impact for this particular work.

The highly enriched uranium contained in the German spent fuel can only be rendered safe by removing it from civil commerce. There is simply no safer way to disposition this material. Several factors lead to the conclusion that SRS is the safest place to do that. First, leaving the fuel in Germany doesn't inevitably exclude the U.S., or any other nation from the consequences of an accident. Historical transport of radioactive fallout from weapons testing shows that radiation knows no boundaries. The entire world is a single impact location. Thus, protection of the health and safety of U.S. citizens and any other nation requires that this fuel be processed in the safest place in the world. And that safest place is the Savannah River Site.

Second, in comparison to the German facilities, U.S. can store it and process it much more safely. In fact, it cannot even be stored for long periods of time in Germany, thus, allowing it to remain there would not be the safest alternative. Third, is the SRS has already repatriated large amounts of stored and processed spent reactor fuels from foreign research reactors as part of the Atoms for Peace Program. We know how to do it and have never sustained an accident associated with any of these repatriation work. None of this work has ever triggered a formal investigation, nor has any worker ever been injured as a result of this. SRS has proven been the safest place for handling this fuel. The culture of safety permeates deeply at the Savannah River Site and the surrounding communities. The men and women at Savannah River Site set records by working almost 25 million hours without a lost workday injury. For the 13th year, they received the Star of Excellence Award from the DOE for the Voluntary Protection Program. The Savannah River National Lab, which currently has the lead responsibility for this program, has been deemed DOE's safest national laboratory for the year 2013. There have been no --

MR. BROWN: About a minute left.

MR. CWALINA: -- personnel contaminations at SRS

since 2010. Without question SRS, the German fuel would be in the hands of the safest workers in the world. Finally, the health and safety of our neighbors surrounding SRS have the highest priority. Contamination and the effluents from SRS operations are below one percent of the safe drinking water limits, demonstrating that SRS has the capability to protect the public. Again, without question, the public's health and welfare would best be served by receiving, storing, and processing the German fuel at SRS. In conclusion, regardless of the political, economic, or contractual reasons, the most compelling reason to receive, store and process the German fuel at SRS is because it is the safest facility in which to do it. I urge you at this point in your EA to conclude a FONSI. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Tom Clements is next and I think its Sam Booher will follow. When you have a minute left, Tom, I'll hold up this sign, but if you don't happen to be looking at me, I'll give you a verbal reminder, as well.

MR. CLEMENTS: Thank you my name is Tom Clements. I'm the Director of Savannah River Site Watch, SRS Watch, a public interest organization that monitors the Savannah River Site. I've got a 20-page comment with quite a number of technical documents as attachments. I've

posted these on SRSwatch.org already, but I'm submitting them for the record printed tonight. I would like to thank those of you who have come to speak out expressing concern and other opinions about Savannah River Site receiving additional high-level waste. The proposal before us, as we've seen would mean more high level waste would come to Savannah River Site and essentially be stranded. The proposal must be rejected and a no action alternative must be supported. Germany made the waste and it can and must deal with it, even if they are having similar problems with locating a geological repository, as is the United States. The reactors in question, the AVR, by the way, the name is Arbeitsgemeinschaft Versuchsreaktor which means experimental reactor. It wasn't research reactor. There are two experimental gas fuel reactors. The records shows they produced electricity in one of them for quite a number of years. Thus, we are dealing with commercial spent nuclear fuel. The German Government and the IAEA are clear they were nuclear power reactors though they were experimental. This is from the IAEA and the German government itself which lists these as power reactors, but the boundaries of the proposal have a real dilemma because under German law since 2005 it is illegal to export spent nuclear fuel for reprocessing and disposal abroad, so some in Germany

and in DOE are engaged in what I believe is a deception to try and reclassify the reactors as research reactors, but nothing in the record supports that. Although, I understand the German -- they're making a German analysis supporting it that's come out 25 years after the reactors been closed. The IAEA and the German Government until now have called them experimental reactors, and even researchers at Jülich facility have called the AVR reactor an experimental reactor not a research reactor. There's a claim that 900 kilograms of HEU is in the spent fuel, but that was when it was supplied. What is the amount now? There's an analysis from Germany that the AVR fuel has little if any HEU fuel left in it. The EA is going to have to address that question. How much is left in the spent fuel at this present time? If it doesn't have any, there's no reason to bring it. The DOE's Federal Register notes that commercial spent fuel would come to SRS for processing and disposition. The first part of that is disturbing and the second part untrue. First, there is no disposal on Savannah River Site and we're finding that out because we have about 3800 canisters of vitrified high level waste with no place to go. Second, development of a new processing technique, and to conclude, by Savannah River National Lab has its own proliferation risks, and that -- those

risks rather than leaving the hard demanding spent fuel in Germany for deep geologic disposal may be the greatest proliferation and risk with this effort. I'm sure the Chinese would be interested in it. Finally, in summary, we don't want Savannah River Site to become a commercial spent fuel dump and I thus support the alternative to leave the waste in Germany. Thank you very much, and I will end at this time.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Thanks, Tom. Sam is next. Not sure about your last name right but the court reporter will want it. Okay.

MR. BOOHER: You were right and most people aren't.

MR. BROWN: Okay. And then Ernie Chaput will be after you.

MR. BOOHER: My name is Sam Booher. I live locally here in Martinez. I am a member of the local Sierra Club. I think it's very generous of our State Department to offer to allow a German commercial power plant to ship its nuclear waste to Savannah River Site for vitrification and then storage at SRS. It really will not be that costly to the American public to pay for this one time processing and permanent storage. My concern is what will happen when England, India, Pakistan, and the other countries that are at this time friendly with the United States find out? Will they want their State

Department -- will they want our State Department to do the same thing for their commercial reactors? Maybe we will see it as a job creating tool for South Carolina processing all this foreign commercial nuclear waste and storing it here. My second question is what will happen when Barnwell finds out? What about the nuclear waste they're holding from Connecticut, New Jersey, and South Carolina commercial nuclear power plants? Will we open the door for more South Carolina jobs in processing of the waste at SRS? Last, what about Plant Vogtle and the other 48 states' commercial nuclear waste? Are they going to be standing by while the State Department gives preferential treatment to foreign governments in Barnwell, South Carolina? The doors opening -- does opening the door for Germany mean we're opening the door for the whole world's commercial nuclear waste? Is SRS going to be renamed the world's commercial nuclear waste repository? What does the State Department say to this idea? What does the federal budget planners say to this idea? But more important what do the citizens of Aiken County think of the idea of living next door to the world's commercial nuclear waste repository? Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Ernie is next and Jack Edlow will follow Ernie Chaput.

MR. CHAPUT: Thank you. My name is Ernest Chaput

and I am providing comments on behalf of the Economic Development Partnership on proposed environmental assessment. For over 25 years the EDP has been an involved stakeholder in all matters affecting Savannah River and the impacts on the rural communities. We have six comments on DOE's proposed environmental assessment. The first comment is reducing the world's stockpiles of weapons-capable nuclear materials, we consider to be a moral imperative. SRS has long been a key non-proliferation performer and we see no reason it should not be involved in this Germany HEU fuel. Second, Savannah River has all the attributes necessary to safely and effectively perform the proposed research and disposition programs, it has a culture of safety and environmental responsibility, it has the right facilities, it has the technology base, it has the experienced workforce. The proposed program builds on a successful past and helps support an important future. Third, DOE's notice of intent for the Proposed EA states in part and I quote, the EA will analyze the potential environmental impacts of a proposal to accept and process the disposition used nuclear fuel from Germany, unquote. We interpret this statement to mean there will be no receipt of any of the subject German fuel at SRS unless and until the EA has been completed and a FONSI has been

issued and signed. I'd like the DOE to clarify as to correct interpretation or not, and if it's not, please give us what the correct interpretation that it should be. Fourth, NEPA requires the agencies to evaluate socio-economic impacts as part of the review of any proposed federal action. Issues associated with used nuclear fuel and nuclear waste often result in intangible or subjective impacts which are not adequately considered in NEPA's objective-based criteria. We recommend that DOE perform an in-depth review of potential intangible socioeconomic impacts which may be associated with the German fuel program and propose appropriate mitigating measures in its findings. Fifth, we were pleased to note that DOE will hold another hearing at the end of the EA preparation and before you take final action. That was a recommendation of ours that you've anticipated, thank you. Sixth, as follow-on to the EA, we recommend that court-enforceable contract be established between the Federal Republic of Germany, the Department of Energy, and the state of South Carolina which codifies the proposed disposition pathway, establishes a schedule and provides funding for the prompt disposal of the German fuel as it is shipped to SRS. The contract must be enforceable in both the United States and in Germany and we believe should be in place prior to the first receipt

of any fuel at the SRS. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this most important proposed environmental assessment. And I do have written comments I'll provide.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Thanks very much. Jack Edlow is next and MJ Plodinec will follow.

MR. EDLOW: Good evening, and thank you very much for the opportunity to come speak with you. My name is Jack Edlow. As the president of Edlow International Company, we provide transportation services for radioactive cargos and should this project go forward, I'm likely to be the transportation -- the company responsible for the transportation of this cargo. As we have done for more than 50 years to Savannah River. Yes, not me, but my father before me, shipped the first fuel back to Savannah River in 1963. And I have been involved in hundreds of shipments back here since that time involving thousands of casks. First of all, I'd like to comment that this is in fact not waste material. This is material which is being recovered, recycled and recovered and disposed of as was indicated in your slides. This is very important to understand. During that 50 years the United States has returned many types of fuels. They've returned TRIGA fuels, they've returned MTR fuels, they've returned DIDO fuel, and now they're returning liquid

fuels, and now this project is graphite fuels. It's all basically the same in that it's highly enriched uranium and in some cases its lower enriched uranium, but it all comes from research reactors or test reactors from around the world. And this graphite is a new form of fuel which will come back with this program, and as indicated, amazing scientific breakthroughs have taken place to allow this type of material to be processed at Savannah River Plant. You have an amazing, unique machine here at this site. It's a one of a kind in the United States and very few machines are like it and that is H Canyon as to what can be processed in that machine and it's a great opportunity for this community to benefit from this machine that can provide economic activity. Now, because I have been involved in transportation all my life, I know a lot about this and I understand most of the people don't know as much as I do. So, I'm available to discuss this kind of thing with you either tonight or I'll give you my card before I leave this evening and you're welcome to contact me. I'll be happy to return down here to talk to people again because I don't want it to be scary or strange and I think people need to understand that this isn't something that's dangerous to them. It's something that we do routinely around the world, and I would be happy to share it. But I think -- I'm very much

in favor of this project, obviously, and I think it's a great benefit and I congratulate Savannah River on its activities. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Sue Parry will follow MJ Plodinec.

MR. PLODINEC: I'm John Plodinec, retiree, resident of Aiken County for 30 years. As far as my bonafides are concerned, I was actually was the technical lead author for the EA for the DWPF at high level waste and was also the one that made the technical case for the EPA the high-level, or that vitrification was the appropriate approach the for the best demonstration of available technology. I strongly support this program and the notice of intent for several reasons. First, and perhaps most importantly that we haven't talked about yet, I believe that this program is in the nation's best interest because it looks at putting this material into forms that will be rendered useless to our nation's enemies. I want to spend my brief time here talking mostly about that. Currently, as it's been said, the material is being stored in two locations in Germany. It's within ten miles of the Dutch border in both cases. This is not a very secure location for either because terrorist or agents of a rogue nation can infiltrate from one country into the other and with all, you know, virtually no action. Now, we can talk about this

experimental versus research. I'm sorry, that's a distinction without a difference. Experiment, research, we're playing semantics there. We also have to remember that this material was produced originally, the HEU was originally produced in this country. If something were to happen to that, either by a rogue state or by a terrorist in some way causing a problem for another country, in Europe for example, it's our reputation that will suffer. We as a country would suffer irreparable harm to our reputation or standing in the world. And at this point and time this is the wrong time to have that kind of an action, to be starting that kind of action.

MR. BROWN: You have one minute.

MR. PLODINEC: Thank you. Andy Cwalina has already talked about the safety record of both SRS and the Savannah River National Lab. I will say also that Savannah River National Lab has unique facilities and it is unique in the combinations of the facilities in human capital to do this job. For that reason, it's the right place to do it. It's the right thing to do, it's the right place to do it, and I believe that, as DOE has laid out, the program is going to be carried out in the right way, so I strongly support it. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Okay. Sue Parr is next and Chuck Georgen will follow.

MRS. PARR: Good evening, my name is Susan Parr, and I'm the president of the Augusta Metro Chamber of Commerce. Our organization serves as a platform for 1100 businesses and organizations in our region that seek to voice their opinions on matters of public policy at the local, state, and national levels. We certainly appreciate the opportunity to provide comments at this public hearing.

For over 60 years, the Savannah River Site has provided outstanding leadership in its missions to manage nuclear materials. Its facilities, human capital and expertise represent the best in the industry and in many respects, the world. The scientists, researchers and workers at the Savannah River Site are our neighbors and friends. We trust them to keep our community safe as they carry out the mission that they have been entrusted to them by our nation.

In the world of international nuclear material management, the United States must, without a doubt, assume and maintain a leadership role, especially at a time when we have the capabilities to offer innovation in an increasingly complex environment. As challenges and opportunities mold an ever-evolving industry, we have a responsibility long-term to discover and implement the technologies that will lead to an even safer and

stabilized future for nuclear materials.

U.S. superiority in developing and implementing technologies that minimize HEU and pioneer the safest and securest disposition of the proliferant materials is already being demonstrated by the Savannah River National Lab. The HTGR project exemplifies the capabilities of SRS as a preeminent resource our nation and the world can depend on. As the surrounding community, we are very proud of this distinction.

We are here this evening to let you know that our community overwhelmingly embraces our role as a region vital to the future of solving some of the world's most difficult problems. Our region has worked very hard to cultivate an environment and culture that supports and understands the important work at Savannah River Site. We believe the relationship between the Site and community serves as a model for what can be accomplished through education and awareness where value and appreciation for the missions of the site grow every day.

Savannah River Site represents a compelling solution for the future of national and international technical leadership in the nuclear industry and it is worthy of the opportunity to implement its plan for HTGR. Its unique assets should be valued for the state-of-the-art capabilities that they are and maximized for the

betterment of our country and our world. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Chuck Georgen and Marilyn Parson will follow Chuck.

MR. GEORGEN: I resided in Aiken since 1975. I have a degree in Chemistry and 39 years of experience of nuclear materials processing. I worked at Savannah River Site for 36 years before retiring in 2011 and I'm currently president of Nuclear Vision Consulting. I'm in favor of the HEU material being brought from Germany to the Savannah River site for interim storage, processing, and disposition. I see this as an international and U.S. security issue. The United States has a policy objective to reduce, and eventually eliminate, HEU from civil commerce. We were the supplier of this HEU and bear some responsibility. At the recent Nuclear Security Summits over 50 heads of state also support elimination of commercial HEU.

Highly enriched uranium can relatively easily be converted into an improvised nuclear device, that is an atomic bomb, a radiological device, or other radiological exposure device. Uranium can be shielded and more easily smuggled across borders than plutonium. The unclassified amount of U-235 to make a nuclear weapon is 25 kilograms. The 900 kilograms of HEU represented in this material is enough to make 35 weapons equivalent to the Hiroshima

bomb. The Manhattan Project was so confident of the gun assembly technique for this weapon that they considered it, no need to test Little Boy.

The chemical processing technology of uranium is available in the literature. The fission product activity in this material is decreasing to where it is no longer immediately lethal on contact. My concern is that suicidal people could process this material by hand for periods of time before succumbing to radiation illness, enough time to fabricate a device.

I support the repatriation of this HEU to Savannah River Site. SRS has the storage space and facilities to disposition this material to a form that is no longer useable by terrorists.

MR. BROWN: One minute left.

MR. GEORGEN: SRS already has the security infrastructure to protect 13,000 kilograms of plutonium and other used nuclear fuel. Adding to this protected inventory is not a challenge. Processing the material by innovative methods looks promising, but there is enough known to process the material and isotopically downblend the HEU to LEU (Low Enriched Uranium), which is not a nuclear proliferation threat. SRS has the knowledgeable people to accomplish this mission who have demonstrated performance by already safely downblending nearly 20

metric tons of HEU to 300,000 metric tons I'm sorry 300,000 kilograms of LEU.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Marilyn Parson and then Clint Wolfe.

MS. PARSON: I'm Marilyn Parson and I'm from Bluffton, South Carolina. The EA scope should include an analysis of the impacts if the new project causes delays in current missions at the site. This analysis should specifically analyze the impacts if the closing of the high level waste tanks and the processing of spent nuclear fuel from L-Basin are delayed by this new project. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Clint Wolfe, and he will be followed by Gerald Rudolph.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you for allowing me to speak tonight. My name is Clint Wolfe, and I'm the executive director of Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness. We're headquartered in Aiken and I've been a resident of Aiken for 25 years. I formerly managed the strategic materials technology department at SRNL. The scope included R & D for aftermath chemical processing, tritium, and used fuel. I also chaired a technical advisory panel for DOE's plutonium focus area. My written comments have been sent to Mr. Grainger so, he has those already. The subject fuel or so called

material exposed to experimental reactors in Germany between 1967 and 1989 was made of highly enriched uranium supplied by the United States and although it's in a very attractable matrix it is a proliferation risk in the wrong hands. The rationale, therefore, for accepting and processing this fuel is not only processing the foreign and domestic research reactor fuel, which the site has done for years very safely. The world needs to reduce the proliferation risk for various nuclear materials and SRS has the expertise to safely make this happen. SRNL is under contract to develop a process which can separate and recover the HEU. SRNL has done flow sheet development for a variety of materials over the years that help de-inventory the mountain laboratory, Rocky Flats, and process orphan materials from across the DOE complex including the Savannah River Site. The development of the disposition process is being funded by the German government as will the eventual disposition campaign. And I understand the entire program is likely to take five or six years and perhaps a billion dollars all funded by the German government. Since there's full cost recovery built into this arrangement, DOE dollars should go further in reducing legacy waste at SRS as the German funds help pay for some of the fixed costs associated with their work.

MR. BROWN: One minute remaining.

MR. WOLFE: The SRS record of safely managing nuclear materials is unmatched. Transport of used fuel has been successfully accomplished for 60 years in the United States without incident. It is generally agreed that the number one threat to our national security is based on some sort of terrorist activity. Securing this fuel and the highly enriched uranium in it will lessen that danger. It is a role proudly played by the employees at SRS for 60 years. Any mission at SRS has the implicit expectation of protection and environmental health and safety. This one is no different. There are many other positives about this program including making the world a safer place because of the special people at SRS. One might not only ask can we do it, but it is our duty to do it. I urge you find no significant impact. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Gerald Randolph, and Susan Corbett will be after him.

MR. RUDOLPH: Hello, my name is Gerald Rudolph. And I'm opposed to accepting this waste from Germany. If they don't have the technology and we do, why don't we send the technology to them and let them keep the waste and send the enriched uranium back to us. We can send the technology, we can send the experts to go over there

and advise them and they can keep their waste and they can keep the HEU that everyone seems to want. I think this vote should include the environmental risk of shipping the waste to the -- if there's the technicians and the technology and I think that if the NEPA as far as a strong -- the environmental impact of the world -- if it's not for the world, then it needs to be focused on the environmental impact for us in the United States and not for the environmental impact for the rest of the world. I think -- I support a no action, thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Susan Corbett will be followed by Joanne Williams.

MS. CORBETT: Good evening. My name is Susan Corbett. I'm the chair of the South Carolina Sierra Club. We're going to submit more formal comments in writing but I want to make a few comments tonight. The Sierra Club is on record for a long time opposing the importation of all kinds of waste at Savannah River Site. We have long believed that the primary function of the SRS is to clean up our environmental legacy, that's the most important thing, that's where the focus should be. And we certainly shouldn't be bringing in anything else that's going to be allowed to add to this legacy waste and it sounds like this isn't going anywhere any time soon. I agree with the previous speaker. Germans are

clever people. They are a highly technical society. They have all kinds of expertise. Let's sell them the technology. Let them do it themselves; let them keep it, reprocess it, whatever the chemical process is, let them store it. We cannot open Savannah River Site up to the world's nuclear waste. We just, -- this is the camel into the tent here, the German waste, next thing you know it's going to be the French or Italians or the Ukranians or the Romanians or where does it stop? It all started here. You know the Citizens Advisory Board considered this question of spent fuel not too long ago. And let there be no mistake, this is spent fuel, however you want to look at it, it's not right. It's still the raw graphite but it's still spent fuel. And the citizens of the Aiken area do want to be known as the world's spent fuel dump, and this is where this is headed. It's very obvious. Now, we cannot be the guardians of the world's weapons-usable material. Other people have to step up and take responsibility, otherwise Savannah River Site is going to be the end point for all this stuff worldwide. Is that what the citizens of South Carolina want? Outside of the people who have a vested interest in this industry, I can't find anybody that who wants that who lives in Aiken. So we say no, take no action. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Joanne Williams, welcome, and William Johnson will be after you.

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, Joanne Williams, from Columbia, and I'm here as a concerned citizen. And it's my understanding that there have been billions of dollars spent and years of work to clean up the Cold War radiation, but that there's still years' work to be done. Therefore, I say that there's no need for an environmental assessment because there's no need for one more gram of radioactive waste to be dumped on Dixie. It's sort of like a variation of the Las Vegas slogan; you know, what's dumped here, stays here. Only this time it's not because we want it to.

MR. BROWN: William Johnson and Keith Sloan will be next.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. My name is Bill Johnson and thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important matter where I can rise to offer my support for finding no significant impact to this proposed activity, and to urge that the EA scope fully consider all environmental and socioeconomic aspects of the proposed action to reach that conclusion. I do feel qualified to support this action, not only because 41 years ago almost to this day, I completed my master's thesis that was sponsored by the National Science Foundation, was done on

the safety of a graphite moderated reactor with BISO and TRISO coated fuel and graphite matrix, the same as this proposed action. But then prior to retiring after 40 years in the commercial and DOE and nuclear sectors, I've had the benefit of a firsthand experience in managing used fuel, nuclear processing, waste management, and environmental cleanup at the Savannah River Site, the Idaho National Laboratory and in Hanford. So I believe this EA should address the following three questions: First, does this action need to be taken? In my mind the answer is an emphatic yes. This fuel's not designed for permanent storage in its current form, as its disposal form. Some type of action to safely dispose of this fuel is ultimately required and doing so now provides the earliest environmental benefit of this process. Second, the proposed action eliminates the attractiveness and availability of the current fuel to those who may desire it for evil and destructive purposes. And this proposed action will develop the technology, infrastructure, and experience needed for DOE to address, not only this fuel, but the more than 2,200 graphite spent fuel elements the DOE has stored at Fort St. Vrain independent spent fuel storage installation in Colorado and at the Idaho National Laboratory. This fuel is materially the same as the fuel the DOE already has responsibility for out of

those test reactors. The second question that needs to be answered, is can this action be done safely and without adverse environmental consequences. In my mind the answer is clearly yes. DOE has safely handled and stored graphite-based nuclear fuel for over 30 years. And SRS has an exemplary record and a vast volume of used fuel storage, processing and waste management. The operational capabilities of H Canyon to perform this work are well mastered to the task and are indeed, unique. In the HEU blend down project in H Canyon, that was done in the mid-2000s, was done without adverse environmental incident. The same back end -- much of the same backend as proposed in this case. It was on budget, on schedule, and was recognized as the DOE project of the year in 2004. This activity builds on that success. Finally, the question must be asked is would this action present adverse socioeconomic consequences. Here the answer is no. On the contrary, this proposed action will provide substantial positive economic benefit. I've already stated that DOE has thousands of similar spent fuel elements it must handle and this goes along the way at providing the means to do so at no expense to the U.S. taxpayer. And contrary to the trends of the last several decades this proposed activity will actually import jobs into the U.S. financed by foreign sources. My belief is

the proposed action will not result in any significant environmental, adverse socioeconomic or cumulative impact and I support the proposed action based on the positive attributes. I respectively encourage the scope of the EA to comprehensively address these and thank you for the time and consideration.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Keith Sloan to the podium. Tom Coleman will be after you.

MR. SLOAN: Good evening, my name is Keith Sloan. I'm Barnwell County Council Representative for District 3, which encompasses Lewiston at the western edge of the county. My background in the nuclear industry goes back to the 1970s. I was employed with Allied General Nuclear Services and Barnwell Nuclear Fuel Plant which was a commercial nuclear fuel process which was not licensed by the U.S. Government and was shut down in 1983. I have a letter that I would like to submit, and I'd like to read it into the record. This is -- and I'd like to make clear that this is a letter that I wrote and is not the official position of the Barnwell County Government. That position will be debated and discussed by Barnwell County and submitted for a later date. This letter is to Mr. Andrew Grainger the NEPA Compliance Officer at the U.S. Department of Energy P.O Box B, Aiken, South Carolina, 29804.

Dear Mr. Grainger, I appreciate the opportunity to provide input regarding the Department of Energy's proposed Environmental Assessment for acceptance and disposition of used nuclear fuel containing Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) from the Federal Republic of Germany.

The management and disposition of spent nuclear fuel from this and other sources is an important global issue --one that affects national security, the economy and the protection of the environment for decades to come. Since the work is being done at the Savannah River Site, it is also a very important issue for my county and the region-one that must be carefully considered and reviewed to ensure it is done properly and with the protection of the people, the environment and public safety as top priorities. After initial review, there are concerns that the scope of the proposed Environmental Assessment is too narrow-that it focuses on environmental justice, it is not broad enough to accomplish the kind of comprehensive scrutiny that is required for a project of this type under the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Specifically, it is believed that the scope should be broadened to include:

Description of the existing economic base in the

five primary counties surrounding the Savannah River Site (Aiken, Allendale, Barnwell in South Carolina and Richmond and Columbia in Georgia.)

Description of local government service systems and expenditures within the region.

Description of demographic and social character within the region.

Employee residency by work location, labor status/occupation category and zip code.

Annual waste transportation shipments by mode, cask type and South Carolina route segments, which are very important in my county.

Impacts of project employment and procurement, by county, including their induced effects in the economies of the counties and region.

Impacts of the distribution of risk on property value and land development patterns within affected counties and region.

MR. BROWN: If you could just summarize it.

MR. SLOAN: Okay. Impacts of disproportionate distribution of risks among demographic sub-groups in the State of South Carolina and the five county region.

Furth, even though the Savannah River Site has an impressive safety record, the public must be assured that SRS has a clear understanding of the technical and safety

issues related to handling spent fuel containing Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) and how processing this type of fuel varies from spent nuclear fuel processed at the site previously.

In this connection, will any modifications or installation of new equipment be needed at H Canyon to accommodate this project? If so, what is the timeline for completion of these modifications? Finally, and perhaps most importantly, what is the designated disposition path for every waste stream that is generated during the course of this project? Will the disposition of waste associated with the project interfere in any significant way with the current mission to solidify and prepare for shipment to long term storage legacy waste currently at the SRS?

Following the public scoping period and the preparation of a Draft German HEU Fuel Environmental Assessment, the DOE is requested to provide a public comment period, which it did, and conduct individual public hearings in each of the five counties to receive input from the public on the Draft Environmental Assessment.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide this input to you, and it's my belief from my days at Allied General Nuclear services to today, that Savannah River

Site is an ideal place for nonproliferation. I believe that --

MR. BROWN: Sir, you've run over time.

MR. SLOAN: I'm sorry.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Submit your --

MR. SLOAN: I do support this effort and I hope it goes through.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you. Tom Coleman and Pam Greenlaw will be next.

MR. COLEMAN: I am Tom Coleman. I have worked in the nuclear industry for four decades in nuclear fuel reactors and government services. I reside in Aiken, South Carolina and I advocate SRNL doing the research and development to be able to recover the high enriched uranium from the German pebble bed reactor fuel. The recovery of this material will eliminate the possibility of it being acquired by potential enemies of the United States and may allow us to use this material for the production of electricity for U.S. consumers.

I am confident that SRNL has people with the appropriate knowledge and experience to perform this work in a safe and environmentally friendly manner. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thanks, Tom. Pamela is next, then Charles Utley will be after you.

MS. GREENLAW: Okay. My name is Pamela Greenlaw. I live in Columbia, South Carolina. It is a great state to be. I'm concerned about a number of things. First of all, the technology that is being used or being proposed is not complete and for us to say we do not need an EA, we don't need an EIS later on is premature. The technology has not been completed and that is speculative. So yes, the EA needs to be completed and possibly likely an EIS. Germany is going to bear the costs of the preparation work and, you know, the cost associated with acceptance, props, disposition, et cetera. Nothing is clear to me about how Germany is going to pay for long term storage. How many years are they going to commit to that? I like the idea of having a written contract of some sort, but it can't be possibly enforceable because it's not going to be up to a treaty status which is certainly something to consider. The idea, too, that we're going to take this spent fuel and get it out of the hands of terrorists, we're only going to be collecting it from countries to whom we've given the uranium and they don't want it anymore and the countries that are going to be keeping the uranium, such as Iran, you know, this doesn't make total sense to me. We're going to try to collect as much as we can in a place where we don't have the technology developed yet,

and then the countries that are not friendly with the United States, they don't need to steal this stuff; they've already got it. Pakistan's already got it; that's where the terrorist risk is. So this is -- this is a -- that people are trying to frighten us into saying we must take it.

MR. BROWN: You have one minute remaining.

MS. GREENLAW: Yes, sir. Thank you. So no action is what we need to do. The predispositional alternatives, reprocessing, I'm surprised DOE put even that out there because there's no utility that wants to do this. They're all saying, not me. No, we're not going to touch this. Okay so number one is out. Separating it and trying to bring it down to low levels, I don't know, and you don't either. So then I -- I believe in your presentation you said that the Germans found the graphite to be unfeasible. And I think your report needs to find out why they found it unfeasible and what is going -- what has happened with that. It's important because they might have environmental factors that we're unaware of. We need to know what they are. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Charles Utley. And Charles will be followed by Wayne Rickman.

MR. UTLEY: Good evening. Charles Utley with the

Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League and locally with with Brownsfield Program. I'm just kind of puzzled this afternoon, because what I've heard, it seemed to be a no-brainer and I'm saying that simply because we have said that we have found a solution. And as it was said earlier, if we found a solution, President Eisenhower gave it to them, why don't you just give it to them. So, therefore, I don't know how much truth there is that you've found a solution. And I'm ready to go with President Eisenhower because it was necessary to give it to them, so let's give them the technology. And I don't think Germans are that dumb. Because if they were smart enough to get some borrowed nuclear power plants, because they said it wasn't feasible for which they're building them, I'd like to know who's the smartest. And then we're saying how easy it is. You heard one of the gentlemen say that he's been working with it and it's very easy and shipping it and I can understand that. If you're not looking at disproportionate to communities when you realize that the communities that are surrounding and the gentlemen that spoke talking about Avondale, and Barnwell and all of the counties that are surrounding it, sure that's a disproportionate amount of contamination that they are bearing for this industry. Now, they don't forget now that across the river is a

power plant, Plant Vogtle. When you put all of that and you know, there's some at odds, you know there's so much you got to interpret in that, so much you've got to get out of that atmosphere itself, when you compound all of that on one group of people, that's disproportionate. I don't know what you call it, but I call it an injustice to those who are looking at and not only playing there, but they're trying to survive. And, you know, I can't get this picture out of my mind where it says that those who were working during the Cold War and we want to show you our gratitude so now you can get free healthcare. Huh?

MR. BROWN: You have one minute remaining.

MR. UTLEY: If they were not injured during that time, ask somebody why we giving them free healthcare now? Somebody's lying. So, all I'm saying is what I'm saying is that, no. Leave it where it is. They have it, they're smart enough to handle it. Don't take their intelligence away, but give them the technology to work with. And I say this because that is the only thing to do is leave it in place and thank you for this opportunity and I speak for the silent majority of those that are not in this room, but living under these conditions. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Wayne Rickman. Donald

Bridges will be next.

MR. RICKMAN: Good evening. My name is Wayne Rickman. I am a retired submarine -- nuclear submarine commander, and I'm on the board of CNTA Navy. To reiterate what Ms. Maxted said, the U.S. has two important international principles. The Atoms for Peace Program, established in 1953, returning the reactor research fuel to the U.S. and the nuclear materials nonproliferation that started in 1992, which tonight is to remove HEU from civil commerce. The SRS has two important national assets, the Savannah River National Laboratory and H-canyon. The lab has received recognition for the excellent worldwide work involving the securing, packaging, and shipping of nuclear materials that have been conducted under its control. H-canyon, in my opinion, is the only large nuclear material processing facility in the U.S. capable of conducting this operation and with the exception of the removal of the carbon, it's similar to what's been accomplished for other foreign used research reactor fuel.

Given the capabilities of the lab to design a safe process combined with the proven credible nuclear operational safety record of H-canyon personnel confirms and re-enforces the proposal that this important, necessary operation should be conducted at SRS. This

proposal allows the confluence of these two national priorities and principles to combine with the two identified national assets here at SRS to reduce the threat margin for the citizens of the United States and to allow the world to be a safer place. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Donald Bridges and then Suzanne Rhodes.

MR. BRIDGES: Good evening. My name is Donald Bridges. I live in North Augusta. I am a retired former employee of Savannah River, a former chair of the Citizens Advisory Board, and presently Vice-Chair of the Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness.

I'd like to speak in support of the action of receiving, processing, and later preparing the nuclear material for disposition. Fundamentally, I support this action because it represents jobs for Savannah River and for this area, and it is consistent with the traditional and historical role of the site over the past 60 years, which has been successful for both the Site and the communities surrounding the Site.

Further, this action will place the Highly Enriched Uranium fuel in a more secure and safe setting than practically any other location in the world. And the entire work scope will be funded by Germans offering a significant economic boom to the area with a program that

is projected to cost on the order of a billion dollars over a four to six year period. It really is much needed because of the fact that Savannah River Plant in that past couple years has had project delays and layoffs, shortage of funds.

Processing this material will necessarily involve some additional research and development. I think that will enhance the technical expertise of the Savannah River National Lab.

Overall, this material, this action will result in a positive move for the Site. It serves our own local best interest, and it serves -- it will take actions that will serve the national and international nuclear community's best interest.

Now, while many make the request -- mention the issues of transportation, safety and so forth. And I won't go into the safety stuff I'll prepare that for the written word that's been discussed here.

MR. BROWN: One minute left.

MR. BRIDGES: Okay. The nuclear material that would possibly be received at Savannah River is U.S. origin material and shipments from U.S. origin material from various international sites are routinely being received here at the Site for many, many years. The Site has received literally thousands of these shipments over a 60

year history and never had a significant accident or occurrence. Any nuclear high level waste from this material will be processed along with the Site high level waste and placed in a stable glass form in a stainless steel containers in well shielded and protected facilities. High level waste placed in containers as noted above from a practical standpoint represents absolutely zero risk to the public or to the environment. Any independent assessment will confirm that the planned action here is safe and secure with no technical basis for rejecting such an action. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Suzanne Rhodes, welcome. Charles Williams will be next.

MS. RHODES: I'm Suzanne Rhodes. I'm representing the League of Women Voters of South Carolina. Thanks for the opportunity to address this very important issue. We've been certainly following Savannah River Site waste for over 30 years. The purpose of this meeting, of course, is to discuss the shipment of German commercial high level nuclear waste. However, the community needs and deserves information about the entire DOE plan to bring waste to SRS. The League is absolutely opposed to the current DOE plan to welcome international wastes to South Carolina, SRS. SRS may certainly become the permanent if problematic storage area for its own waste

for decades; hope no longer than decades. And we're disappointed with the lack of progress on the Hill. Many proponents seem to think that the problem with Yucca Mountain is Harry Reid and that SRS waste will end up in Nevada as soon as he dies, loses his position, whatever. The site at Yucca Mountain has certainly been studied and has been found lacking. Anyone urging Yucca Mountain needs to do some independent research. I hear that Harry Reid phrase a whole lot from the industry. I don't know why it's there, but it is. One source of information as of recently, or -- which is fully footnoted with respected federal research sources; the report is on our website. The federal government has the responsibility not only for funding DOE -- SRS cleanups but also for ultimate storage of power industry and they've had that responsibility since the beginning and, as you know, nothing much has happened but now the industry, DOE, and apparently Congress, and now a variety of international assets all see SRS as the solution to their waste problem. The only easy solution. DOE seems to be overwhelmed with waste responsibility, and Congress has been paralyzed. SRS now holds more curies than any other defense site and for -- is a close second, they've got bombs. We have, I think been a lot smarter about -- the staff has been a lot smarter about taking care of the

waste here although it has a slightly different start, but anyhow, before the League will respond -- well, we'll oppose the receipt of anymore waste at SRS without protecting South Carolina interests, which means literally an act of Congress for waste disposal programs and also demonstration of legal U.S. responsibility for the waste. This country has, like the Germans, proposed, operated and closed many of the reactors and although something is learned from each of these attempts, we don't often research reactors and neither should the Germans. I was surprised to hear how much of this kind of waste we have in this country. It looks like SRS H-Canyon, if it stays open, is going to have a lot on its hands because I don't what else we're going to do with those wastes scattered around the U.S.

MR. BROWN: If you could summarize; I forgot to give the one minute.

MS. RHODES: Okay. A month ago we asked for a programmatic environmental impact on all these developments and it's entirely reasonable for Europe to be responsible for its own waste. It has six reactors, plus about 30 closed reactors that are in some stage of closed down. SRS should not be a permanent repository for -- by default. We will not benefit becoming an international sacrifice. So in summary, we are already

doing more than our share. Congress needs to fund SRS waste cleanup and develop a long range plan, and Europe and others need to take responsibility for their own wastes. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Charles Williams, pass? Okay. Laura Lance is next. Sorry to cue you with such short warning.

MS. LANCE: I'm half tempted to pass, but --

MR. BROWN: You ready?

MS. LANCE: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay and Glenn Carroll will follow Laura.

MS. LANCE: My name is Laura Lance. I was born in Aiken, South Carolina. My family moved here with the Savannah River Plant in 1952. My father was a nuclear physicist at Savannah River Plant. The comment, the comments I would like to make, I guess, concern a pattern I see. I see Savannah River Plant being built in the Cold War era and there was this urgency to get the job done. It was a national emergency that we should build this plant, and be prepared to defend ourselves at no matter what cost.

The technology didn't yet exist to deal with the waste generated by this, to store the waste process. That was okay because this was an emergency, we had to do what needed to be done. Flashing forward, I'll just jump

into MOX. A similar thing happened with that. There would be -- some materials had been generated and we made an agreement to keep it out of the hands of terrorists and we would bring it here and process at the MOX facility. Again, the technology did not exist to do this, yet the project went forward, and it was overrun with billions of dollars of costs and has yet to be resolved because the technology doesn't yet exist to do that. In order to burn the fuel, to utilize the fuel once it's made if that can even be accomplished, and now here we're looking at accepting high level nuclear waste from Germany and the technology doesn't yet exist to do this, but we feel confident it can be done. There's mention about, you know, the concern about terrorists getting it. Okay, leaving it in Germany would probably be the safest thing in terms of that instead of shipping it across -- shipping it up, you know, the railway up to Savannah River Plant. But I guess the point I wanted to make is this seems to be an ongoing pattern of management by crisis. And it's amazing how fast two minutes goes. My mouth is so dry. Management by crisis and it seems to me that nuclear waste, generating it, disposing of it, storing it, should be handled with the utmost care. The number one concern at this point should be how to do this properly. Instead it's been turned into a business model

and people stand to profit at every stage of this, the people who are going to ship it. Wait, a minute, I need to get to another point I wanted to make. Somebody said earlier, oh, please let me find this. That the protection of human environmental health and safety of the local people was first priority and all the time that I've lived in Aiken, there's never been any sort of emergency plan, disaster plan, anything. Any mode to notify people when there is a release and there have been releases, there have been accidents but we've never been notified. We've been told maybe years later that it wasn't any worse than a chest X-ray, what we were exposed to. The bottom line is if our safety is of such concern why -- am I about out?

MR. BROWN: Yes. Yes you are. Sorry.

MS. LANCE: Okay, that's it. Anyway, I'll submit a written statement, as well, but thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: All right. Okay. Glenn Carroll is next followed Gloria Tatum is next.

MS. CARROLL: My name is Glenn Carroll. I'm coordinator of Nuclear Watch South. We have 15,000 members all over the country largely attracted by our sticker campaign, nonukesyall.org. So, whoa to the hypocrites. Are you kidding me? You know, this stuff is highly radioactive. What is the MOX program about? It's

putting plutonium into a reactor and making highly radioactive and protect it, so get real. We are making bombs at Oak Ridge. We are producing tritium in commercial and nuclear reactors in Tennessee. We've squandered $5 billion on a MOX factory to nowhere that would deal with 50 tons of plutonium, now that's a priority that's here in the United States. We could have put it in the waste program. We still can, maybe we will. I'm here to tell you the nuclear industry is rotting, it is dying and it is starting to stink. And one of the stinkiest things to me is you come to an official government environmental assessment program and the title of it uses a term that has no relationship to anything they're calling spent nuclear fuel, which is a legal term which is legally governed by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and they've call us here tonight to talk about used nuclear fuel. So, is this an official proceeding? What the hell are we talking about? So, let's get down to some brass tacks. We need to take the no action alternative here. There's a law in Germany. The United States does not need to be party to some breaking their law. That waste is to stay in Germany and dumped within Germany. The tanks at Savannah River Site are on a closure program. I know they're being used by the H Canyon. I think somebody should probably sue. The only

waste that's allowed in those tanks is the waste that accrues while you're dealing with waste in the tanks. So, that's our program and we need to assess what will be the impact on the tank closure program if we go chasing the graphite balls that belong in Germany. And you know, I wanted to make the comment here. You know, we are working with an agency to provide some type of new technology that's never been done and this is the agency that just blew up the only nuclear waste dump in the nation with kitty litter. Are you kidding me? And so --

MR. BROWN: You have about a minute left.

MS. CARROLL: All right. I know the comments of my peers that Germany is a mature and responsible, technological society; they can handle this. They can probably teach us a thing or two.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Gloria Tatum and then Courtney Hanson.

MS. TATUM: Wow. We have a lot of people here who work in the nuclear industry. And they all support bringing more nuclear waste, spent fuel from other countries to SRS. Isn't that a big surprise? And they're going to make money. This is what it's all about, money. Why are we not taking our spent fuel and nuclear waste to Germany? Is it because the German population is more aware of the environment than we are?

They don't want their environment polluted. They don't want the health of their people endangered, that's why they're sending it here. And who is against this; the environmental groups. They want no action. And why is that? Because they care about the environment. They care about the health of the people. They care about future generations. It's not just about their pocketbook. Which this room is packed with people who want to enrich their pocketbooks. They don't care about the environment or their health. And everybody knows that nuclear waste does better in dry desert areas. Look at this subtropical rain storm. We live in an area that's very wet. It's sandy soil, things decay, they leak into the environment. You know, but, no, let's don't look at that. No, let's look at our pocketbooks because that's the only thing that really matters. You can get jobs selling crack cocaine. Why don't you support that? You know, or maybe you could put the nuclear waste into popsicles and sell it to children. You can make money doing that, because that's what this is about. Yeah, I see you back there laughing. Yeah, I know, I know, your pocketbook is more important than my health, my children, my grandchildren's health. It's not even important about your grandchildren's health because you think your money can make them immune from the

radiation and Jack, I'm real glad that you're --

MR. BROWN: A minute. A minute.

MS. TATUM: -- going to make money, because we know that you know more than everybody else in the room. So, thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you. Courtney Hanson and Besty Rivard will be following Courtney.

MS. HANSON: Hey, I am Courtney Hanson. I'm organizing director for Georgia Women's Action for New Direction. We advocate for nuclear non-proliferation and environmental cleanup. We are a state-wide organization representing thousands of women and men, including those communities living downwind and downstream of SRS in Georgia. From an environmental and health perspective we suggest the no action alternative on this issue considering whether to import used nuclear fuel from Germany. First, the receipt of this fuel is unprecedented. SRS has received research reactor fuel but never commercial fuel, which is essentially what we're dealing with here. And it really has not demonstrated a capacity or competency to deal with large amounts of graphite waste. What it does have is a very large stockpile of nuclear material that needs to be remediated before it considers accepting new emissions. In addition, it should really be heavily considered that

the communities surrounding SRS do not consent to more waste coming into their area. That's been demonstrated here tonight by the several folks from both South Carolina and Georgia who have given their time to be here and speak and it also was demonstrated by the unprecedented amount of public participation of the Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board this year on the same issue of importing nuclear waste. I think more nuclear waste at SRS has the potential to impact local environments and as a result, public health. And this is a burden that Georgia communities just cannot bear. Already in the Georgia communities downwind and downstream, there is no robust radiological monitoring program even though there is a history of contamination in drinking water, in garden vegetables, in fish, and more. And, in addition, cancer rates in that area are well above the national average. So, the no alternative action -- the no action alternative I should say is really the best way to go in terms of the environment and public health. And if Germany does need help, we can help them. We can export the technology. We can export our experts and there is a precedent for that. We saw that after Fukushima. SRS sent staff there to help in the cleanup efforts. It was very successful. We can do that again. So, again, let's export our technology, but

not import the problem onto U.S. soil. Please take the no action.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Betsy Rivard, and then Elizabeth Witham.

MS. RIVARD: Hi, I'm Betsy Rivard. I am a concerned citizen, but I'm also on the board of Georgia WAND, Women's Action for New Direction and Nuclear Watch South. I'm from Atlanta. I support no action. I think the material should be left where it is and as other people have said, Germans are pretty smart people. They do a lot better on their math test than we do, for sure. And scientifically, I'd say they're superior, and they can handle their own waste. I don't think we need any of theirs. I think the other option should require a storage site which you don't really have. And the Savannah River Site should concentrate on dealing with the waste that is already here, there. And we shouldn't be adding more to the tanks that we're trying to empty as Glen stated. And I'm kind of puzzled. Some people are saying that you should find no significant impact. I don't think you can tell people what to find on the environmental assessment. That's -- an assessment is something you've discovered whether there will be impacts. I did notice that that was the only part that was skipped over on these slides. The impacts were

listed there, but we didn't have a chance to read them. But the Federal Register does read them, potential impacts and I don't think they're just mentioned because they're picked out of somebody's head. There is potential for impacts to the general population and workers from radiological and non-radiological releases impacts of emissions on air and water quality and greenhouse gas emissions, impacts of ecological systems, impacts of waste management activities, impacts of the transportation of radioactive materials. I don't understand why you think it's safer for us to take it across the ocean, put it on a train, get it up to the Savannah River Site. Remove it from these containers that they're pretty well contained in it seems. What are we going to do with the containers and then you take these balls out that we really don't know how to handle. And we're going to chop them all up and dissolve, we're going to digest it. I don't think we were told exactly what we were going to digest it with. It's probably nitric acid or something like that. And we're going to have a whole lot more stuff to put it in those tanks. I just say no action. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Elizabeth will be followed by Rick Berry.

MS. WITHAM: Good evening, I'm Betty Witham

actually, and I came here in 1958 because of the Savannah River Plant. My husband worked in the labs, and I think the labs, of course, are just excellent. I think there's no question about that. And I feel that everybody has said practically the same thing. So, I think that perhaps if the labs could provide the material, the technology for the Germans to handle their own waste, that would be by far, the very best thing that we must concentrate on what we have here. I mean this has gone on forever. It's really disgraceful, I think, that we haven't handled our waste from the past. And so I do not approve of this, or wish this action to take place. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Rick Berry and then Harvey Harmon will be after you.

MR. BERRY: Hi, my name is Rick Berry. I'm here to talk on the socioeconomic portion, and I'm in favor of the process continuing. The process has been described to us in technical terms and there's a long way to go. Fifty years ago, I was in college, in one of the few colleges, I was a physics major, only two colleges had a nuclear reactor; I was in one of those two colleges. In that time, the progress that we made in the United States in the nuclear industry stands far ahead of any place else in the world. For us to consider the socioeconomic

factors of exporting technology or a specialty that we developed here. It isn't just the people, it's also the facility that we have, the physical facility that has been produced here. I heard folks say that they're worried about the concentration and we have a large number of people here. I heard somebody mention here, without numbers, higher incidences of cancer and other things like that. I have not experienced that. Not being a physical specialist, let me tell you where I am. My specialty, I am a member of the Chamber of Commerce of North Augusta. I'm not here to represent them, but I am thoroughly involved in their activities. I am on a radio station that is active in the conservative group. We hear a lot from the community there. I am an officer in a Kiwanis Club that operates in three South Carolina counties and six Georgia counties.

MR. BROWN: You've got a minute remaining.

MR. BERRY: Thank you. I'm thoroughly involved in the community and the ratio of folks in favor versus the ration of folks who are not in favor seems to be very heavy. I'm saying that as a reporter from the far end. I don't represent the chamber. I'm not representing the radio station. It's purely a report. I risk offending my friends whom I believe that even with theatrics and entertainment mean well, but they probably gave a fear

that is unfounded. Those health fears, if they were real would have been felt and proven and reported on by those experts who have worked in the field for 50 years. So, I go on record and report for my friends in the favor of proceeding forward with the economic -- with the evaluation with some faith in our people to come. If we had stopped early we might not have had the car. If we'd stopped early we would not have had electricity. I think that it's too early to stop now, but continue and the cautions are well noted.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Harvey Harmon and Miss Connie Young will follow.

MR. HARMON: Actually my name is Harry Harmon.

MR. BROWN: Oh, Harry, okay.

MR. HARMON: Good evening, I worked at Savannah River Site since 1973 and some other DOE locations after that period and was heavily involved in off-site fuel processing for the first half of my career and waste management the second half. I'm strongly in favor of proceeding with this evaluation. I won't go into the details that have already been stated, but Savannah River Laboratory does indeed have the type of facilities, the hot cells, the dry boxes for radio-chemical fluids all that. They have the capabilities needed to do these flow sheet evaluations. Nowhere else can do it as well and

Savannah River Site is the right place to do this job in my opinion. I'm retired. I won't make one penny whether they do this job or not. I have seen the way work is done there. I have a great deal of confidence in the way it's done and the people that do it. And I live very close to the site. I brought up three beautiful children and I've got two even more beautiful grandchildren living in Aiken and I'm not concerned one iota about their health. I also want to add that a lot has been said about sending the technology to the Germans. They do not have a fuel reprocessing plant, folks. They had a pilot scale facility years ago that's finished and as you know, these large nuclear plants are multi-billion dollar a year prices and to start from scratch to startup, it would probably be a couple of decades over there. So it's not -- the technology can be exported, but that doesn't give them the ability to do it. We have the reprocessing plant, and H Canyon is available to do that. I'm convinced that if this work cannot be done safely based on the work that the Savannah Laboratory does and on the work that the environmental evaluation show, that DOE will decide not to do it. And I have that confidence in the people out there both the contractor side and the DOE side. So I strongly recommend we proceed with this technology, the program, environmental assessments, and

make a rational decision after we have plenty of good information. But I am biased towards the capability of the Site. I've seen it, I know it, and I believe it will work fine. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Miss Connie Young and she will be followed by Jesse Colin Young.

MS. YOUNG: Hello, I'm Connie Young. I have to say, I don't think it's a question about the SRS particularly. I think this is a question about what we as a community want to become. So although the SRS may have all these capabilities, the first thing that popped out for me is repository. I don't believe we are a repository. So I don't know how you can assess that environmentally, and I would like very much to understand how that would happen. So from a perspective of what is rational and reasonable, I think, sure if you want to go ahead with the assessment, but with no repository as an option, you have to reassess your assessment. From a Don't Waste Aiken perspective, of which I'm a member, our whole mission is to not have any more commercial spent nuclear fuel coming to the SRS. That was a mission we started a year ago, and it end up in a -- pretty much, I think it was 18 to three saying they didn't want to have any commercial spent nuclear fuel. We understand the military aspects of the SRS, kind of. So we ask that we get our old

stuff, our legacy stuff, out of the way, get a lot of work in figuring out how to do that and get our money, how do we get our representatives to do this please, so that our DOE can work appropriately and the SRS can function how it's supposed to. That should be our priority. The Germans are very smart. They're our allies. They've got it, they're not the Iranians. And perhaps they do have the capacity and maybe it will take some time for all of us, even thinking about working with this stuff. So, why can't they be more partners? Yes, use our lab and let's get our other waste out of here, because it's getting to be a contentious issue in our community in Aiken County. I'm sorry, I've talked to all kinds of people and frankly, they're just really upset about that and it will be an election issue. So, I ask DOE hey, if there's no repository, we've got to change up what we're talking about, and there isn't one answer as it's not. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Jesse Colin Young will be followed by Denise Traina.

MR. YOUNG: I'm Jesse Colin Young, one of the founders of Don't Waste Aiken, along with Connie. We got involved with this because oh, a year and a half ago we knew it was in the wind. The feds, the Blue Ribbon Commission was here and they were looking for a place to

put this 74, whatever it is, thousand tons of spent nuclear fuel and we thought that they were eyeing the SRS. I'd like to say that Connie and I had a tour of the SRS. Thanks to Theresa Haas. It's an amazing place there and there's a place full of dedicated brilliant people and we were really impressed with that. But we know -- we know that there is no exit strategy now, and there is no effort in the administration to find a repository and I went into the, what I would call the graveyards out there where those huge buildings with the classification is varied and all you is the giant manhole covers and I just can't imagine that we want to continue, with no exit strategy, building these huge warehouses. And even if the government is kind enough to give us the money to classify it, which they seem to be reticent to do. So Don't Waste Aiken a month ago, has taken the position of no action on this. I don't want the door and I don't think any of the thousands of people who have been speaking to us on the Facebook page want to open the door to spent nuclear fuel brought here because it has to be stored here and there's nowhere to send it. So, we definitely support no action. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Denise, did I get your last name correct?

MS. TRAINA: Traina? Uh-huh.

MR. BROWN: I did. Okay.

MS. TRAINA: That's right. Good evening. My name is Denise Traina and I've lived in Augusta for over 25 years. I'm a concerned citizen and healthcare worker and presently serve as co-chair of the Georgia Green Party. On behalf of the Georgia Green Party, I want this body to know that we remain steadfast in our commitment to protect our air, water, and soil. And we take our goals as caretaker seriously. We will continue to urge this body and others to invest more of our taxpayer dollars, in the best energy and industrial options that will avoid risks to our environment and to the health of our citizens. We urge any country that produces waste or its byproducts or whatever we want to call it, fuel, to dispose of it themselves and to rethink the gains truly, truly outweigh the risks. No action, no thank you. Good night.

MR. BROWN: Well, that is actually an appropriate ending. We have concluded and actually only about six or seven minutes overtime. I want thank everybody for attending, for listening, for commenting. The information, again, on the slide show is available at the website which is http and then sro.srs.gov. So that will be available at some point for more information.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Say that again.

MR. BROWN: It's sro.srs.gov. Again, thanks very much for your attendance.

(Hearing concluded at 9:07 p.m.)

1

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

AIKEN COUNTY

I hereby certify that the foregoing meeting transcript, consisting of pages 4 through 67 was taken down by me and transcribed by me and that the same is a true, correct and complete transcript of said meeting.

I further certify that I am a disinterested party to this action and that I am neither of kin nor counsel to any of the parties hereto.

This the 3rd day of July, 2014.

Claire R. Netzler, CCR

Certified Court Reporter and

Notary Public