Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Meeting on Proposed MOX Facility Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Savannah, Georgia

Date: Tuesday, March 25, 2003

Work Order No.: NRC-800 Pages 1-137

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

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 + + + + +

4 PUBLIC MEETING ON PROPOSED MOX FACILITY

5 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

6 + + + + +

7 TUESDAY,

8 MARCH 25, 2003

9 + + + + +

10 SAVANNAH, GEORGIA

11 + + + + +

12 The Public Meeting was held in the

13 Conference Room of the Georgia Coastal Center at 7:05

14 p.m., Francis "Chip" Cameron, Facilitator, presiding.

15

16 PRESENT:

17 FRANCIS (Chip) CAMERON

18 LAWRENCE KOKAJKO

19 TIM HARRIS

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 I-N-D-E-X

2 SPEAKERS Page

3 SARA BARCZAK 36

4 JOHN HULL 38

5 CHESTER DUNHAM 40

6 KIRK COBB 41

7 VICTOR MERESKI 45

8 BOBBIE PAUL 46

9 KELLIE GASINK 51

10 WHITNEY ERIN LAMB 54

11 KIRK COBB 57

12 CHERYL JAY 60

13 DAVID KYLER 61

14 MAXINE HARRIS 61

15 KEN BROMBERG 65

16 VERNELL CUTTER 66

17 TODD KAISH 68

18 KELLI PEARSON 72

19 JODY LANIER 74

20 CHERYL JAY 77

21 CAROL CAIN 79

22 VICTOR MERESKI 83

23 CHESTER DUNHAM 85

24 VERNELL CUTTER 89

25

1 I-N-D-E-X

2 SPEAKERS Page

3 DAVID KYLER 94

4 SARA BARCZAK 98

5 KELLIE GASINK 109

6 ANDRE ENTERMANN 120

7 KIRK COBB 127

8 SARA BARCZAK 128

9 CHESTER DUNHAM 129

10 KEN BROMBERG 129

11 JOHN HULL 130

12 SARA BARCZAK 130

13 JOHN HULL 136

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay, good evening,
3 everyone.
4 (Certain people respond.)
5 MR. CAMERON: I'd like to welcome you to
6 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's public meeting
7 tonight. My name is Chip Cameron. I'm the Special
8 Counsel for Public Liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory
9 Commission. And we're going to try not to use a whole
10 lot of acronyms tonight.
11 UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.
12 MR. CAMERON: And if we do, we'll explain
13 them. Everybody's in support of no acronyms.
14 UNIDENTIFIED: No acronyms.
15 MR. CAMERON: But one we will use is -- is
16 NRC for Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
17 And the subject of tonight's meeting is
18 the draft environmental impact statement that the NRC
19 has prepared to help the NRC in its decision-making on
20 the application that we received from -- from DCS to
21 construct a mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility.
22 And it is my pleasure to serve as your facilitator for
23 tonight's meeting. And in that role, I'm going to try
24 to help all of you have a productive meeting tonight.
25 And I just wanted to cover three items of

1 meeting process before we get -- get on with the
2 substantive discussions. And the first thing I'd like
3 to talk about is the purpose of the meeting, why is
4 the NRC here tonight. And we have several purposes.
5 One is to clearly explain to all of you what the NRC's
6 process is for evaluating this application that we
7 have for the mixed oxide fuel facility, and also to
8 explain what the findings are in this draft
9 environmental impact statement that we've prepared.
10 Second purpose is to hear your
11 recommendations, your concerns on this process and the
12 draft environmental impact statement. And a related
13 purpose is to try to give you information tonight so
14 that if you want to submit a written comment to the
15 NRC on this draft environmental impact statement,
16 you'll have more information, be better equipped to do
17 that. And the NRC staff will be explaining how to
18 submit written comments. But just let me emphasize
19 that anything we hear from you tonight will carry the
20 same weight as a -- as a written comment. And, of
21 course, you can speak tonight and also submit a
22 written comment.
23 And the ultimate goal here is to have your
24 comments tonight, the comments that we get at other
25 public meetings that we're doing, the written

1 comments, to have those comments help us to make our
2 decision on finalizing this draft environmental impact
3 statement, and also in making a decision on the
4 application that we have for -- to construct the mixed
5 oxide fuel facility.
6 In terms of the format for the meeting,
7 the second item I want to cover, we're going to have
8 some brief NRC presentations, just to give you some --
9 some background, and then go out to you for questions
10 that you might have, to make sure that you understand
11 the process. And we'll try to answer those clearly.
12 We're also asking for -- for formal comment tonight.
13 Anybody who wants to say any -- anything on the draft
14 EIS, we're going to give you an opportunity to do
15 that. And as I mentioned, we are taking a transcript,
16 so your comments will be -- will be recorded.
17 We thought that it might be useful --
18 usually what we do is we have the NRC presentations,
19 and then we have question and answers, and then we
20 just have people comment. And we thought what we'd do
21 is have some comments -- we'd do the question and
22 answer, have some comments, and then go back and have
23 another question and answer session. There may be
24 some things that the NRC hears in the comments that
25 they'll want to clarify for you, there may be

1 questions that you have. And then we'll go back to
2 the -- to the formal comments.
3 The third item that I wanted to talk about
4 are ground rules for the meeting. And they're very,
5 very simple. If you have a question, please signal me
6 and I'll bring you this microphone. And please ask us
7 your question or make a comment and tell us who you
8 are and what your affiliation is, if appropriate. And
9 we have a sign-up sheet for people who want to make a
10 comment, make a statement tonight, and that's out in
11 front. And I think everybody's been -- been signing
12 up and indicating whether they want to -- to speak
13 tonight.
14 I would ask you, in your -- your formal
15 comments, to try to keep it to -- to five minutes.
16 That's a guideline. I think that that is plenty of
17 time. But we do want to make sure that everyone has
18 a chance to speak tonight who wants to talk. So if
19 you keep it to five minutes, then that will allow
20 everybody else in the room to have their -- their
21 opportunity. And we realize that there are a lot of
22 other things, important events going on tonight in the
23 city. And if -- if you need to go early and you do
24 want to talk, can you just indicate -- you'll have
25 some time when the NRC first starts to talk. Could

1 you just indicate on the sheet that you signed in that
2 you want to -- to speak early. And I would just ask
3 for everybody's indulgence to let those people who
4 have to leave early -- I'm going to put them on first,
5 and we'll hear their comments, and then they can --
6 they can get on with whatever else they need to do.
7 And I would also ask that only one person
8 at a time speak. That will allow us to -- Melanie is
9 our stenographer. She's taking the transcript. That
10 will allow us to get a -- a clean transcript so that
11 you can recognize who's talking. But more
12 importantly, it will allow us to give our full
13 attention to whomever has the floor at the moment.
14 And I just want to thank all of you for --
15 for being here. The NRC has an important decision to
16 make, and this is going to be helpful to us. And
17 we'll try to keep the meeting as informal as possible.
18 We need to do the microphones because we're taking a
19 transcript and -- so that we'll have a record of what
20 was -- what was said. But if you have something to
21 say, if you have questions, please -- please just say
22 that and what's on your mind, and relax, and we'll
23 just try to have a -- a nice, informal discussion and
24 give you some information and get some information
25 from you.

1 The agenda is pretty -- pretty simple.
2 We're going to have two presentations. One is going
3 to be an overview of NRC responsibilities. And we
4 have Lawrence -- Mr. Lawrence Kokajko, right over
5 here, to do that. And then we're going to go to Mr.
6 Tim Harris, who's right here, who's going to talk
7 about the findings in the draft environmental impact
8 statement.
9 By way of introduction, Mr. Kokajko is the
10 acting Branch Chief of the Environmental and
11 Performance Assessment Branch in the Division of Waste
12 Management in the NRC's Office of Nuclear Materials,
13 Safeguards, and -- and Safety. He, before that, was
14 the Section Chief of a Risk Task Force that looked at
15 how you factor in risk into NRC decision-making. He's
16 been with the NRC for about 13 years. And he has a
17 Bachelor's in psychology from Memphis State, a
18 Bachelor's in applied science and technology; and also
19 a Master's in education from King State College. And
20 he'll be coming up in a minute.
21 And Tim Harris, who I think a lot of you
22 already know, is the Project Manager for the
23 environmental review on the construction application.
24 And he has a Bachelor's in civil engineering from the
25 University of Maryland.

1 We also have other NRC staff here from our
2 regional office, our Office of General Counsel. David
3 Brown is the Project Manager for the safety aspect of
4 the construction authorization application. And I
5 think that if we need to clarify how all that comes
6 together, we -- we will for you. But environmental
7 review, Tim Harris; safety review, Dave Brown.
8 And with that, I'll just ask Lawrence to
9 -- to lead off for us. Lawrence is going to do his
10 piece, and then Tim will do his. And we'll try to
11 keep it brief. And then we'll go out to you for --
12 for questions, then.
13 Lawrence?
14 MR. KOKAJKO: Thank you, Chip.
15 Can everyone hear me? Thank you.
16 Good evening. My name is Lawrence
17 Kokajko, and I am the acting Branch Chief of the
18 Environmental Performance Assessment Branch in the
19 Division of Waste Management. And I'm very pleased to
20 be here this evening, and I'd welcome all of you to --
21 at this meeting.
22 We are meeting on the NRC's draft
23 environmental impact statement for the proposed mixed
24 oxide or MOX fuel fabrication facility. And I'd like
25 to thank you for taking the time to participate. And

1 we do look forward to hearing from you this evening.

2 This meeting is one of a series of

3 meetings planned to inform the public about the

4 environmental impact statement for the proposed

5 facility, and to solicit public comment. There are

6 three handouts that you may have seen at the door.

7 The first is a set of slides; the second is the

8 agenda, with a facts sheet and a comparison of

9 alternatives; and the third one is a feedback form.

10 And we're very interested in getting feedback on how

11 this meeting went this evening. We would appreciate

12 you answering the questions on the feedback form and

13 either handing it back to an NRC staff person, or you

14 can staple the two together and drop it in the mail.

15 And the postage is prepaid. In fact, I'd like all the

16 NRC people, could you raise your hand one more time so

17 that everyone knows who to give it to.

18 (Certain NRC staff members respond.)

19 MR. KOKAJKO: And Adrienne is at the front

20 desk, too.

21 If you would like a copy of the draft

22 environmental impact statement, we have a limited

23 number here, and you may take one with you. If we run

24 out, we will mail you a copy. Next slide, please.

25 The presenters tonight will be myself, as

1 well as Tim Harris. Tim is a member of my staff. And
2 we've included our phone numbers and Email addresses.
3 You may contact us if you have any questions after the
4 meeting. Next slide.
5 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to get
6 your comments on the draft environmental impact
7 statement. Before we hear your comments, we'll
8 provide some information on the NRC's role in the
9 proposed MOX project, and describe the *National*
10 *Environmental Policy Act* and the EIS process, and how
11 the EIS fits into NRC's decision-making. Tim will
12 give an overview of the draft EIS, and then there will
13 be time to answer questions. Next.
14 The proposed MOX facility would take
15 surplus weapons plutonium and depleted uranium and
16 make nuclear reactor fuel. Congress, in the *Defense*
17 *Authorization Act of 1999*, gave NRC a role in the
18 proposed MOX project. Specifically, NRC has licensing
19 authority over the MOX facility, so our role is to
20 make a licensing decision regarding the safe operation
21 of that facility. NRC is an independent government
22 agency, and our mission is to protect the public
23 health and safety, and the environment, in the
24 commercial use of radioactive material. Our role is
25 different than the Department of Energy's.

1 The Department of Energy's role in this
2 project relates to implementing United States nuclear
3 non-proliferation policy, including the disposition of
4 surplus weapons plutonium. The Department of Energy
5 also has responsibility to design, build and operate
6 two facilities that support the proposed MOX facility.
7 These two facilities are the pit disassembly and
8 conversion facility, and the waste solidification
9 building.
10 While the pit disassembly and conversion
11 facility and the waste solidification building are
12 considered in NRC's environmental review, it is
13 important to note that NRC does not have the licensing
14 authority over these two support facilities. That
15 responsibility rests with the Department of Energy.
16 NRC only has authority over the proposed MOX facility.
17 Next slide, please.
18 I'd like to briefly describe the
19 environmental impact statement process. The *National*
20 *Environmental Policy Act* requires government agency to
21 prepare an environmental impact statement for major
22 federal actions such as the potential licensing of the
23 proposed MOX project. An environmental impact
24 statement presents environmental impacts of a proposed
25 action, along with reasonable alternatives to that

1 proposed action.

2 Note that the bolded areas are

3 opportunities for public involvement in the process,

4 and we consider this a very important -- very

5 important part of the environmental impact statement

6 process review. NRC's involvement with the MOX

7 project started when DCS, the applicant, submitted an

8 environmental report and request to construct the MOX

9 facility. We published the notice of intent to

10 prepare an EIS in the *Federal Register* in March of

11 2001.

12 During the scoping process, the public

13 helped determine what issues would be addressed in the

14 environmental impact statement, and now we have

15 completed the draft environmental impact statement,

16 and we have sent copies to approximately 550 people

17 throughout the nation. We are currently in the

18 comment period for the draft environmental impact

19 statement. This meeting is being transcribed, and

20 comments made here tonight will be included in the

21 official comment record. The last slide shows that --

22 shows several ways that you can submit comments to us.

23 We will review and consider the public comments, and

24 then finalize the environmental impact statement later

25 this year. Next slide.

1 As I mentioned earlier, NRC's role is to
2 make a licensing decision regarding the proposed MOX
3 facility. I'd like to take some time to describe the
4 licensing process, and how the EIS we're discussing
5 tonight fits into NRC's decision-making.
6 There are two decisions that NRC will have
7 to make for the proposed MOX facility. The first is
8 whether to authorize construction of the facility.
9 The second is to -- is to whether to authorize
10 operation of the facility. These decisions are shown
11 in the middle of the slide.
12 NRC's environmental review is shown at the
13 top portion of the slide, and consists of preparing
14 the final environmental impact statement. The final
15 environmental impact statement will be used by NRC to
16 decide whether to authorize construction, and later
17 whether to issue the license to operate the MOX
18 facility.
19 NRC's safety review is shown at the bottom
20 portion of the slide. The safety evaluation report
21 for the construction authorization request focuses on
22 safety assessment of the proposed design bases to
23 determine if it meets NRC requirements. NRC's final
24 environmental impact statement and safety evaluation
25 report for construction authorization request will be

1 the basis for making a decision on whether to
2 construct the proposed MOX facility. We anticipate
3 that that decision could be made in the fall of 2003.
4 DCS plans to submit a license application
5 to operate the proposed MOX facility in October of
6 2003. The safety evaluation report on the operating
7 application and the FEIS will be the basis for making
8 a decision on whether to allow DCS to operate the
9 proposed MOX facility.
10 There will be two opportunities for
11 hearing. John Hull, with our Office of General
12 Counsel, is here and can answer questions related to
13 the hearing process.
14 John?
15 (Mr. Hull raises his hand.)
16 MR. KOKAJKO: To summarize, a single
17 environmental impact statement will be used to support
18 the decision to construct and later operate the
19 proposed MOX facility.
20 Now I would like to turn the presentation
21 over to Mr. Tim Harris of my staff. Tim is the lead
22 -- the lead for the environmental review for the
23 proposed project at the NRC.
24 Tim?
25 MR. HARRIS: Thanks, Lawrence.

1 MS. BARCZAK: Question.

2 MR. CAMERON: Sara?

3 MS. BARCZAK: Mr. Harris, do we need --

4 are we able to ask the -- each presenter, or do you

5 want to wait until...

6 MR. CAMERON: Let's -- let's wait.

7 MS. BARCZAK: Okay.

8 MR. CAMERON: If you can just sort of keep

9 track of your questions.

10 MS. BARCZAK: That's fine.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, good.

12 MR. HARRIS: As Lawrence said, my name's

13 Tim Harris, and I'm the environmental review lead for

14 the MOX project. And I guess we've been doing this

15 for almost two years, and I think it's the third trip

16 down here. And it's a pleasure to see so many

17 friendly faces. Thanks for coming back again, and we

18 look forward to your comments.

19 What I'll do tonight is provide an

20 overview of the draft environmental impact statement.

21 You saw copies outside. It's a relatively thick

22 document. I'm going to try to hit the highlights. If

23 there's things that -- that we don't cover here,

24 they're certainly covered in the document. And if

25 there's something you want to know about, please feel

1 free to ask a question. First off I'll describe the
2 alternatives that were considered, and then also
3 alternatives that were considered but not analyzed in
4 detail. Next slide, Dave.
5 To understand how we made that distinction
6 between alternatives we considered and alternatives
7 that we analyzed in detail, it's helpful to understand
8 the purpose and need related to the draft
9 environmental impact statement. As we stated in our
10 notice of intent, the purpose and need of the MOX
11 facility that's addressed in this draft environmental
12 impact statement is essentially the same as used by
13 the Department of Energy in its programmatic
14 environmental impact statements.
15 Specifically, the purpose and needs
16 relates to agreements between the United States and
17 Russia to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons by
18 assuring that those materials are converted into a
19 proliferation resistant form. And also to reduce the
20 risk of plutonium from falling into the hands of
21 terrorists or rogue states.
22 The draft environmental impact statement
23 evaluates two alternatives in detail. These are the
24 no-action alternative, and the proposed action. The
25 no-action alternative would be continued storage of

1 surplus weapons plutonium at various DOE sites
2 throughout the nation. The no-action alternative is
3 used in the environmental impact statement as a
4 baseline for decision, as a comparison of different
5 alternatives.
6 The proposed action includes impacts from
7 the construction, operation, and decommissioning of
8 the proposed MOX facility. And it also includes
9 impacts from connected actions, such as the
10 transportation of surplus weapons plutonium, depleted
11 uranium, and MOX fuel. As Lawrence mentioned, our EIS
12 also includes impacts of two DOE facilities. I think
13 he made the point there that as far as EIS goes, we
14 included the evaluation of those DOE facilities to --
15 to get the full picture, but it's important to realize
16 that those facilities aren't part of our -- our
17 licensing review.
18 And again, those facilities are the pit
19 disassembly and conversion facility, which would take
20 plutonium metal and convert it into a powder or oxide
21 form. Waste solidification building would take waste
22 from the pit disassembly and conversion facility, and
23 also the proposed MOX facility.
24 We also included impacts associated with
25 the potential use of the MOX fuel in the environmental

1 impact statement. For the proposed action, we also
2 evaluated the differences in using a sand filter, as
3 was suggested during scoping, with the use of HEPA
4 filters, as we proposed by -- by the applicant, DCS.
5 As I said before, the purpose and need is
6 used to determine which alternatives we evaluated in
7 detail and those that were not. In addition to siting
8 and technology options that were evaluated by Duke
9 Cogema Stone & Webster in its environmental report,
10 several other alternatives were raise during scoping,
11 and also during meetings here last fall.
12 Immobilization was initially considered to be a
13 reasonable alternative; however, following the
14 Department of Energy's admitted rod that we -- we
15 talked about last September, DOE believed that an
16 immobilization only approach would not meet the U.S.-
17 Russia agreements; and therefore that alternative did
18 not meet the purpose and need.
19 Another alternative that was discussed at
20 our meetings last fall was deliberately making off-
21 specification MOX fuel. This alternative involves not
22 removing the impurities that generates a lot of waste.
23 Basically, you leave the impurities in the powder form
24 and make the fuel without removing them. The reason
25 you remove the impurities is that it improves the

1 neutronics or basically makes the fuel more efficient.
2 But again, you're not removing the impurities in this
3 alternative, and you also wouldn't use the MOX fuel.
4 Instead, the off-specification MOX fuel would be
5 stored at spent fuel pools at existing reactor sites
6 prior to geologic deposit -- prior to disposal at a
7 geologic repository.
8 The impacts of this alternative are
9 addressed qualitatively in the draft environmental
10 impact statement. To summarize, the monetary costs of
11 this alternative would be about the same as the
12 proposed action. And, as I mentioned, this
13 alternative would generate less waste. However, the
14 benefits would be lower than the proposed action
15 because electricity would not be produced. Therefore,
16 the alternative of producing off-specification MOX
17 fuel was not obviously superior to the proposed
18 action. In addition, this alternative was viewed as
19 not meeting the U.S.-Russia agreements.
20 For the proposed action and no-action
21 alternative alternatives---next slide, Dave---the
22 impacts associated with the following comprehensive
23 list of technical areas were evaluated. The technical
24 areas on the right are considered to have more
25 significant impact or were issues that were raised

1 during the public meetings. These are discussed in
2 the body of the environmental impact statement in
3 Chapter 4. To allow more time for public comment, as
4 I said, I'll try to focus on the issues on the right.
5 I'm sorry, your left. The issues on the right are
6 discussed in appendices. Excuse me for getting...
7 Again, the things I'm going to talk about
8 tonight are human health, air quality, hydrology,
9 waste management, environmental justice. In addition,
10 I'll summarize the impacts associated with
11 transportation and potential MOX fuel use, and also
12 summarize the cost-benefit analysis. Next slide.
13 First I'd like to summarize the impacts
14 associated with the no-action alternative. The
15 impacts for this alternative were previously evaluated
16 by the Department of Energy. And the impacts included
17 in our draft environmental impact statement are
18 essentially a summary of those provided in earlier DOE
19 environmental impact statement. The packet of
20 information that we provided with you has a comparison
21 of comparison tables which shows the no-action
22 alternative and the proposed action. So if you want
23 to look at numerical differences, we provided that in
24 your handout. I won't get into specific numbers here,
25 but you have that information.

1 The impacts to the public and workers from
2 this no-action alternative---that is, continued
3 storage---were considered to be low. There were no
4 significant air quality or water quality impacts
5 associated with this impact. As you can imagine, if
6 you're just storing the material, you don't get a lot
7 of air-water emissions. Also there was no significant
8 waste management issues or environmental justice
9 issues. Next slide, please.
10 UNIDENTIFIED: It's currently stored as a
11 metal; right? Or if it's in different forms...
12 MR. HARRIS: Chip's going to tell you to
13 -- to wait and ask questions. But the answer is it's
14 in various forms.
15 MR. CAMERON: Yeah. I know there's a lot
16 of detail here, but if you could just try to keep
17 track and then we'll -- we'll get it all out, and that
18 may be more efficient for us. But thank you.
19 MR. HARRIS: The next series of slides
20 summarize the impacts of the proposed action. The
21 proposed action includes impacts from three
22 facilities, and those are: the proposed MOX facility;
23 the pit disassembly and conversion facility; and the
24 waste solidification building. I've presented the
25 impacts in terms of increase or decrease relative to

1 current conditions at the Savannah River Site. And,
2 again, numerical values are provided in the table that
3 you have as part of your handouts.
4 There would be no adverse chemical or
5 radiological impacts during construction. From
6 operation of the three facilities, the annual public
7 collective dose would increase by about 11%. And,
8 while that may seem significant, the next slide I'll
9 show you will help put that in perspective. There
10 would also be no significant impacts from chemical
11 exposures during normal operation.
12 This slide shows the radiation dose from
13 several sources, and also the NRC public dose limit.
14 The average annual natural background, the top line,
15 includes radiation from the earth, and that that comes
16 from space, and is about 360 millirem. And a millirem
17 is just a unit of radiation exposure or dose. The
18 annual NRC public dose limit, the second line, is 100
19 millirem. To put it in a perspective, if you -- if
20 you got a chest X-ray you'd get about six millirem.
21 So the bottom line is the annual dose to the public
22 from the three facilities, and that's less than one
23 millirem. So even though it's 11% of -- of what's the
24 public (sic) is currently receiving from living next
25 to the Savannah River Site, it's a very small number.

1 Accidents have the greatest consequences
2 of the impacts that we evaluated in our environmental
3 impact statement. Two conservative scenarios were
4 evaluated for a number of potential accidents. The
5 short-term scenario assumes that people are exposed by
6 inhaling contaminant material in a plume. We also
7 evaluated a long-term scenario, which includes the
8 impacts of the -- of the short-term scenario, but also
9 includes exposures from eating crops that could become
10 contaminated. And this exposure period was assumed to
11 be one year following an accident.
12 The potential accidents are evaluated in
13 terms of risk. The classical definition of risk, just
14 to, I guess, give a little risk education, is: The
15 risk is the probability of the event, times the
16 consequences, equals risk.
17 In keeping with NRC's mission to protect
18 public health and safety, we want to insure that the
19 overall risk to the public is maintained to be very
20 small. Therefore, events that have significant
21 consequences, like -- like the ones that are presented
22 in the environmental impact statement, are required to
23 be made highly unlikely through design safety
24 features. These design safety features are the topic
25 of our safety evaluation report. Remember, Lawrence

1 had the two slides; one was the environmental piece,
2 one was the safety piece. And those -- those types of
3 safety issues, to make sure that the accidents are
4 highly unlikely, are discussed in that -- that
5 document.
6 In March we notified a number of
7 stakeholders that we had identified an error in the
8 accident consequences due to a computer code bug. And
9 we felt that it was important to inform stakeholders
10 early in the process. I think actually I found out
11 about it on a Monday afternoon, and we issued a letter
12 on Thursdays. So we felt it was very important to --
13 to get the information out to you in a timely manner.
14 During subsequent review we also found an
15 additional error in wind data that DCS had provided in
16 its environmental report. Essentially a problem
17 related to units. They had reported meters per second
18 and the data was actually miles per hour. These
19 errors don't change our conclusions or preliminary
20 recommendations. The numbers presented on the slides
21 and in the comparison tables are updated, and we are
22 in the process of issuing errata sheets. Hopefully
23 those will go out next week. So by attending this
24 meeting you'll -- you'll receive errata sheets. And
25 we're also post that (sic) on the Web and -- and try

1 to get it out to people. Another thing we did was
2 extend the comment period by 30 days, so comments are
3 due now by May 14th. So we tried to be very proactive
4 in engaging the public in this.
5 The hypothetical events that caused the
6 highest consequences are a MOX explosion from a
7 hypothetical explosion. And we estimated that this
8 would result in less than 50 latent cancer fatalities
9 for the short-term scenario, and less than 200 latent
10 cancer fatalities for the one-year scenario. The
11 hypothetical tritium fire at the pit disassembly and
12 conversion facility, that number was previously 400.
13 As is stated in the environmental impact statement,
14 the short-term impacts would be less than one latent
15 cancer fatality, but for the one-year scenario we're
16 estimating 100 latent cancer fatalities could be
17 produced if that accident did happen.
18 These estimates do not credit any
19 intervention actions. That is, it's assumed that the
20 crops become contaminated and the people eat them.
21 Obviously, that may not happen, but we try to be very
22 conservative in our analysis.
23 The probability of these hypothetical
24 events occurring is still considered to be highly
25 unlikely. And again, through the use of preventative

1 and mitigative features that are part of the safety
2 evaluation that NRC is currently doing. The
3 consequences of these events are significant.
4 However, the overall risk to the public is still
5 considered to be very small because we're considering
6 those to be highly unlikely events. Next slide.
7 Air quality relates to compliance with the
8 *National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Emissions*
9 *of Chemicals*. Air quality at the Savannah River Site
10 already exceeds the particulate matter 2.5 or PM 2.5
11 standard. The proposed action would result in an
12 increase of about .1% during construction, and that's
13 largely due from earth moving activities, and .01%
14 increase during operation.
15 However, EPA has delayed implementing the
16 PM 2.5 standard. And if and when attainment plans are
17 developed by the State of Georgia and South Carolina,
18 SRS could be required to develop some plans to meet
19 those standards. It's not unlike areas that are non-
20 attainment areas. Say Atlanta is a non-attainment
21 for, say, ozone. And during the winter they burn
22 reformulated gasoline as a mitigated measure. Those
23 type of things could be implemented. Next slide,
24 Dave.
25 Surface water would not be significantly

1 affected during construction through the use of
2 sedimentation control features. And there would be no
3 direct operational discharges to surface water. Waste
4 from the MOX facility would be managed by the Savannah
5 River Site, and discharges from existing Savannah
6 River Site waste management facilities are not
7 expected to change significantly as a result of
8 processing the additional MOX waste.
9 Groundwater would be used during
10 construction and operation. Approximately 37% more
11 groundwater would be used in the "F" area from the
12 proposed action. And there is existing well capacity
13 there, and we don't feel that using this water will
14 create a significant impact either on groundwater
15 quality or its availability.
16 There would be no significant impact on
17 the current SRS waste management capability from
18 processing waste from the proposed action. Operation
19 of the three facilities would generate about 300% more
20 TRU waste than is currently being generated at SRS.
21 The TRU waste is planned to go to the waste isolation
22 pilot plant in New Mexico for disposal. The volume of
23 TRU waste at the waste isolation pilot plant would be
24 about 3% of the capacity of that facility.
25 Operation of the three facilities would

1 increase low level waste by about 32% above what is
2 currently being produced at the Savannah River Site.
3 And non-hazardous solid waste would be about 60%.
4 But, again, the SRS has capacity to handle this waste,
5 and actually the increase is -- is a small percentage
6 of what they can manage. So we don't think that the
7 waste management impacts are significant. Next slide,
8 Dave.
9 An environmental order -- sorry. Excuse
10 me. An executive order issued by President Clinton in
11 1994 directed federal agencies to address any
12 disproportionate -- excuse me, disproportionately high
13 or adverse human health impacts to low income and
14 minority populations. Impacts from constructing and
15 operating the three facilities are not high or
16 adverse. Therefore, there would be no environmental
17 justice concern associated with either constructing or
18 operating the proposed MOX facility.
19 However, due to the prevailing wind
20 directions, there is a potential impact to low income
21 and minority populations in the highly unlikely event
22 that a significant accident would occur. And we've
23 put together mitigation measures to help reduce those
24 impacts to those populations. Again, we think the
25 risk associated with these potential accidents is

1 small to -- to any population.

2 Transportation of material was identified

3 during scoping as a significant concern to many

4 stakeholders. I see Kirk is nodding his head over a

5 conversation before the meeting. Transportation

6 analysis includes shipping plutonium from various DOE

7 sites to the Savannah River Site. It also includes

8 shipping depleted uranium from a enrichment (sic)

9 facility to a -- another conversion facility, where it

10 would be processed into an oxide form, and then that

11 depleted uranium oxide would go to the Savannah River

12 Site. Our analysis also includes shipping fresh MOX

13 fuel from the Savannah River Site to a generic Midwest

14 reactor. And the transportation of -- of spent MOX

15 fuel---that is, MOX fuel that has been in the reactor-

16 --is also discussed generically.

17 To summarize, there's not a -- we found

18 that the impacts associated with all this

19 transportation are not significant. There would be

20 less than one latent cancer fatality from routine

21 transport to the public along transportation routes,

22 and also to transportation crews. Hypothetical

23 accidents result -- during transportation would result

24 in insignificant impacts.

25 The potential impacts associated with

1 using MOX fuel are also discussed generically in the
2 draft environmental impact statement. The collective
3 dose to members of the public from normal operations
4 would be essentially the same, whether the reactor
5 used conventional, low enriched uranium fuel, or a
6 mixture of low enriched uranium fuel and MOX fuel.
7 We also looked at design-base accidents
8 and the risks associated with developing a latent
9 cancer fatality between the two types of fuels; that
10 is, low enriched uranium fuel or a mixture of MOX
11 fuel. The risk varied from 6% lower to about 3%
12 greater, depending on the event that was analyzed.
13 We also looked at various beyond-design
14 basis accidents. And the risk there would vary from
15 about 7% lower to about 14% greater.
16 We have received an application from Duke
17 Power to place lead test assemblies in either their
18 Catawba or McGuire reactor, and we will do additional
19 site-specific evaluations before any lead test
20 assemblies are placed in a reactor, or before MOX fuel
21 is used in any reactor.
22 The draft environmental impact statement
23 -- and I'm almost done, so bear with me. The draft
24 environmental impact statement includes a cost benefit
25 analysis of the proposed action. And we've looked at

1 it both on a national scale and a regional scale. The
2 cost benefit analysis is used by the NRC in
3 determining its preliminary recommendation.
4 The national cost, the information on the
5 left, would be about $3.85 billion. The national
6 benefits would include the safe use of excess
7 plutonium, and also employment and income. On a
8 regional scale---and, again, the region we looked at
9 is -- is essentially a 15-county area surrounding the
10 Savannah River Site---the proportion national cost
11 within that region would be about $8 million. The
12 regional environmental costs are considered, and the
13 environmental impacts that are presented in the draft
14 environmental impact statement are not considered to
15 be significant. The regional benefits would be about
16 $350 million in income during construction, and $640
17 million during operation. Next slide, Dave.
18 In conclusion, the impacts of the proposed
19 action are generally not significant. Accident
20 impacts from the pit disassembly and conversion
21 facility and the MOX facility are significant.
22 However, the probability of these accidents is
23 considered to be highly unlikely. And, again, our
24 regulations and our mission, as far as protecting the
25 public health and safety, requires those accidents to

1 be highly unlikely.

2 Therefore, the overall risk to the public

3 is considered to be very small. There is a potential

4 environmental justice concern, should an accident

5 occur. And part of the reason we're out here is to

6 hopefully get comments on whether the mitigation

7 measures that we proposed are on target, or whether we

8 should consider other things.

9 Staff's preliminary recommendation is the

10 proposed MOX facility with appropriate mitigation

11 measures to reduce the potential impacts. Before

12 making any decision, the NRC will consider comments on

13 the draft environmental impact statement. We'll

14 prepare a comment summary document so that you can see

15 how your comment was addressed, and then we'll revise

16 the environmental impact statement as appropriate.

17 NRC will finalize the EIS and complete its

18 safety evaluation report, and decide whether or not to

19 authorize construction of the MOX facility. When DCS

20 submits an operating license application, NRC will

21 review that application and prepare a second safety

22 evaluation report. NRC will only grant authority to

23 operate the MOX facility if it can be shown to be

24 safe.

25 The next slide shows ways that you can

1 submit comments. Again, as I mentioned, we've
2 extended the comment period to May 14th. You can mail
3 comments to Mike Lesser; you can send me an Email; you
4 can also submit comments on the Web; and then you can
5 fax comments to me. And again, all the comments we
6 hear tonight will be part of the official comment
7 record. And I thank you and look forward to hearing
8 your comments.
9 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Tim. And
10 thank you all for your patience in sitting through
11 what is a lot of detail, but...
12 MR. HARRIS: I tried to hit the high
13 points.
14 MR. CAMERON: ...but I was just going to
15 say Tim tried to hit the high points on it. But --
16 and if we need to go back to a particular slide for
17 your question, we'll -- we'll do that.
18 One important issue that I wanted to make
19 sure that people understand, though, is that in
20 addition to the NRC's evaluation -- the environmental
21 evaluation and consideration of public comments in
22 that, before we make a decision on whether to grant or
23 to deny the construction authorization, there's the
24 safety evaluation that has to be completed and
25 combined with the environmental evaluation; is that

1 correct?

2 MR. HARRIS: Right.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

4 MR. HARRIS: And that's -- I think that's

5 an important -- important point.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Good.

7 Sara, you had -- probably have a lot of

8 questions. I know you had -- had one.

9 MS. BARCZAK: I'll only ask one to start

10 with. A clarification, I think, from Lawrence.

11 What are the remaining chances for us to

12 have public input in this process? I only -- I saw

13 two public comment boxes. But I was hoping he could

14 elaborate on that.

15 And then secondly---and Dave might answer

16 this---is there any input in the safety evaluation

17 review? So...

18 MR. HARRIS: I'll try to answer those, and

19 if either -- either gentleman want to...

20 MS. BARCZAK: Okay.

21 MR. HARRIS: ...add more, they can.

22 Essentially, the process that we talked

23 about, the last public involvement is what we're doing

24 right now. So we're out here trying to solicit

25 comments, you know. We've tried to have been very

1 proactive in getting information out to the public.

2 I'll try to talk louder. Can you hear me,

3 Chip?

4 UNIDENTIFIED: We can hear you.

5 MR. HARRIS: Okay.

6 MR. CAMERON: Is it -- is it coming

7 through, Melanie, onto the...

8 COURT REPORTER: Is Tim coming through?

9 Is that what you're asking me?

10 MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

11 COURT REPORTER: Go ahead and speak.

12 MR. HARRIS: Yeah, it sounded -- I guess

13 it's back now.

14 MR. CAMERON: All right.

15 MR. HARRIS: Your other comment related to

16 public input during the safety evaluation report. And

17 typically we don't solicit comment on the draft safety

18 evaluation report. But we do have public meetings,

19 trying to keep the public informed. And we're always

20 receptive to comments. But there's no formal process

21 as part of that review.

22 MS. BARCZAK: Not like this?

23 MR. HARRIS: Not like this. But again, we

24 do have meetings on the safety evaluation report where

25 the public can attend and ask questions and express

1 views.

2 MR. CAMERON: And can you -- can you just

3 tell people a little bit more about that? And I don't

4 know if John wanted to talk to that or not, but...

5 MR. HULL: I just wanted to add something

6 in clarification.

7 MR. CAMERON: ...unfortunately we need to

8 get you on the microphone.

9 MR. HULL: On the safety review that's now

10 ongoing, there is a hearing that's also underway, a

11 legal hearing before the Atomic Safety and Licensing

12 Board. And there are two intervener groups which are

13 -- do have several contentions that have been admitted

14 by the board on safety issues. So that's a form of

15 public input, although limited.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And I guess just to

17 finish that up, when the staff meets with the

18 applicant on the safety evaluation issues, as you

19 said, those meetings are open, but they're usually --

20 are they usually in -- in NRC headquarters or...

21 MR. HARRIS: Well, we have them in

22 different places. And we have meetings in -- in North

23 Augusta; also at headquarters.

24 MR. CAMERON: And if Sara or anybody else

25 wanted to find out when those meetings were going to

1 be held...

2 MR. HARRIS: They're noticed on the NRC

3 Web page which I'm sure Sara is very familiar with, at

4 the meeting -- meeting notice section.

5 MS. BARCZAK: So if we write to you, then

6 that will be included in the official public comment

7 period only tonight?

8 MR. CAMERON: Let me get you -- I'm sorry,

9 we couldn't hear you, plus we need to get it on the

10 transcript. It's a nuisance, but...

11 MS. BARCZAK: So if we write to you after

12 this meeting, that will be included in the official

13 public commentary, or it won't be?

14 MR. HARRIS: Yes, it will. Up through May

15 14th. You can write to me; you can send me an Email.

16 If you go to the Web, there's a space there for you to

17 submit comments or you can fax them to me. So there's

18 lots of ways to hopefully -- for you to send comments.

19 MR. CAMERON: Let's -- let's go to Mr.

20 Dunham and then we'll come over. Okay.

21 COURT REPORTER: Be sure and give your

22 name when you start speaking, please.

23 MR. CAMERON: Oh, yes, please -- please do

24 that. In fact, let me get yours.

25 MS. PEARSON: Kelli Pearson.

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Kelli.

2 Mr. Dunham?

3 MR. DUNHAM: Chester Dunham.

4 You did say this is the last meeting of

5 its kind? The type of meeting that we're having

6 tonight, you said something...

7 MR. HARRIS: For the draft environmental

8 impact statement we're -- we're holding two additional

9 meetings later this week. But I don't believe that

10 we're going -- planning to...

11 MR. CAMERON: Maybe we can get you up

12 there. Because otherwise people are going to have to

13 speak into the microphone so we get it on the

14 transcript.

15 MR. DUNHAM: The only thing I want to ask

16 at the present time is that, you know, this is real --

17 this is some serious stuff.

18 MR. HARRIS: Uh-huh.

19 MR. DUNHAM: And what I'm saying, when I

20 look around I want to see what you all did so far as

21 getting the information out to the public. You know,

22 I don't see no -- I see one elected official, I think.

23 Alderman Pete McKacus (phonetic), I saw him earlier.

24 Right. He's over there. And I think that's all.

25 You know, this -- serious as this is, we

1 should have had all of our elected officials. This --
2 we shouldn't have had room in this little building
3 right here to hold the people. The seriousness of it,
4 they all should know about what's going on. And
5 that's the question I wanted to ask, so far as what we
6 did so far as getting the communication out, you know,
7 for them to be here speaking, you know, one way or the
8 other.
9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
10 Dunham.
11 Tim?
12 MR. HARRIS: To -- people like yourself,
13 Mr. Dunham, that attended previous meetings, we mailed
14 you a copy of the environmental impact statement. We
15 also mailed you an invitation to these meetings. We
16 also have an electronic newsletter that's broadcast to
17 hundreds of people. I don't know what the exact
18 number is. But a large number of people get that. We
19 also advertise in the paper. So we -- we tried to do
20 everything we could to get people out.
21 MR. COBB: It was in the paper last
22 Friday. Unfortunately it told us the wrong day, but
23 it was in the paper. It was in...
24 MR. CAMERON: We probably should get...
25 MR. COBB: It says Monday.

1 MR. CAMERON: We probably should get that
2 on the transcript. I don't know what's the matter
3 with this microphone. I don't know whether we're
4 going to be able to...
5 COURT REPORTER: I think if -- if they'll
6 stand up and just speak standing, without the...
7 MR. CAMERON: Without the mic, you'll be
8 able to get...
9 COURT REPORTER: ...without the stick,
10 that I'll be able to get them; yes.
11 MR. COBB: Okay. I'll make a comment...
12 COURT REPORTER: But I do need your -- I
13 do need your name, though.
14 MR. COBB: Yes. Kirk Cobb.
15 And the comment I have is the -- the
16 notification for this meeting was in Friday's *Savannah*
17 *Morning News*. And -- but it said 7:00 to 10:00 on
18 Monday, and of course that was wrong, it was Tuesday.
19 MR. HARRIS: Yeah, we advertise in the
20 paper, but that wasn't our advertisement. That was --
21 that was an article that was done by the paper.
22 MR. COBB: Right.
23 MR. HARRIS: And I don't -- I don't
24 believe it was reviewed by us.
25 MR. COBB: Right. There was a public

1 notice in the newspaper. And if someone showed up
2 yesterday, then they could have come today. It's
3 better that it wasn't yesterday, it was going to be
4 tonight, you know.
5 MR. HARRIS: You know, and we also try to
6 outreach, you know, to Sara, who's -- who's very
7 connected to community, to have her help disseminate
8 the word, as well, and solicit, you know, to Sara how
9 -- how can we let people know better.
10 MR. CAMERON: But let's -- let's go back
11 to Mr. Dunham's point, and maybe there's something we
12 can do about this. I think his concern was to make
13 sure that the elected officials here knew about this
14 meeting. And the meeting is less important than --
15 than knowing that there is this process going on, that
16 there is a draft environmental impact statement out
17 for review.
18 Can we talk through various means, talking
19 to Sara, Mr. Dunham, can we get a -- and Councilman,
20 can we get a list of the elected officials in the City
21 of Savannah, and make sure that we send them the fact
22 that this is out for comment, if we haven't done that
23 already?
24 MR. HARRIS: Well, if they attended
25 meetings, any previous meetings, we mailed it to them.

1 MR. CAMERON: But I don't think they have.

2 MR. HARRIS: But if they -- if they

3 haven't, then yeah, if Sara or -- or Chester wants to

4 put...

5 MR. COBB: If they get the list, we'll

6 make it available.

7 MR. HARRIS: Yeah, we'll make it available

8 to them.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So we'll work with

10 you, we'll get it to the local officials so that they

11 have time to look at it and still meet the comment

12 deadline.

13 UNIDENTIFIED: The public virtually has no

14 idea about this.

15 UNIDENTIFIED: The people that were

16 impacted have no idea about this.

17 UNIDENTIFIED: Right. No one knows about

18 this going on now.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

20 UNIDENTIFIED: And I luckily got an Email.

21 MR. CAMERON: All right. Thank you. I

22 think...

23 UNIDENTIFIED: Next time I'll know. I

24 mean, I'm in the loop now.

25 MR. CAMERON: Well taken. All right.

1 Yes, sir. And let's...

2 MR. MERESKI: Okay, try it without. My

3 name is Victor Mereski, M-E-R-E-S-K-I.

4 I think part of the reason for the lack of

5 participation here is the general feeling that

6 decisions have already been made and this is just a

7 show for public benefit. And I hope that isn't true,

8 which is one reason I've come to make some comments.

9 But deep-down I believe the decision has been made and

10 my statements will make no difference.

11 MR. CAMERON: Can we -- I think it's

12 important to...

13 [Applause.]

14 MR. CAMERON: ...for the NRC to address

15 that concern.

16 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. I mean, I think that's

17 why we took the effort to come down here tonight and

18 have the meeting, is to get your comment. If -- if

19 your comments weren't going to make any difference, I

20 could have stayed at home and had dinner with my wife

21 and kids. It's important for us to come down here to

22 spend the time to get the comments. And to answer

23 your first point, no, no decision has been made. This

24 is just one step in the process. Again, the safety

25 evaluation report is still ongoing, and there's a

1 number of significant items that are in discussion
2 between NRC staff and the applicant. So no, the
3 decision has not been made.
4 MR. CAMERON: And all the record for this,
5 the how we consider the comments on the EIS,...
6 MR. HARRIS: We'd like...
7 MR. CAMERON: ...what is being considered
8 in the safety evaluation is there for people to -- to
9 see. In other words, it's a visible process.
10 MR. HARRIS: Right. If you -- if you
11 submit a comment that relates to an issue that's in
12 the safety evaluation report, staff will get that.
13 MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's -- let's go
14 right here.
15 MS. PAUL: I don't want to use that; all
16 right?
17 MR. CAMERON: Okay.
18 MS. PAUL: My name is Bobbie Paul. And I
19 would like to address how our comments are received.
20 And I did attend the other meeting. And as people
21 make comments, what is the procedure that you all use
22 to evaluate them? I understand there are lots of
23 scientific, you know, equations and different things
24 you use.
25 How many people are looking over these

1 comments? I have a lot of people who want to write
2 literally hundreds of letters, and they ask me a
3 similar question: How will my comments be received?
4 And I don't know what to tell them.
5 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. We take each comment
6 and, you know, depending on how many specific issues
7 are in that comment letter, it may be one comment,
8 "I'm opposed to the facility," we take that. You
9 know, one comment, "I'm for the facility." We take
10 that. More importantly, the comments relate to, "I
11 don't think you adequately addressed this issue
12 because..." So we take that comment and combine it
13 with other comments and look at the totality of
14 comments within that area and say, "Should we change
15 this? Should we do another analysis?"
16 MS. PAUL: So the more technical actually
17 -- more technical, the more specific tends to rise to
18 the top?
19 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. I mean, I have a hard
20 time with -- with what to do with, "I'm opposed to the
21 facility." "I'm for the facility."
22 MS. PAUL: Right. I understand.
23 MR. HARRIS: You know, a specific comment
24 on a specific issue, and you may make many of those,
25 you know. "I don't want the facility because I don't

1 think these impacts were adequately addressed."

2 All those get compiled, and we produce a

3 common response document. So you can go and -- and

4 look at say, "Okay, this was an issue. My comment is

5 reflected in that comment. This is what the NRC did

6 with the comment." So it's a very transparent

7 process.

8 MS. PAUL: So if we're looking at say the

9 immobilization, for example,...

10 MR. HARRIS: Right.

11 MS. PAUL: ...and as I recall during your

12 presentation you said if -- mainly you backed up to

13 the U.S.-Russia...

14 MR. HARRIS: Right. Didn't meet the

15 purpose and need of the...

16 MS. PAUL: Right. Can you just succinctly

17 say what -- why?

18 MR. HARRIS: Why? Because it didn't meet

19 the U.S.-Russia agreements. That the -- the

20 Department of Energy felt that -- an immobilization

21 only approach wouldn't be accepted by the Russians.

22 So because...

23 MS. PAUL: Because they wouldn't accept

24 them or we couldn't...

25 MR. HARRIS: Wouldn't accept that

1 alternative. Because the purpose and need relates to
2 those U.S.-Russia agreements, as well as other things.
3 MS. PAUL: And that wasn't just a
4 convenient thing so that we didn't need to look at it.
5 Once we hit that portal, it was off the table; is that
6 right?
7 MR. HARRIS: That was their decision. I
8 mean, people may comment otherwise, and we certainly
9 welcome those comments.
10 MS. PAUL: And about how many people
11 decide on our comments, look at our comments?
12 MR. HARRIS: Around 20.
13 MS. PAUL: Okay. Thank you.
14 MR. HARRIS: At various levels.
15 MR. CAMERON: One thing that I think it
16 might be important for people to understand, the issue
17 that was raised just there, is that -- and I'm going
18 to ask Tim or Lawrence or -- or John to perhaps
19 address this, is that the NRC is given -- has been
20 given a specific responsibility by Congress in our
21 legislation to evaluate the safety and environmental
22 impacts of an action. And that's why when someone
23 writes in and they say, "We support it," period, or,
24 "We're against it," period, without anything more, we
25 don't have the authority -- in other words, our

1 mission is not to count how many people were for or
2 how many people are against. That's why, as in your
3 phrase, the technical, and include environmental in
4 there, rise to the top; because they go to our
5 statutory authority and our -- our mission.
6 MR. HARRIS: And we look at -- look at the
7 comment and look at what we had written and said,
8 "Should we revise this? Should we do something else?
9 Should we modify from the -- from the draft to the
10 final?" So that's how your comments are used.
11 MS. PAUL: So if there were -- if there
12 were, say, 200,000 people outside that just said they
13 didn't want this, versus a technical thing that...
14 MR. CAMERON: The 200,000 people who don't
15 want it, the NRC can't do anything about that because
16 we're a creation of the Congress. The 200,000 people
17 who don't want it need to talk to the -- to the
18 legislature.
19 MS. PAUL: Legislature. Right.
20 MR. CAMERON: Okay, that's how that --
21 that works. We only have a specific...
22 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. Again, our mission is
23 to protect public health and safety.
24 MR. CAMERON: Okay, we're going to --
25 we're going to go right here, and then we'll go over

1 to that young lady. Go ahead.

2 And let -- Melanie, let me know if you

3 can't hear and we'll try the microphone.

4 And please give us your name.

5 MS. GASINK: My name is Kellie Gasink.

6 I actually had a number of comments,

7 though not lengthy. But I really don't have a

8 question, any more than I feel that -- that you're

9 coming to us with a question. In fact, what I just

10 got through hearing is every last person in Savannah

11 could be opposed to this and that wouldn't impact on

12 you at all. And I think that that's an important

13 thing right there.

14 There's a very big difference between

15 democracy and pretend democracy. And what we have

16 here is a pretend democracy. And so what that looks

17 like is that we're not able to determine social

18 policy. But, in fact, social policy is what perhaps

19 being decided (sic) by people who don't have to live

20 next to -- to this facility.

21 Democracy would mean that if we don't want

22 our children---I have three of them, age 4, 4, and 6--

23 -living next to a dangerous nuclear material, I can't

24 choose to not have that be. I can't choose that, and

25 none of you can choose that. So that -- that's a

1 tremendous problem. And if we don't want to have
2 nuclear bombs and weapons near our children for moral,
3 ethical, and other reasons, that's also a choice we
4 can't make.
5 So I want to start by saying that this is
6 not a democratic procedure. And we're going to have
7 to go from there. But unfortunately the answers don't
8 lie with the people trying to offer us pretend
9 democracy.
10 And then I wanted to express my
11 disappointment at this environmental impact statement.
12 And I don't think it addresses the environmental
13 impact on us at all. And if I asked the people in
14 this room, I don't think that they would think that
15 what you've said addresses the environmental impact on
16 this community on having this facility here.
17 And I want to say that we don't agree with
18 the increased nuclear contamination or with nuclear
19 waste, and that we vote no, for what it's worth, and
20 that you should tell your superiors that. We don't go
21 with this mess. And -- and so I want to just say that
22 I am with the Green Party of Chatham County, and as
23 such, we're concerned very much with the environment.
24 We're concerned with three aspects of the environment,
25 actually. We're concerned with the physical

1 environment, we're concerned with the social
2 environment, and we're also concerned with the
3 political environment. And I have concerns in regards
4 for all three.
5 As far as with the physical environment,
6 there is no way to eliminate -- there's risks.
7 There's no way to make the risk of nuclear accidents--
8 -I love this---highly unlikely without getting rid of
9 the facility. There's no way to make the risk of
10 these accidents highly unlikely, other than to not put
11 them next to a city of 135,000 people, which they
12 could do. Most of the place -- places in this country
13 are areas that are more than 90 miles from a large
14 city. And this is what they're not doing.
15 They won't address why they won't put this
16 in the desert. Why not? Okay. That's what they
17 should be answering. Not having pretend democracy.
18 We don't need pretend democracy.
19 Also we're concerned with the social
20 environment. This plan will increase racism in this
21 county. And that's a problem. That's a social
22 problem.
23 Also there is the issue of the political
24 environment, and this plan will take away political
25 power from us. Because of having nuclear weapons and

1 nuclear materials in our neighborhood, we're actually
2 have less (sic) ability to control anything that goes
3 in our neighborhood. We're able to have less control
4 over our local elected officials because of the
5 interference of the federal government.
6 So we object to the impact on the
7 environment on the physical, social, and political
8 levels.
9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Kellie.
10 And I -- I just would encourage all of you, and not
11 just Kellie, but when you do have reasons why you
12 disagree with what is in this draft---and I'd
13 emphasize that---please -- you know, please let us
14 know in writing and please go into detail.
15 MR. HARRIS: Yeah, the more -- the more
16 specifics you can provide, the better.
17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Yes. Do you want to
18 try it without?
19 MS. LAMB: Yes.
20 MR. CAMERON: Okay, go ahead. And please
21 give us your name.
22 MS. LAMB: My name is Whitney Erin Lamb.
23 First of all, I want to second everything that she
24 said. And I want to know why the damage from the
25 product that this place is going to create isn't

1 included in the risk and with the overall damage of
2 the area?
3 MR. HARRIS: Can she be more specific,
4 Chip, as far as...
5 MR. CAMERON: Well, it sounds to me...
6 MS. LAMB: Bombs make a mess. Why isn't
7 that...
8 MR. CAMERON: ...sounds to me that...
9 MS. LAMB: ...going in with the mess of
10 the whole plant. The products.
11 MR. CAMERON: Is that more specific?
12 MR. HARRIS: Well, the product of the --
13 the proposed MOX facility is reactor fuel.
14 MS. LAMB: Some of the product that goes
15 to creating more damage and...
16 MR. HARRIS: I think the piece -- the
17 piece that we're looking at is -- only relates to the
18 surplus weapons plutonium being converted to reactor
19 fuel.
20 MS. LAMB: Right. Let me clarify.
21 MR. HARRIS: Okay, please.
22 MS. LAMB: I don't think that everything
23 has been included in a broad enough scale, as far as
24 the people in the area and the environment that is
25 impacted by this one site. I think it branches out

1 more than we are talking about.

2 MR. CAMERON: So you think that like the

3 scope of impacts looked at has to be...

4 MS. LAMB: Right.

5 MR. CAMERON: ...broader, and that other

6 types of -- of cost, besides the costs that you saw in

7 those slide -- that slide, additional costs have to be

8 looked at.

9 MS. LAMB: And what happens when the

10 facility is useless? How will you clean it up?

11 MR. HARRIS: Yeah, well, we included the

12 environmental impacts associated with cleanup.

13 MS. LAMB: Can you summarize it?

14 UNIDENTIFIED: It's insignificant; right?

15 MR. HARRIS: I -- I don't know if I can

16 get into that -- it's been months since I read that

17 section, but...

18 MR. CAMERON: But first of all, though...

19 MR. HARRIS: ...I can try to get you some

20 answer. It was -- it was costly...

21 MR. CAMERON: Decommissioning impact has

22 been looked at?

23 MR. HARRIS: Yeah.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

25 MR. HARRIS: It shows how much low level

1 waste would be generated, what the cost would be, what
2 the doses to the public would be, what the doses to
3 the workers would be.
4 MS. LAMB: And how long it was out there?
5 MR. HARRIS: How -- yeah, right.
6 MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's -- we're going
7 to go for some questions back here, and then maybe
8 we'll shift gears. And Kellie sort of started us off
9 with a comment. Maybe we'll get some more comments
10 and then come back for questions. But I know there's
11 a number of people who have questions, so let's give
12 it a whirl.
13 Do you want to try, Kirk, without this?
14 MR. COBB: I think I can speak loud enough
15 that you can all understand me, and I don't need the
16 microphone; okay? And I'm Kirk Cobb. And I'm a
17 chemical engineer. Lived here in the Savannah area
18 for 24 years. Work in private industry. And I -- I
19 did get a -- I received a copy of your draft. And I
20 didn't read through it all, but I picked out a few
21 interesting points.
22 And first of all, unlike some of you, the
23 concern I have is that there are 38 metric tons of
24 plutonium in the United States located in these --
25 they're stored -- this plutonium is stored in the

1 places that are shown here. They're Department of
2 Energy facilities; right?
3 MR. HARRIS: Right.
4 MR. COBB: Okay. They're all over the
5 country. Most of them -- now, if you look, there's a
6 table on Page 1-9 that shows us how many tons are in
7 what location. There -- in the Pantex site and the
8 Rocky Mountain Flats site, which are in the panhandle
9 of Texas and in what -- and east of Colorado, of the
10 38 metric tons of plutonium, 33 metric tons, and
11 that's a significant total or significant amount of
12 the total, are in the panhandle of Texas and in
13 Colorado.
14 MR. HARRIS: Right.
15 MR. COBB: Why not build -- no. And I do
16 want this other statement. Because some of you will
17 disagree with me. I think it's a very good idea to
18 utilize this -- to tie up this plutonium as -- as fuel
19 rods and use it, dilute it, make it so that it's not
20 an enriched plutonium, so that it's not susceptible to
21 being stolen or -- by -- or hijacked or whatever by
22 terrorists or something. Let's get this stuff out of
23 circulation. And I think it's a good plan to...
24 And the last time we were here, the
25 plutonium -- I asked the question: How much

1 plutonium's going to go in the fuel rods? And the
2 answer was: Oh, about 4 or 5%. So you're like, all
3 right, 94, 95% uranium fuel with 5% plutonium.
4 Terrific. So let's do this program. And I -- I went
5 through some numbers with Dave earlier today. You're
6 going to use about a ton of this stuff in one reactor
7 every 18 months. So you can work out some numbers.
8 I thought it was very interesting. In about 12 years
9 it'll be used up. It'll be tied up in waste fuel,
10 which then can go to a geological deposit. This is
11 good.
12 My feeling -- my thought, though, is since
13 the majority of the stuff is in the panhandle of Texas
14 and in Colorado, why not build the MOX facility up --
15 either in Texas, for example, where most of the stuff
16 is located. Twenty-one (21) metric tons is at the
17 Pantex site, which is the panhandle of Texas. Take
18 everything there, do the process there, and there are
19 enough nuclear power plants in Texas. As Dave said,
20 you're probably planning to use these fuel rods in
21 only four reactors. There's -- there are four
22 reactors in Texas. Use -- do the whole thing in
23 Texas, and be done with it.
24 MR. CAMERON: Okay.
25 MR. COBB: Okay?

1 MR. CAMERON: Kirk,...

2 MR. COBB: Those are my thoughts.

3 MR. CAMERON: Great. And we're supposedly

4 in a question period now, and obviously we're...

5 UNIDENTIFIED: We're supposed to have

6 already been in the comment period.

7 MR. COBB: But I thought you were asking

8 for comments.

9 MR. CAMERON: We're hearing -- we're

10 hearing comments; okay? And we're going to treat --

11 when we hear a comment, even though it might be

12 phrased like a question, we're going to take that.

13 MR. COBB: I'm not offering a question.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

15 MR. COBB: I'm not asking a question. I'm

16 offering a comment.

17 MR. CAMERON: Right. And I think that

18 what we need to do is, let's see if there's just

19 straight informational questions that we can clear up,

20 and then let's go to comment period. And I think,

21 Cheryl, we'll put you on first.

22 MS. JAY: Well, my -- my question is why

23 aren't we following our agenda? We've already --

24 we're supposed to be in public comments at 8:00, and

25 we're already -- it's already 8:00.

1 MR. CAMERON: Well, I think that obviously
2 there's a lot of questions; okay?
3 MS. JAY: Well, that's my question.
4 MR. CAMERON: And we're trying to be
5 flexible to deal with those questions. Unfortunately,
6 it's far from running a train here, or maybe it is
7 like running a train; we're late. Let's see what
8 informational questions we have, and then we'll go
9 right into comment; okay?
10 Questions. Now, these are questions.
11 Yes, sir, go ahead.
12 MR. KYLER: Yeah. I'm Dave Kyler of the
13 Center for a Sustainable Coast.
14 Two questions. One is: How often have
15 either a construction authorization or operation
16 licensing been denied or revoked by NRC?
17 MR. HARRIS: It has occurred. More --
18 more likely what happens is that the applicant and the
19 NRC can't agree to close issues, and the thing just
20 basically dies on the vine. That's what happens more
21 often than not, rather than NRC...
22 MR. KYLER: Can you say how often that is?
23 Do you have any ballpark...
24 MR. HARRIS: The NRC has tons of licenses,
25 and I can't speak to how many have been -- how many

1 applications have not been -- I just don't have that
2 knowledge.
3 MR. CAMERON: If you are interested in
4 specifics, we probably can -- can get you that. But
5 there have been a number of large projects, reactor
6 projects, that have been cancelled because the NRC
7 regulations could not be met.
8 MR. HARRIS: You know, a recent example is
9 the LES enrichment facility that the applicant
10 withdrew their application.
11 MR. CAMERON: Second question?
12 MR. KYLER: Yeah. Accident impacts at MOX
13 facilities are significant, but, according to your
14 assessment, risk is small, you know, with a low
15 probability of occurring. How is that probability
16 determined?
17 MR. HARRIS: I'm going to let Dave answer
18 that question.
19 MR. CAMERON: Lawrence, did you have
20 something else that you wanted to say, too? I'm not
21 preempting Dave, but I forgot you had your hand up.
22 You wanted to clarify something.
23 MR. KOKAJKO: Well, I just wanted to say,
24 you asked about what the NRC has done. The Atomic
25 Safety and Licensing Board just recently made a

1 partial decision on a private fuel storage initiative
2 in Utah denying their request to build a large
3 centralized interim storage facility. That just came
4 out this month. As a data point, the -- the -- I
5 could not tell you, you know, where we have ceased --
6 told them to stop operations. I mean, there's a lot
7 of examples. I worked on two projects, two reactor
8 projects, and we maintained them shut down for
9 extended periods of time until they got their safety
10 program back up to where we thought it should be.
11 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Lawrence.
12 Dave, how is probability -- the
13 probability part of the risk equation determined?
14 MR. BROWN: Well, the -- the applicant
15 needs to make a case that -- that they're going to
16 show that this accident is highly unlikely, and that
17 they've applied the right kind of equipment and
18 strategies to make that case to the NRC. And then
19 that's what we're reviewing right now.
20 We've mentioned in our safety evaluation
21 that's ongoing we've got about 66 open items that have
22 been -- many of them have now been closed by getting
23 additional information from the applicant about things
24 like how are they going to reduce the probability of
25 that accident.

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

2 We have a question here, and then we're

3 going to go down here. Yes?

4 MR. KOKAJKO: Could I make one more

5 comment on that, please.

6 The facility is required to submit an

7 integrated safety assessment in addition to their

8 safety analysis on how they come -- they think the

9 facility is safe. This is a tool that is used to

10 determine the probabilities of these accident

11 sequences and what they could do to help prevent and

12 mitigate them at the facility. This is required under

13 the Title X *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 70. And

14 the DCS will have to submit this ISA as part of their

15 application process.

16 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

17 Yes, ma'am?

18 MS. HARRIS: My name is Maxine Harris.

19 My question is: If the Savannah River

20 Site is funded by the federal government, what happens

21 if all of this weapons grade plutonium is gathered

22 together at this site and the government, as we know,

23 is headed into deep deficits already, and with the war

24 it's continuing. What happens if the government is no

25 longer able to fund the ongoing process, and this

1 accumulation of plutonium or MOX are sitting in old,
2 antiquated, leaky tanks? And I understand that there
3 has been an incident of a leak already that caused
4 some problems. What is to prevent -- prevent this
5 situation from happening?
6 MR. HARRIS: I think we're going to let
7 the -- the gentleman from the Department of Energy --
8 but I think it's important to note that, you know, the
9 Department of Energy operates the Savannah River Site.
10 The NRC is an independent government agency, and our
11 only role at the Savannah River Site relates to
12 evaluating the safety of the proposed MOX facility.
13 As far as other -- other Savannah River Site
14 activities, we don't have any interaction at all.
15 I'll let my colleague from the Department
16 of Energy...
17 MR. CAMERON: I think maybe this is
18 working back here. Let's give it a try.
19 MR. BROMBERG: My name is Ken Bromberg
20 from the Department of Energy. And I would -- I would
21 make several points in regard to the question.
22 First of all, with the exception of the
23 Rocky Flats material, all of the plutonium will stay
24 at the respective DOE sites until just in time, when
25 it's ready to be made into MOX fuel. Then it will be

1 brought to South Carolina to be made into MOX fuel,
2 other than Rocky Flats.
3 Point two, there's legislation that was
4 passed, introduced by now Senator Lindsay Graham that
5 requires that if the material is not made into MOX
6 fuel by 2012, and in each year after that by an amount
7 stipulated in the legislation, the federal government
8 is fined a million dollars a day, up to $100 million
9 a year, for each and every year that that plutonium
10 stays there.
11 Third of all, none of the plutonium that
12 is going to be made into MOX fuel is in the form of
13 liquid waste. It's all in the form of -- two-thirds
14 of it is in the form of metal and pit form, which is
15 currently stored at the Pantex plant in Texas, and the
16 rest is stabilized and stored as -- in a powdered form
17 in a sealed 3013 container. So none of it is in a
18 liquid form that's going to spill from a high level
19 waste tank.
20 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Ken.
21 Let's go down here. This seems to be
22 functioning, but -- it isn't?
23 UNIDENTIFIED: No, it's not functioning.
24 MR. CUTTER: Vernell Cutter.
25 Earlier it was stated that this is not a

1 give me, that this is still open. Two weeks ago we
2 had the bi-state conference by the Savannah State
3 College, where we were glad that over 135 citizens
4 from around this area participated. But it was stated
5 at that meeting that there is a MOX facility building
6 on location at the Savannah River Site. Is that true?
7 MR. HARRIS: No, I don't believe that is
8 true. We did send invitations to try to publicly
9 advertise the series of meetings that were had at that
10 conference that you talked about. We talked to Dr.
11 McLean, and also to Renaul, and I can never pronounce
12 her last name, who was gracious enough to, I
13 understand, set those out. And I was happy to hear
14 from Dr. McLean that the conference was a success.
15 But I should clarify that there is no MOX facility at
16 the Savannah River Site. That's still under review.
17 MR. CUTTER: It was also alluded to
18 earlier -- it was actually stated that our country is
19 now at war and there seems to be some problems with
20 France. Isn't Cogema a French-owned company?
21 MR. HARRIS: That is correct.
22 MR. CUTTER: Just wanted to be sure.
23 If we're talking about MOX fuel, what is
24 the utilization of that fuel? Is it for electricity?
25 MR. HARRIS: Yes. The reactor fuel would

1 be -- the current plan is to have the mixed oxide fuel
2 used in a reactor, and that reactor would produce
3 electricity.
4 MR. CUTTER: Produce electricity for whom?
5 MR. HARRIS: I assume for Duke -- Duke
6 Power customers.
7 MR. CUTTER: Duke Power customers,
8 meaning, then, for folk in the Augusta/Aiken, South
9 Carolina area, that would not cheapen their electric
10 bill or their power bill?
11 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. I don't -- I don't
12 think I can comment on that.
13 MR. CUTTER: I'm just saying, so you're
14 saying, then, that our government will spend money to
15 do this, build the facility, but then Duke would take
16 the benefit for producing power and charging a
17 customer?
18 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.
19 UNIDENTIFIED: That's right.
20 MR. HARRIS: Is that correct, Peter?
21 Todd?
22 MR. KAISH: My name is Todd Kaish. I work
23 for...
24 UNIDENTIFIED: Speak up.
25 MR. KAISH: My name is Todd Kaish. I work

1 with Duke Cogema Stone & Webster. The mission
2 reactors, the Duke reactors are not supplying power to
3 the Aiken and Augusta area. The area -- the area in
4 their service area is North and South Carolina.
5 UNIDENTIFIED: Not even in Savannah? Not
6 even in Georgia?
7 MR. CUTTER: So, again, I want to be sure
8 that my question is answered here. You're saying,
9 then, that the residents, citizens of Georgia, South
10 Carolina, will bear the main environmental impact
11 statement effect, but then the utilization of the
12 power will be benefit (sic) by the citizens of North
13 Carolina and South Carolina?
14 MR. CAMERON: And I guess that these fuel
15 rods from the MOX facility could go to any number of
16 reactors. But I think your point is coming across,
17 Mr. Cutter. But I think that people, as Tim had
18 indicated in his presentation, would say that the
19 benefits of this program, or the supposed benefits,
20 depending on what you think about it, is to -- to deal
21 with the weapons material. So there's a number of
22 benefits.
23 But let me go to my colleagues. Let's go
24 to Lawrence to see what his response is. And we
25 really need to -- I'm going to just have a -- go for

1 a couple more questions, and then we're going to start
2 the formal comment, and we'll come back to you for
3 questions. But I think we need to get on.
4 Lawrence?
5 MR. KOKAJKO: First, what the Duke plants
6 have -- or will be doing -- first, what the Duke
7 plants will be doing will be putting the fuel in as
8 lead test assemblies. When you put in a new fuel type
9 or a new enrichment of fuel type into a reactor, you
10 just can't, I guess, go buy it and go put it in there.
11 You have to evaluate it because it changes the
12 parameters of the reactor operations design. It may
13 change the accident consequences, as pointed out by
14 Tim in one of his slides.
15 So what they've agreed to do thus far---
16 and it's by no means certain---is they would like to
17 be able to put this fuel in the -- certain facilities,
18 and then they'll evaluate its performance. So
19 conceivably, the fuel -- let's say if it -- if it
20 worked out, they would then try to be used (sic) in
21 other reactors throughout the nation. So it's not
22 just the -- the North Carolina plants. It could be
23 plants in Iowa, Vermont, Arizona, California, or
24 wherever. It could be anywhere. But the idea is that
25 it's got to be tested first. And so these lead test

1 assemblies are being done up there. So it's not a
2 matter that they're all of a sudden receiving the
3 benefit from it, to -- to take this fuel up there and
4 use. It's -- it's more of -- it's done under a
5 section in 10 CFR 5059, I think. They have to
6 evaluate it and we have to evaluate it, too.
7 MR. CUTTER: If I'm hearing you correctly,
8 then, Lawrence...
9 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.
10 MR. CUTTER: ...what you're saying, that
11 actually this is a test for a nuclear power plant?
12 You're saying?
13 MR. KOKAJKO: No, sir. No, MOX facility
14 is not a test.
15 MR. CUTTER: No, I'm saying the process.
16 MR. KOKAJKO: To use that fuel -- to use
17 that fuel, in order to insure that it is operating as
18 it's designed, they've agreed to allow those lead test
19 assemblies to be placed in there if they can find out
20 that it's safe to do so, and if we agree with that.
21 And right now we have not agreed with that.
22 MR. CUTTER: I just want to personally
23 thank you all, because for 13 years I've been coming
24 to these meetings and listening. And I want to thank
25 you all personally, also, because I see now that you

1 all no longer just sit in groups. You do disburse
2 yourself among us, and that you have taken a concerted
3 effort to be genuine in your visitation. So I want to
4 thank you all again. And I'll stop my questions
5 there.
6 MR. HARRIS: Thank you.
7 Can I just add one point, Chip?
8 MR. CAMERON: Yeah, go ahead.
9 MR. HARRIS: You talked about the -- the
10 local environmental cost. As I talked about in my
11 slide, in the regional -- there is regional economic
12 benefit, also. So it's -- so it's -- you don't get
13 the benefit from, say, the electricity, but there's --
14 there's dollars that go into the local community,
15 jobs.
16 MR. CAMERON: But as -- yeah. I think Mr.
17 Cutter's point is there might be a mismatch between
18 impact and -- and cost.
19 MR. HARRIS: Right.
20 MR. CAMERON: We're going to go for two
21 more questions, and then we're going to ask Cheryl to
22 lead off the public comment for us.
23 Can you just tell us your name again,
24 please.
25 MS. PEARSON: My name is Kelli Pearson.

1 And at the risk of sounding like a nimbi,
2 I just want to follow up with Mr. Cobb's question, and
3 wondering if you could give a short explanation of the
4 primary reason we're not considering that area of
5 Texas or Oklahoma or...
6 MR. HARRIS: Yeah, sure. The Department
7 of Energy, as I alluded to, has done two environmental
8 impact statements on the -- the whole program of what
9 to do with surplus weapons plutonium. And in that,
10 they looked at a number of alternatives, which
11 included locating the MOX facility, the pit
12 disassembly and conversion facilities at other
13 locations. Their decision, what they concluded was
14 that the Savannah River Site was the best location for
15 those facilities. So going into our -- our EIS, we
16 took that as a given.
17 MS. PEARSON: Okay.
18 MR. HARRIS: And stated that in the very
19 beginning in the notice of intent, that -- that we
20 weren't going to look at locating this facility
21 somewhere else in the country.
22 MS. PEARSON: Seems like that transport is
23 one of the riskiest parts of the whole process. Is
24 that true?
25 MR. HARRIS: Well, certainly depending on

1 where the facilities are located, the transport would
2 be more or less.
3 MR. CAMERON: And these comments like
4 Kirk's and his comment are going to be considered as
5 -- as comments. Even though the NRC has said this is
6 what the scope is, they will be at least considered...
7 MR. HARRIS: Right.
8 MR. CAMERON: ...and evaluated.
9 And let's have one more question right
10 here, and then let's go to some comments.
11 MR. LANIER: I'm going to try it without
12 the mic.
13 MR. CAMERON: Okay.
14 MR. LANIER: My name is Jody Lanier, and
15 I have three questions.
16 First, referring back to your Slide #6,
17 looks like there will be a -- there's a second comment
18 period when the final EIS is released. Does that mean
19 there'll be another meeting like this here after that?
20 MR. HARRIS: No, I think what those two
21 boxes were meant to show, Jody, the first box was the
22 meetings that we were having last September that you
23 attended here.
24 MR. LANIER: Right.
25 MR. HARRIS: The second box is tonight.

1 MR. LANIER: This one? Okay.

2 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. So, as Sara talked

3 about in her comments, unless -- unless events say

4 otherwise, this will be the last...

5 MR. LANIER: Okay.

6 MR. HARRIS: ...public outreach.

7 MR. LANIER: In the future, about

8 notifying the local media, when I got a copy of the

9 notice that you sent me about this meeting I went by

10 the one locally owned radio station in town, WRHK,

11 105.3, and asked one of the managers there if he could

12 read this on the air sometime. And whether he has or

13 not, I don't know. But for any future meetings here

14 I think that the NRC should notify all of the local

15 stations, radio stations and the TV stations or the

16 companies that own them. Because the only public

17 notification I've seen about this meeting was what the

18 gentleman referred to in the newspaper.

19 MR. HARRIS: Well, actually we -- we do do

20 that. We issue press releases to notify the press.

21 We -- we actually had an ad---you may not have seen---

22 but we did have an ad. We paid for an ad in the local

23 paper to do that.

24 One of the suggestions that Sara had,

25 which we followed up on, was to advertise on the local

1 cable channel, apparently Channel 8 maybe.

2 MS. BARCZAK: The government channel.

3 MR. HARRIS: On the government channel.

4 We contacted them and arranged to have the meeting

5 noticed there. So we're trying -- trying to let

6 people know. But if you've got some more suggestions,

7 we're happy to hear them.

8 MR. CAMERON: And a final question?

9 MR. LANIER: Yes, a final question. On

10 Page 223 of the report I see here it mentions about

11 why you do not consider immobilization in the

12 statement. Says that, "Since immobilization fails to

13 degrade isotopic composition of plutonium, Russia

14 fears that immobilization would leave open the

15 possibility that it could be used in weapons."

16 And just for the benefit of those of us

17 here who aren't nuclear scientists, could you explain

18 how using this plutonium in MOX fuel is going to make

19 it so that it can't be used as -- as a weapon, say in

20 case somebody tried to get a hold of it?

21 MR. KOKAJKO: It essentially changes into

22 different isotopes that cannot be used as weapons.

23 MR. HARRIS: Yeah, essentially, when you

24 put it in a reactor, there's a lot of neutrons. The

25 neutrons hit the atom and change it into a different

1 atom.

2 MR. LANIER: Whereas with immobilization

3 that would not happen?

4 MR. HARRIS: Right.

5 MR. LANIER: Okay. Thank you.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Jody. And

7 thank you all for questions. And we'll go back for --

8 for more questions. But as Cheryl pointed out, we're

9 not on time, and we're going to -- Cheryl, would you

10 like to lead off with a comment for us?

11 MS. JAY: So you're going to put me on the

12 spot?

13 MR. CAMERON: That's right.

14 MS. JAY: Okay, my name is Cheryl Jay. I

15 have lived in Savannah all of my life in the shadow of

16 the bomb factory, as we used to call it. I am a

17 clinical medical laboratory scientist, and I'm also a

18 science teacher.

19 As a clinical medical laboratory

20 scientist, I would like to comment on the obfuscation

21 that you use in your dose analysis. When you compare

22 human dosage that we receive from natural sources,

23 such as radiation from the cosmic universe, from

24 medical exams, from chest X-rays, those are either

25 things that we cannot avoid or things that we choose

1 to benefit our health.

2 We do not choose to increase our dosage of
3 harmful radioactive isotopes to ourselves and our
4 families by the military, industrial, and nuclear
5 complex that is going on at the Savannah River Site.
6 I see this MOX facility as just a continuation of
7 nuclear weapons production at the Savannah River Site.
8 It is a justification for the jobs, for the continuing
9 usage of this material. I resent the fact that you
10 have brought in the aspect of terrorism into this
11 situation. I submit to you that immobilization will
12 do exactly the same thing, and it will also decrease
13 the -- some aspects of terrorism because we will not
14 have as much transportation. In immobilization, the
15 -- this material is still at DOE facilities. All this
16 material is now at DOE facilities. If DOE facilities
17 are not safe, then MOX is not safe, either. So that
18 -- I think that is a total just obfuscation also,
19 trying to cloud the issue and -- behind the flag and
20 the issues that are going on worldwide.

21 Also, I -- I submit to you that saying --
22 also hiding behind this Russian treaty, quote-unquote,
23 that we have is a very misleading statement because we
24 do not follow international nuclear treaties. At the
25 moment our government has pulled us out of serval

1 international nuclear treaties, and so saying that,
2 you know, we'll let those poor "Ruskies" down if we do
3 this is -- is just erroneous. And it is -- it is just
4 justification for -- as several people have alluded
5 to, taking the U.S. tax dollars and putting it into --
6 into something that has not been tried here, that we
7 don't need. We do not need MOX fuel. We do need to
8 get rid of plutonium. I -- I agree with that. But we
9 can do it cheaper, more safely, and with less waste by
10 immobilizing it.
11 Thank you.
12 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you.
13 [Applause.]
14 MR. CAMERON: Let me ask Carol. Carol
15 Cain. Do you want -- why don't I bring you this
16 microphone. Okay, yeah, because it seems like it's
17 doing better.
18 MS. CAIN: I'm Carol Cain, C-A-I-N.
19 Part of my problem with all this is the
20 financial aspects of it. There's so many questions,
21 as far as the nuclear processes. But I'm just
22 wondering about the -- the financial part of it. It's
23 like she said before, we're already at a deficit and
24 they want to build another new building down there at
25 Savannah River Site. And what's going to happen if,

1 in the middle of it all, we run out of money? And
2 then it gets back to the other thing about -- it's
3 kind of like we're building this facility for Duke and
4 everybody to turn around and make electricity for then
5 the ratepayers to pay. And it just -- it's like --
6 it's something like *Alice in Wonderland*, is what I
7 think of all this. It's just -- it just really gets
8 out of hand, when you start talking about it.
9 And there are many issues to go into, but
10 this is all I'm just going to say right now. And I'll
11 write letters.
12 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Carol.
13 And, Bobbie, did you want to -- did you
14 want to talk now or do you want to...
15 MS. PAUL: I'll make my comment, because
16 we need to go. Carol just...
17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Good. Thank you.
18 MS. PAUL: Thanks.
19 I'm Bobbie Paul, and Sara asked me to read
20 an Email that she got today from someone who couldn't
21 come named Ellen O'Leary from Tybee Island, Georgia,
22 because she had to go to the hospital for another test
23 pursuant to her kidney operation.
24 "I'm a 49-year-old woman born and bred in
25 Savannah. Two weeks ago I had my left kidney removed

1 for a renal cell carcinoma. I have led an extremely
2 health-conscious life. Unfortunately, environmental
3 pollutants cause most cancers. I don't want to move
4 from my home and family, but I suspect the DOE
5 Savannah River Site in my case.
6 "SRS has the most radioactivity of any DOE
7 site nationally. There are millions of gallons of
8 high level radioactive waste in faulty storage there.
9 We should not add the potentially dangerous MOX
10 project to this overburdened site.
11 "Shipping plutonium, as well as the new
12 MOX fuel, would present further concerns in safety and
13 security. The MOX project has already doubled in
14 price in the last few years. Who knows what it would
15 cost us to support the sister program in Russia under
16 questionable safety and security precautions.
17 "And finally, the low income community of
18 color surrounding the SRS site is being unjustly
19 burdened with yet another deadly, dangerous project.
20 As a tax-paying citizen, I demand freedom from another
21 unnecessary danger to my life.
22 "Signed," or Emailed, "Ellen O'Leary,
23 Tybee Island, Georgia."
24 I don't live in Savannah, I live in
25 Atlanta. And I went to the MOX hearing in Augusta.

1 And, you know, after my questions tonight, reading
2 something so highly emotional in such a highly
3 charged, emotional time for all of us, I, too, wanted
4 to take some time to study the three copies I got in
5 the mail---same address---and write my comments down.
6 I head up a women's peace organization
7 called WAND, Women's Action for New Direction. And
8 it's national. And we have about 16 chapters and I
9 don't -- I don't know how many members. About 500 or
10 600 just in our Atlanta area.
11 I just wanted to share a little comment at
12 the end of the last meeting I had with a gentleman in
13 the parking lot. And I was so overwhelmed with all of
14 the technical talk and what was really going on. And
15 I said to the fellow, who was somehow related to the
16 industry, "So what was really going on here tonight?"
17 And he -- he said, "What do you mean?"
18 I said, "Well, it just perplexes me. If
19 this stuff is so -- if there's so many steps to go
20 through all of this, and there's so many
21 technicalities, and it's going to cost so much, and so
22 many people are confused, why are we doing it? Why
23 don't we just immobilize it until we can have a better
24 science past a couple of hundred years, at least. Or
25 100 years."

1 And he looked at me, he said, "Are you
2 kidding? Do you -- do you know how much money we've
3 spent on that plutonium?" And it's haunted me. And
4 I don't know when we're going to say enough is enough,
5 and we just take this stuff out of our universe. We
6 can't put it back in the ground. Like the Native
7 Americans once told us, "Never take it out of the
8 ground." But we have. And I think we've got to put
9 profit aside and -- and do things for future
10 generations.
11 Thank you.
12 [Applause.]
13 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Bobbie.
14 We're going to go to Victor Mereski, and
15 then Mr. Dunham, and then Mr. Cutter.
16 MR. MERESKI: Thank you.
17 My name is Victor Mereski, M-E-R-E-S-K-I.
18 I'm a resident of Savannah for about 35 years (sic).
19 I'd like to tie into the last comment that
20 was made about the concern of future generations. I
21 really feel that the whole nuclear energy program has
22 lost track of how long this pollution lasts. I
23 believe that all of recorded human history is
24 something like 10,000 years. But this pollution is
25 going to last and be a danger to people, I understand

1 from Sara, about 240,000 years.

2 And you think of all the disasters that

3 have occurred in the world during the 10,000 year

4 period that we know of, and here we're talking about

5 a period that's 24 times that. And yet they say

6 there's a low accident probability. Why don't I

7 believe the government?

8 [Laughter.]

9 MR. MERESKI: Well, in reading over

10 material about the release of nuclear pollution into

11 the air, water, so forth, I remember reading that they

12 were conducting tests of new mothers, testing their

13 milk. I forget the specific component that they were

14 checking for. But they were recording this, I think,

15 in various places in the country.

16 But in South Carolina the readings kept

17 going up; okay? And when this was pointed out, that,

18 you know, this is a concern, what do they do about it?

19 They stopped the test. You know, this is really

20 taking into consideration finding out what's going on.

21 Stop the test. We have no more rising pollution in

22 mothers' milk because we can't see it anymore. Why

23 aren't those tests being restarted?

24 I haven't heard anything about the taking

25 into consideration the risk of a terrorist attack

1 while this material is being transported. And I
2 wonder what protection there is during the transport
3 of this material, you know, from preplanted land
4 mines, radio controlled stuff like that, that seems to
5 go on all over the world. Why can't it happen here?
6 I think it can.
7 I feel that too much of the material that
8 is presented to us is in a fashion of, well, you can
9 only comment on this specific thing. If it's outside
10 of that, well, it just goes into the wastepaper
11 basket. But the whole nuclear program is ill-
12 considered. I would really like an answer to why they
13 are not testing the mothers' milk in South Carolina,
14 and why they don't start again and see how it compares
15 with their previous tests.
16 Thank you.
17 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Mereski.
18 [Applause.]
19 MR. CAMERON: Let's -- let's go to Mr.
20 Dunham, and then we'll go to Mr. Cutter.
21 MR. DUNHAM: I guess I wear many hats.
22 But my name is Chester Dunham. I works with the (sic)
23 International Longshoreman's Association, the shipping
24 industry. I'm a longshoreman. I'm also the Safety
25 Director for our union with the International

1 Longshoreman's Union right here in Savannah, Georgia.
2 Also the President of the A. Philip Randolph
3 Institute, which is a non-partisan organization to
4 deal with problems and other type of things. It's a
5 national organization, etcetera.
6 But what I want to talk about tonight is
7 that the representative here from NRC, in your own
8 mission, you -- you did a real good job in doing the
9 presentation to us about the -- the program. I
10 listened carefully and I jotted things down along the
11 line in your slides. When you're talking about the
12 environmental reviews, safety review, the situation
13 about the -- the proposal about the United States and
14 Russia, the storage spaces, impact area, proposed
15 action, impact human health, potential risks vial
16 quality waste management, environmental justice,
17 transportation, all of those things. And you did a
18 very good job. But even with everything that you did,
19 and talking about a minimum risk here and there and
20 all of that, the risk factor is still there.
21 You know, it's a situation with these
22 ships that I work on. Sometime a ship may come up the
23 Savannah River that may have one container, and
24 they're dealing with some type of liquid explosive.
25 And what they will do is, they will stop the traffic

1 in Savannah River. They would -- they would close the
2 traffic down to one vessel. No other movement within
3 that port until that ship reaches destiny and dock,
4 and whatever is on there comes off.
5 Sometimes some of the ship may come up,
6 and you look at the invoice, and they might -- Coast
7 Guard gets involved, and they say, well, we have a
8 particular container, or one or two containers or
9 something on that ship maybe discharging or -- and
10 what that tells you then, that the Coast Guard will
11 come in, and then they will have labor on those
12 facility (sic), on those boxes or what-have-you, with
13 liquid in it. And what they would tell you, that
14 certain areas, you have to move out of that area
15 because of the danger, explosive, that something
16 happen. In other words, it's another thing that
17 sometime in safety -- going through safety things that
18 they tell you, a situation is -- well, I tell you
19 what. Said if a situation happens where a box or
20 something is on board of a ship, and don't stop and
21 ask questions. That if you see any type of little
22 smoke or any type of thing that's unusual, get off the
23 ship and leave from that area. We'll talk and explain
24 later.
25 And when you look at that situation, and

1 then think about what's up here, and the danger there,
2 is what puzzle me and what -- you know, and that's my
3 concern. That the situation that we talking about,
4 Iraq, and we're talking about their weapons of mass
5 destruction and all of those things over there. But
6 some of that same stuff is in our -- in our back door.
7 And the thing that I'm saying, in
8 listening to the expert -- listen, I'm not a scientist
9 or nuclear person or expert or that type -- but
10 listening to them and listening to you all, that it's
11 a danger factor there. And it's the risk is there.
12 And no matter what, the risk is still there. And I'm
13 seeing that what these gentlemans (sic) here, the job
14 that they did tonight, but the bottom line is still --
15 listen, you all -- and this building should have been
16 packed, as I said. But the bottom line is still
17 dealing with the federal government. It is dealing
18 with politics. It's dealing with elected official.
19 They're going to do a report, a study. But if we
20 don't like what's going on, then it's up to us to
21 speak up. It's up to us to write letters, starting --
22 I don't care if it local, state, and federal.
23 Because federal is the last stop. Federal
24 is the key. And if that's what we have to do, we're
25 not satisfied and we think it's a risk, then that's

1 what we're going to have to do, get together and write
2 locally, but make sure that we deal with the senators
3 and congressmen, federal people, and do something
4 about the situation.
5 Thank you very much.
6 [Applause.]
7 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Dunham.
8 And let's go to Mr. Cutter now.
9 MR. CUTTER: Again, good evening to all I
10 haven't had the opportunity of speaking to. Again,
11 thanking our Creator for this opportunity to be able
12 to speak this evening.
13 As I stand here this evening, I stand here
14 again, Vernell Cutter, with Citizens for Environmental
15 Justice. Have served as convener since that
16 organization was formed.
17 I was sitting there and I was thinking
18 about how and why our organization formed, when we
19 looked at the Sierra Club and we looked at Green
20 Peace. And folk were talking about save the spotted
21 owl and save the humpbacked whale. But no one was
22 speaking about saving the people of color. Our
23 organization formed because, when we look historically
24 at the disproportionate health risk to people of
25 color, the facilities are built primarily in our

1 areas.

2 And I listened. And I listened to your

3 cost analysis. But I don't see the cost that you can

4 place on a life. I don't see that. You talk about

5 jobs and how that would be a benefit. But then, when

6 I say how people of color are the ones that primarily

7 work with the exposure, and how then they must make a

8 choice between feeding their families and going to a

9 highly contaminated place, I don't see it as being

10 fair. I don't see it as being equitable. I don't see

11 it as being democratic.

12 I stand here tonight as an advocate for

13 the health of our people. Health of all people. I

14 listen, and I see how our country now -- our

15 President's asking for 75 billion for the rebuilding

16 of Iraq. How much money is being asked to put a

17 health center there in the Augusta-Aiken, South

18 Carolina area, so as that people who then suspect that

19 they are adversely affected can go and receive medical

20 treatment. I don't see that in your cost analysis.

21 I stand here tonight as a spokesperson for

22 the disenfranchised, for the folk who do not read or

23 receive Emails, for the folk who just don't understand

24 how to read the newspaper to know if the meeting was

25 yesterday or today. Speak for those who have been

1 speaking for years and years, and have not been
2 listened to, have not been heard, and who have died
3 and gone on.
4 I've attended meetings all around this
5 world, and I've listened to the various stories of
6 folk, and I -- and I see how the meetings have changed
7 where it used to be government against people, people
8 against government, and we would chant, "I'm sick of
9 being tired. I'm tired of being sick."
10 And government would sit there and they
11 would shiver and they would wonder, 'Oh, are they
12 really going to attack us tonight?' And I can see
13 then, you know.
14 Now we converse about, "How are your
15 families doing? Good to see you. Haven't seen you in
16 two years. Yes, you remember our last meeting." But,
17 you know what, you can have all the scoping meetings
18 you want. But until you get serious and say this is
19 a true EIS, environmental impact statement, and allow
20 people to talk about each section and to be honest
21 about it, then it is not a true democracy. It is
22 simply folk doing a job, and learning how to use the
23 psychology of presenting it better so folk then
24 swallow it better.
25 I speak, then, for the ancestors who have

1 died trying to tell folk to realize that at the end
2 you ask yourself: What have I done for humanity? How
3 have I contributed? It doesn't matter how much money
4 you make. Can't take any of it with you. So, then,
5 again, only what we do for one another will last.
6 I can go on with comments such as that.
7 But I would like to say some specific recommendations
8 that we would present for you all. First of all, that
9 the mitigation measures section related to the EJ
10 community---environmental justice community---must be
11 more detailed. You can't just give a little portion
12 and say that's going to suffice, but it must be very
13 specific.
14 Secondly, that Duke-Cogema must be
15 mandated to meet and work with the environmental
16 justice community. You can't have them then just send
17 the little people there and say, "Okay, we pay you
18 this. You work with the environmental justice
19 community." But if they're going to reap the
20 benefits, they must have a working relationship with
21 the environmental justice community.
22 Thirdly, that a stronger emergency
23 response measure be implemented in collaboration with
24 the environmental justice community. You cannot say
25 then, "This is what we'll do," but then these same

1 folks who do not receive Emails, these same folk who
2 do not read the newspaper, know exactly what they must
3 do. We're saying it depends on how the wind blows.
4 Well, who knows how the wind blows?
5 Fourthly, that independent researchers
6 must be allowed to validate risk assessment associated
7 with latent cancer fatalities. True enough, it's good
8 for you to tell us, but they always tell you if
9 something happens to you, seek a second opinion. And
10 I'm saying that's the same thing that should be
11 allowed to the environmental justice community.
12 And lastly, that resources be allocated to
13 the environmental justice community to analyze the
14 complete environmental impact statement, that states
15 that there would be disportionately (sic) impacted
16 under the accident analysis. You say that. Anyone in
17 their right mind, to look at the semantics of that,
18 will say, "What does that mean?" You're saying
19 there's going to be a disproportionately affect (sic)?
20 Well, then, allow the environmental justice community
21 the opportunity to research that and say what that
22 would be. If you've spent so much money so far, then
23 allow it to spend a portion of that, small portion, to
24 let it really be known of the people that it's going
25 to really affect. Thank you.

1 [Applause.]

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Mr. Cutter.

3 And David Kyler.

4 MR. KYLER: Those are two very tough acts

5 to follow, so I hope I don't put anybody to sleep.

6 Due to the late hour and my needing to drive back to

7 St. Simons. I'm just going to read a portion of my

8 prepared statement, and *ad lib* on a few things that

9 have come up tonight.

10 First, going to talk about some

11 recommendations that I jotted down after arriving that

12 I don't have in my prepared statement. Some of these

13 track some other comments that have been made.

14 By the way, I'm Dave Kyler with the Center

15 for a Sustainable Coast. We're a six-year-old non-

16 profit organization supported by memberships and

17 foundations, whose mission is to protect the public

18 interest in issues related to coastal Georgia's

19 growth, economy, and environment.

20 Further analysis of water use and

21 contamination, and the options and alternatives, needs

22 to be added to this draft impact statement. After

23 looking at this thing -- and, by the way, I have an

24 engineering degree so this should be a lot easier than

25 it is trying to analyze this ponderous statement. On

1 Page 4-6 is an "Annual Water Usage and Waste Water
2 Discharge" for the various sites. If you'll look at
3 the SRS line on that chart, water requirements in
4 millions of liters per year. Millions of liters.
5 127,000 million liters from surface water; 13,247
6 million liters from groundwater are used. How much is
7 discharged? 700,000 million liters. A little bit of
8 retention of water appears to be taking place there.
9 That was not at all clear from what I read in the
10 statement, nor from what I heard tonight. Which, by
11 the way, looking at the hydrology slide we saw
12 tonight: Surface water, no significant discharges
13 during construction. Operational discharges through
14 existing SRS facilities. No significant change for
15 permitted discharges. Well, folks, there's should be
16 (sic) a very strong concern in this region about water
17 use, not just the quality of the water being
18 discharged. Both are very important.
19 Something like 40,000 jobs in this region,
20 10,000 jobs in Chatham County, alone, depend upon
21 nature-based businesses, and those depend upon the
22 function of that river. And whether it's in the form
23 of contamination or in the form of diversion and
24 retention of water, that either way or both ways, that
25 could have drastic effect not only on public health,

1 but also on the economy of the region. That needs to
2 be much more thoroughly analyzed. And the
3 significance of that chart I referred to in terms of
4 water use needs to be thoroughly tracked and
5 alternatives need to be evaluated.
6 As Mr. Cutter said, evaluation of
7 emergency response capacity needs to be looked at.
8 It's been brought to my attention, from other reading,
9 that many times far more people attempt to evacuate
10 than are necessary to be evacuated. And because of
11 that, evacuation routes are overloaded, and the
12 facilities available that would be adequate if people
13 were properly notified, and only those needing to be
14 evacuated were. But instead, they get all tied up,
15 and the facilities are not sufficient. So both the
16 education of an at-risk population, and the capacity
17 of the facilities needed to evacuate need to be much
18 more thoroughly analyzed.
19 I think we also need to test the
20 assumptions, as they always say in cost benefits
21 analysis, of the time -- time line effects of costs
22 and benefits. Typical cost benefit analysis places
23 future -- reduces the impact of future costs in
24 proportion to their distance away from the present
25 time. Well, at the rate we're going it seems to me

1 that environmental resources are going to be worth
2 more in the future, not less. And if they're brought
3 back to the present with a discount method, they're
4 going to be very much reduced in value compared to
5 what they are likely to actually be worth in that
6 future time. So alternative methods for evaluating
7 costs and benefits need to be factored in.
8 The groundwater geology in this area is
9 susceptible to variable conditions that are site-
10 specific and cannot be accurately predicted. And the
11 consequences for those factors need to be taken into
12 account in evaluating risk.
13 And last in the way of general
14 recommendations, we need to develop a process which
15 the Corps of Engineers is even considering, I guess
16 under pressure from Congress---and if they can do it,
17 certainly NRC can do it---called independent external
18 review. Essentially, what this is saying is that the
19 agencies that are responsible for administering these
20 projects, whether it's the Corps of Engineers or NRC,
21 are so compromised in their function that they become
22 advocates for the projects, rather than being capable
23 of objectively evaluating these projects. And that
24 job needs to be given to a -- for a second opinion, as
25 Mr. Cutter said, to another party that's more capable

1 of being both objective and external, and has no
2 entanglements with the project.
3 A lot of other things I could say. I have
4 some other things in my draft statement. But that's
5 -- that's good enough for now. In essence, we need to
6 know a lot more than we know now before a responsible
7 decision can be made in public interest.
8 [Applause.]
9 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Mr. Kyler, for those
10 very specific remarks.
11 MR. HARRIS: Did you want to let him know
12 he can hand in his public written comments to the...
13 MR. CAMERON: Sure, if it's -- if it's
14 ready. Yeah.
15 Mr. Kyler, if your -- if your -- if you
16 have a prepared statement -- if anybody has a prepared
17 statement that you would like us to attach to the
18 transcript, as well, we can do that.
19 Let's go to -- to Sara. Sara Barczak.
20 MS. BARCZAK: My name is Sara Barczak.
21 I'm the Safe Energy Director of Southern Alliance for
22 Clean Energy here in our Savannah field office. And,
23 not to brag, but I've actually gone through my draft,
24 and I have ran out of tabs, actually, because there's
25 so much to highlight in here. So let me start my

1 watch, because you all know that I can talk too much.
2 Before everybody leaves, I just want everybody to know
3 that there are numerous articles on the colorful tri-
4 fold display back there that highlight some of the
5 things that I'm going to touch on here. And I think
6 you all will be interested in them.
7 We're a regional non-profit. We were
8 formerly Georgians for Clean Energy last time you saw
9 me here in September. We have members throughout the
10 region, and primarily have focused on energy policy
11 for the last 20 years. We'd like to state that the
12 current draft environmental impact statement now
13 before us leaves much to be desired, and that we are
14 likely going to resubmit and restate all of our past
15 concerns again. In a sense, it appears that many of
16 the important objections to the plutonium bomb fuel or
17 MOX program have been entirely dismissed by the U.S.
18 Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
19 For example, at the scoping meeting here
20 in Savannah, which many of you were at last September,
21 many people were concerned about terrorism---and that
22 came up again tonight---and wanted to know how
23 terrorism would be addressed in the draft report. On
24 Page I-29, in the section on impacts from terrorism,
25 dedicates a whopping two sentences to this issue,

1 stating, quote, "Many commentors raised a number of
2 different issues concerning terrorism. The draft EIS
3 will not address terrorism, because these impacts are
4 not considered to be reasonably foreseeable as a
5 result of the proposed action," end quote.
6 That is not acceptable, given the repeated
7 concerns that we, along with NRC staff, heard voiced
8 back in September. It is hard to believe that
9 transporting tons and tons of weapons plutonium across
10 the country to one single location, the Department of
11 Energy's massive Savannah River Site that's only about
12 90 miles upstream from us, does not constitute an
13 action that terrorists might want to take advantage
14 of.
15 Isn't plutonium a highly toxic substance
16 with a hazardous radioactive life of 240,000 years,
17 and is a key component to modern nuclear weapons, and
18 that one only needs several pounds of it to make a
19 bomb? Though in numerous federal agency meetings---
20 and I've been to them; Department of Energy, Nuclear
21 Regulatory Commission, EPA, etcetera---on various
22 nuclear-related topics the -- the issue of terrorism
23 is supposedly going to be addressed in separate
24 guidelines and under "top-to-bottom," quote, agency
25 reviews. It is extremely pertinent and vital to

1 address terrorism concerns and security measures in
2 this DEIS, in this draft.
3 We have general concerns about the
4 plutonium disposition program which we've all
5 overheard today. We'd like to make it clear from the
6 outset that we oppose the production of any type of
7 plutonium bomb fuel program, and we oppose it for a
8 variety of reasons. It's an experimental program that
9 has never been pursued at this scale. It poses a risk
10 to workers and surrounding communities at both the
11 production and reactor sites. It will increase the
12 volumes of hazardous radioactive waste streams at a
13 location that is already plagued by enormous
14 quantities of waste and previous contamination.
15 It raises -- and this is where our
16 expertise sort of in the -- the energy policy, it
17 raises complex consumer and ratepayer concerns over
18 government subsidies unfairly favoring a destructive
19 type of energy production over a more environmentally
20 friendly and safe alternatives that do exist. It
21 increases the negative health impacts to communities
22 in cases of severe accidents at reactor locations, and
23 it blurs the division established between military and
24 civilian nuclear programs.
25 We believe that the NRC has only one

1 option that will protect the public health, and that's
2 to deny the application request for this facility. We
3 urge that the pursuit of developing a plutonium fuel
4 economy be ceased in all sectors of government and
5 private enterprise, as it will allow plutonium, which
6 we know is a dangerous material, to enter civilian
7 commerce and the international marketplace.
8 We thoroughly disagree with the NRC
9 staff's preliminary decision in this report that,
10 quote, "the overall benefits of the proposed MOX
11 facility outweigh its disadvantages and costs," end
12 quote. The NRC states, on Page 2-37---and I would
13 suggest everybody look this up when they leave here---
14 the four main points of consideration that brought
15 them to this---in our opinion---flawed decision.
16 1. The national policy decision between
17 Russia and the U.S. to reduce surplus
18 weapons plutonium;
19 2. The minimal radiological
20 impacts of and risk to human health posed
21 by the construction, operation, and
22 decommissioning of the plutonium fuel
23 factory;
24 3. The minimal environmental
25 impacts the plutonium fuel project would

1 pose, and last;

2 The economic benefit to the

3 local community.

4 On that same page the NRC states---and we

5 heard it again tonight---that the most significant

6 potential impact is if there were a large accident at

7 the proposed fuel factory. But narrowly concludes

8 that though those occurrences -- though the

9 consequences of an accident would be significant---and

10 this is their quote---"the likelihood of such an

11 accident occurring would be very low or," in

12 parentheses, "highly unlikely."

13 We believe fundamentally that the no-

14 action alternative the NRC was mandated to study is a

15 better choice overall. We'll touch upon errors we

16 have found with these four points in our detailed

17 comments that we'll -- we'll get in before the May

18 14th deadline.

19 But that does bring me to formally request

20 an additional extension of the public comment period

21 beyond the recently adjusted May deadline. This

22 program is a federal action, and given the state of

23 our nation and the degree to which Congress and the

24 general public is distracted by events unfolding in

25 the world, we find this request reasonable. And,

1 additionally, errors in the NRC calculations allowed
2 for the initial extension. And since they are not yet
3 clearly understood, then one cannot be sure of what
4 else may be incorrect. It seems to follow that the
5 public should have more time to respond.
6 All right, I've already gone over and I
7 apologize. I'll summarize as fast as I can.
8 For those people here, I think one of the
9 biggest keys to this whole program is we keep hearing
10 this Russian policy agreement, blah, blah, blah, blah,
11 blah. And that, by the way, came under the Clinton
12 Administration because of Al Gore. So it's not like
13 they were helping us out, either. And it's been now
14 supported by the Bush Administration.
15 Even though -- and I'm going to get
16 through this. Even though our nation is supposedly
17 engaged in a program being performed under the guise
18 of disposition of surplus weapons plutonium in a
19 supposed parallel venture with Russia to reduce our
20 nuclear weapon stockpiles, the Department of Energy's
21 National Nuclear Security Administration issued a
22 press release on May 31 st of 2002 announcing that it
23 would begin design work for a facility to manufacture
24 plutonium pits, also known as triggers, for nuclear
25 weapons, a critical component. Rocky Flats, which

1 you've heard about tonight, which is the site in
2 Colorado that is now shipping its plutonium to SRS,
3 had carried out this function up until 1989, and is
4 now closing. SRS is believed to be the preferred site
5 for this plutonium trigger plant that will cost
6 billions of dollars. That press release is back there
7 by that tri-fold display. And it's not my press
8 release, it's the Department of Energy's press
9 release.
10 We are very concerned about the overlap or
11 parallels that may occur between the plutonium mixed
12 oxide fuel program and the modern pit facility
13 program. At the October 2002 public meeting that
14 Department of Energy had up in North Augusta on the
15 plutonium pit meeting -- or facility, that I went to,
16 DOE's staff said that, quote-unquote, "synergies would
17 be evaluated in their draft EIS." We believe that the
18 NRC should also give a very close look to the possible
19 use of the same -- to the possible use of the same
20 buildings, like the MOX plant, the pit disassembly
21 plant, by both programs, and that the exact amounts
22 and types of waste generated by each, and how those
23 wastes will be dealt with, the thorough tracking of
24 plutonium in and out of the facilities, and the
25 possible overlap of contracting partners. All this

1 information should be made available to the public and
2 should be reviewed prior to the issuance of this final
3 MOX proposal.
4 We think that the NRC should deny the
5 plutonium fuel factory license application request
6 based on the obvious conflict with the national policy
7 on surplus weapons plutonium. What really is our
8 national policy? Is it to bring weapons plutonium to
9 SRS to secure it, or to bring it there to help us
10 build new nuclear weapons? There is enough public
11 information available to show there is a major
12 discrepancy. Since many of the decisions in this
13 draft EIS are based on not wanting to conflict with
14 foreign policy agreements, such as the unfortunate
15 cancellation of the cheaper and possibly safer
16 immobilization option, it appears that, in itself --
17 in -- that it, in itself, is a flawed argument since
18 there is no cohesive policy on what we, the U.S.,
19 intends to do with our surplus plutonium stockpiles.
20 We're also very concerned about all the
21 changes which, of course, the NRC didn't make; the
22 Department of Energy made. And we -- we fully feel
23 that the Department of Energy has to go back to the
24 drawing board and do a supplemental environmental
25 impact statement to what we were told, like Mr. Cobb

1 when he said why can't it be done in Colorado.
2 Changes have been made to this program---cancelling of
3 immobilization, making SRS an immediate plutonium
4 storage facility---that why can't the NRC say, "Look,
5 we can't grant you your operating license because you
6 need to do some of the regulatory things that all
7 these people are asking about. Like, get them off our
8 back and do your job, Department of Energy."
9 And then I'm -- finishing up here, I've
10 mentioned this at the September meeting, but I want to
11 let everybody here know that in February -- February
12 -- well, February 2002, report to Congress by the
13 Department of Energy called "Disposition of Surplus
14 Defense Plutonium at Savannah River Site," that in it
15 they recommend that we need at least two more
16 additional unnamed nuclear reactors to get this
17 plutonium bomb fuel program going. And our nearby
18 Southern nuclear plant, Vogtle, expressed interest in
19 the plutonium fuel program back in 1996, and we're
20 concerned about the implication for the need for more
21 reactors, and how will the NRC address this need. I
22 didn't see it in this draft impact statement. And I,
23 for one, don't want MOX fuel, period. I don't want it
24 at Plant Vogtle, and I don't want it up at Catawba or
25 McGuire, period. I don't want it.

1 I have -- that was blowing that first
2 bullet point, in my opinion, out of the water, on
3 we're doing this because of our agreement with Russia.
4 I have four more pages, and I'm not -- I
5 can't get to them, on the environmental concerns, on
6 the nuclear waste concerns, on the water concerns, on
7 the economic benefit, and additional concerns. I'm
8 glad somebody already mentioned Cogema, which is a
9 French government owned company, and the concerns we
10 have in there. And I'm just going to state this
11 again. Their track record needs to be investigated.
12 DCS does not have any environmental track record
13 because they didn't exist prior to this program coming
14 into place. So why is it that unfeasible to look at
15 their -- each company separately that made this
16 international consortium, and see are they doing a
17 good job. Because they're not doing a good job in
18 France. And right now we supposedly don't like
19 France. And we're about to give them all our
20 plutonium.
21 So, anyway, I will potentially at this
22 point have this on our website so everybody else can
23 read it, because I think it's interesting reading. I
24 do want to thank the NRC staff...
25 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

1 MS. BARCZAK: ...for being here in
2 Savannah.
3 [Applause.]
4 MS. BARCZAK: The Department of Energy
5 doesn't come here, and that's why you get a lot of the
6 questions that you get. And, you know, you have a
7 hard job, but you can still make the right decisions.
8 And the thought in that slide that said this -- this
9 final decision could be issued by this fall of 2003.
10 No way---excuse my language because I'm recorded---in
11 hell should that be allowed. No way. Please allow
12 for an extension, and please go back to the drawing
13 board and really, really look through this. And I
14 will provide the full comments to the recorder that I
15 didn't get to read. Thank you.
16 [Applause.]
17 MR. CAMERON: Could we have the
18 representative from the -- the Green Party. Is it --
19 who is the representative from the Green Party?
20 Kellie?
21 MS. GASINK: Yes.
22 MR. CAMERON: All right.
23 MS. GASINK: My name is Kellie Gasink. I
24 actually wasn't intending to -- to come here to speak
25 on behalf of the Green Party, but I'm happy to do so.

1

2 I'm -- I wanted to say that one of the
3 most appalling things I think that I noticed is that
4 the people have discussed it, but that the only
5 newspaper -- only daily newspaper in town has
6 announced this meeting location at the wrong time, the
7 wrong day. And that despite the fact that I'm also
8 grateful that -- that this meeting is happening and is
9 here, I think that we should -- that that shouldn't be
10 a favor to the community. That, in fact, that's the
11 minimum that we should ask. I mean, that's a part of
12 democracy.
13 And I think that there's a frustration
14 here because the process is not democratic. It's
15 simply not. It's not democratic when we can't make
16 any of these decisions as a community. And when the
17 process is so narrow that we're locked out of it, it's
18 not going to reduce people's frustration about the
19 democracy, that people can simply complain about it.
20 And I'd like to think that we could do more than --
21 than complain about what's happening.
22 And as I sit here, you know, tonight, I've
23 learned a great deal more than I knew before I came
24 into the room, and I'm grateful for that. But I would
25 have liked to have known a lot of this stuff long

1 before, and I wasn't aware of it. And it isn't
2 covered in the -- on television, it isn't covered in
3 the newspaper, it is not information that's made
4 available to us. So I just wanted to say that at the
5 outset.
6 But we are opposed to the shipping of --
7 of surplus plutonium to this area. We're opposed to
8 the shipping of depleted uranium. We don't agree that
9 this community should have to suffer increased nuclear
10 contamination or nuclear waste. And also, that when
11 evaluating risk, risk is never something that's in
12 isolation. And the fact that we're forced to discuss
13 it as though it were is silly.
14 The question is not whether this plant or
15 this idea or this plan would be safe; it's actually
16 would it be safer to do something else. That is the
17 only question. Nothing is safe. Apparently going
18 outside isn't safe because the sun rays aren't exactly
19 safe. But everything is relative. It's also the case
20 that going out in the sun -- you know, the sunlight
21 and having my children play is a good deal safer than
22 having to worry about whether there's going to be a
23 nuclear disaster. So it's -- so these things are
24 relative. So the fact that we're not able to know why
25 other options other than the Savannah River Site are

1 being eliminated and are not being discussed here.
2 We're supposed to be discussing, in isolation, how we
3 feel about the fact that it's coming here, knowing
4 that we don't have the control over that decision. So
5 that's -- that's not a situation that creates either
6 democracy or safety. Because we all know that when
7 people get together they can, by discussing things
8 together, come up with the safest proposals. But
9 that's when you're in a democratic situation, when the
10 people discussing it can make the decisions about what
11 to do to make things safer. And it just seems to us
12 that we can stay here and talk about things that are
13 really, really important, and we're not the ones
14 making this decision.
15 And so I'm -- so I basically -- that was,
16 you know, what I wanted to -- to express. And I
17 didn't have any, you know, prepared statements for --
18 for you all. But the one other and last thing---I'm
19 sorry---that I wanted to say was that also that using
20 this -- creating this -- this fuel that is going to be
21 -- the benefit of which was going to be used by
22 corporations and not the general public is -- is
23 completely repulsive and racist. That -- that one
24 company now in one stage, and there may be other
25 companies in other stages, are going to be getting

1 something free and selling it to us, when the benefit
2 should be directly to the public. If this fuel is
3 given to them free, then they should be giving it to
4 us free. The fact that a few people would be
5 benefitting from this, and also, by the way, people
6 who don't even live in this community and have to deal
7 with any of the issues created by the facility, are
8 just astoundingly unacceptable. And, again, that's
9 out of the scope of what the public is able to discuss
10 or impact on.
11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you.
12 [Applause.]
13 MR. CAMERON: Jody, would you care to give
14 us your comments and recommendations, please.
15 MR. LANIER: Good evening. My name is
16 Jody Lanier. I'm here as a private citizen. I'm a
17 lifelong Savannah resident. I have a two-and-a-half
18 page prepared statement I'd like to read. But before
19 I get started, I'd like to say at the last meeting
20 that I really didn't appreciate being cut off too soon
21 in my comments, especially when I was near the end.
22 I timed myself at home saying this. This should be
23 between five and ten minutes. So I know the hour's
24 late, so please bear with me. I hope I don't put you
25 to sleep.

1 MR. CAMERON: So you're telling me you
2 don't want me to cut you off?
3 [Laughter.]
4 MR. LANIER: Well, that would be nice.
5 Okay. I'd like to thank the NRC for
6 having this meeting here tonight. At the September
7 26, 2002 meeting, I spoke about my concerns regarding
8 this project. Mainly, the inclusion of immobilization
9 as a no-action alternative, and evacuation plans for
10 Savannah and Chatham County in case of an accident or
11 terrorist attack at the MOX fabrication facility, or
12 any shipments of plutonium that may come into the Port
13 of Savannah to support the facility.
14 The report states that if the surplus
15 plutonium were disposed of only by immobilization,
16 Russia would not dispose of its surplus because they
17 believe that we would eventually recover the plutonium
18 and use it to make atomic bombs. To allay their
19 fears, we could use a famous Russian proverb, "Trust,
20 but verify."
21 At the end of the Cold War, monitors from
22 the United States and Russia went to each other's
23 countries to verify that nuclear missiles and other
24 strategic weapons and delivery systems were destroyed.
25 Now this processes could be repeated and supplemented

1 with spy satellites and other surveillance technology
2 to make sure immobilization plutonium is not made into
3 nuclear weapons. With this in mind, I believe that
4 immobilization should still be a viable option for a
5 no-action alternative.
6 When I read over the draft EIS, I felt
7 like only a nuclear scientist, brain surgeon, or
8 attorney could fully understand it. However, it
9 became clear that one did not need any of these --
10 those people to see that there was no mention of
11 Savannah at all in the report except for a few
12 citations noting previous meetings here. This leads
13 me to believe that the Commission does not really care
14 about the opinions of the more than 200,000 people
15 living in Savannah and Chatham County; or, for that
16 matter, those Georgians and South Carolinians living
17 anywhere downwind and downstream of SRS. If that's
18 the case, why is this meeting taking place? The
19 general message seems to be that we, the Commission,
20 are holding this meeting to tell you what we're going
21 to do next, but there's nothing you can do about it.
22 Tough luck.
23 It also seems to say that DCS does not
24 care about needlessly putting us at risk by proceeding
25 with this project. That really doesn't come as a

1 surprise, since they apparently have no qualms about
2 putting the people of their hometown, Charlotte, North
3 Carolina, and the greater Metrolina region at risk
4 with their plan to use the MOX fuel at Duke's Catawba
5 and McGuire Nuclear Power Plants.
6 I'm also concerned that communities
7 downstream of SRS will face the same risk if the
8 reactors at the Southern Company's Plant Vogtle are
9 chosen as the fifth and sixth reactors to use MOX,
10 which would put all of us in double jeopardy.
11 The section on environmental justice
12 mentions the effects on fishing near SRS. Since waste
13 that is released or leaked into the waterways
14 eventually reaches Savannah, and because fish can't
15 tell the difference between bait from a fisherman in
16 Blackville, South Carolina, and that from one in
17 Chatham County, the effects the MOX facility would
18 have on fishing in our area need to be studied. We
19 already have radiation monitors in place that could be
20 used for this purpose.
21 The EIS also bases its definition of
22 environmental justice on the impacts to areas with
23 predominantly racial minority and/or low income
24 populations. I believe that failure of this report to
25 take into account the impacts to downstream

1 communities beyond a 50-mile radius, regardless of
2 their racial or income demographics, constitutes
3 environmental injustice. The definition of
4 environmental justice must be expanded to include
5 these impacts. Therefore, the final EIS for this
6 project and, for that matter, similar reports about
7 future activities at SRS, need to include these
8 impacts, as well.
9 The most disturbing part of the report to
10 me is the mention of the Commission's ruling in
11 December 2002 that it is not obligated to consider
12 risks associated with terrorism in any environmental
13 impact statement. In light of the tragedy of
14 September 11, 2001, concluding that the risk of a
15 terrorist attack is speculative is absolutely absurd,
16 irresponsible, and unconscionable. With this ruling,
17 the NRC has not only set a dangerous precedent, it has
18 also stuck its head in the sand like an ostrich. What
19 a shame. If the Commission will not consider these
20 risks, who will? Who will protect us?
21 The EIS further states that the wind at
22 SRS mainly blows to the west-northwest and north, and
23 that the probability of a substantial leak is very
24 low. I remember the infamous tritium leak of December
25 1991 that shut down Savannah's industrial water supply

1 for almost two weeks. I would hate to think what
2 would have happened if that had been plutonium-laced
3 waste, instead. Besides duct tape and plastic
4 sheeting, is our only defense against an accident or
5 terrorist attack at the MOX facility consist of
6 praying that the wind continues to blow away from us,
7 and that SRS will dramatically improve its more than
8 50 year track record of leaks? If that is the case,
9 we would be in the same predicament as Wile E. Coyote
10 when he opened a miniature umbrella to protect himself
11 from a falling boulder. Also, in light of recent
12 congressional hearings and news reports containing to
13 the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plant in New York, if
14 SRS security is anything like that at a commercial
15 nuclear power plant, we would feel as confident as
16 Bill Dana's famous character, Jose Jimenez, was before
17 he was launched into space.
18 The greater metropolitan areas of Augusta
19 and Aiken can have expanded economic opportunities
20 without jeopardizing downstream communities like
21 Savannah. Making a firm commitment to clean up SRS
22 once and for all can accomplish this. That way
23 Augusta and Aiken get the benefits of more jobs
24 related to SRS, and an expanded tax base. At the same
25 time, downstream communities will not have to worry

1 about more toxic and nuclear waste being generated,
2 resulting in a win-win situation for all.
3 Since I believe that my concerns have not
4 been adequately addressed in this draft EIS, I am
5 submitting, as an attachment, a supplement to my oral
6 comments from the previous meeting that was sent in
7 before the prior comment period ended. I still
8 believe that this project will flush our valuable tax
9 dollars down the toilet. Especially when one realizes
10 that Duke will essentially be getting free MOX at
11 taxpayer expense. Further, it will not reduce the
12 amount of plutonium stored at the site, especially if
13 the Department of Energy decides to build and operate
14 its modern pit facility at SRS.
15 As I said back in September, this project
16 is an attempt by the DOE and DCS to shove a giant Pu
17 Pu platter down our throat. And that when I want a Pu
18 Pu platter, I want it from an honorable Chinese
19 restaurant, not a dishonorable MOX plant. I call on
20 our congressman from Georgia's 12th Congressional
21 District, Max Burns, whose home in Screven County is
22 only one county downstream of SRS, as well as
23 Congressman James Clyburn of South Carolina, a member
24 of the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee of
25 the House Appropriations Committee, to intervene and

1 stop this project from proceeding forward. In the
2 meantime, it's time for the NRC to get its head out of
3 the sand and start thinking outside the box. Say no
4 to MOX. Choose a no-action alternative.
5 [Applause.]
6 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Jody.
7 And I just wanted to alert the audience to
8 something that -- that Jody mentioned, that you may
9 not know of. He referred to a December 2002
10 Commission decision that essentially, if I have it
11 right, ruled that terrorist concerns did not have to
12 be considered in the environmental impact statement.
13 And I just wanted to tell people that if you're -- if
14 you're interested in seeing that decision, that we
15 could probably get copies of -- of it for you, if you
16 want to see that. But that's what you were referring
17 to; right, Jody?
18 MR. LANIER: Right.
19 MR. CAMERON: All right.
20 Nadia? Nadia Baker?
21 Okay, how about Andre. Andre Entermann?
22 MR. ENTERMANN: Right here.
23 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead, Andre.
24 MR. ENTERMANN: Hi. My name is Andre
25 Entermann. I just had a couple of comments. I didn't

1 do much planning or research before I came here, so
2 I'm pretty ignorant for most of these things. But I
3 think it's very, very, very extremely obvious that
4 this is just the most, you know, repulsive, disgusting
5 idea ever. Just the word "nuclear" is just so
6 horrible. Like I can't believe we're actually
7 considering this and getting so technical with it.
8 It's such a simple answer.
9 And, let's see. Yeah, like I think -- I
10 think this whole discussion is just a waste of time,
11 as far as just going through this environmental impact
12 statement. It's just -- it's, again, so obvious. And
13 the overabundance of the word "significant" and
14 "insignificant," it's just like what does that mean,
15 you know. What's the definition of "significant"? I
16 mean, it doesn't mean anything to me. You know, we
17 use it so freely here and there. And it just -- I'm
18 very, very, very concerned for the environment, and I
19 think we're just raping Mother Earth, you know, day-in
20 and day-out. And there's got to be some private
21 advantage in mind in this whole scenario in, you know,
22 the U.S. with this whole space command and putting
23 nuclear weapons in space and trying to dominate the
24 world. And, you know, it's just -- it's crazy, you
25 know.

1 And I -- and real quick, can I get a vote.
2 Is anyone in here for this site? Like does anyone
3 want to go through with this, like actually get this
4 thing running and make fuel in here? Anybody? You
5 guys?
6 MR. HARRIS: We're neither for or against.
7 MR. ENTERMANN: Neutral. Okay.
8 MR. HARRIS: Our job is just to make sure
9 that -- evaluate the proposal and determine whether
10 it's safe or not.
11 MR. ENTERMANN: Right.
12 MR. HARRIS: We're not a proponent or
13 against it.
14 MR. ENTERMANN: I had a question real
15 quick. Like on the MOX facility, like what's the --
16 the corporation or like the business that benefits
17 from it, like the -- who's like the business that's
18 running it, kind of?
19 MR. HARRIS: It's a consortium called Duke
20 Cogema Stone & Webster.
21 MR. ENTERMANN: So it is Duke. Okay.
22 MR. HARRIS: DCS. Yeah.
23 MR. ENTERMANN: Okay.
24 MR. HARRIS: Sorry. Sorry, Chip.
25 MR. ENTERMANN: So you -- so the NRC and

1 -- and the federal government have -- they don't
2 benefit from this really at all, like -- like as far
3 as making sure that the EIS gets out and doesn't prove
4 anything bad?
5 MR. HARRIS: We have a disclosure. I --
6 whether the impact is good or bad, we want to disclose
7 it, not -- I mean, our job isn't to only sugar-coat it
8 and set it out there. We...
9 MR. ENTERMANN: Right, right, right.
10 MR. HARRIS: ...tried to say this is what
11 we honestly think. You know, we did independent
12 analyses. We didn't just accept what DCS did. We did
13 our own analyses.
14 MR. ENTERMANN: Yeah. It just seems like
15 so me information, I don't think really anyone can
16 really get through. I mean, the book, in itself, is
17 an environmental impact, you know, all the paper.
18 It's just ridiculous, you know.
19 [Applause.]
20 MR. ENTERMANN: It's such a simple thing,
21 it'd be done on one piece of paper, you know. It's
22 just like, God, nuclear. It's nuclear. It's like why
23 would you ever want to risk it. Oh, I -- I just don't
24 understand.
25 But, let's see if I have anything else.

1 And that -- yes, so making the MOX fuel, there is
2 waste involved; right?
3 MR. HARRIS: Oh, yeah.
4 MR. ENTERMANN: So what happens to the
5 waste? It just gets...
6 MR. HARRIS: It's going to be transferred
7 to the Savannah River Site where they'll manage it.
8 And depending on what type of waste it is, it goes
9 different places.
10 MR. ENTERMANN: Goes different places and
11 is swept under the rug, basically? I mean, is that
12 worse off from where it was in the beginning?
13 MR. HARRIS: No, I mean, it goes to -- to
14 licensed safe disposal facilities.
15 MR. CAMERON: Andre, you're going to have
16 to, first of all, get closer to the mic for people to
17 -- to hear you. And I guess we're going to have some
18 time for more questions like this after we're done
19 with the -- the speakers. I don't know if we have
20 anybody else.
21 But do you have any -- do you have any
22 more in the comments?
23 MR. ENTERMANN: Yeah, one more question.
24 Just a question. I don't have -- so many things on my
25 mind right now, I just don't even know where to start.

1 But how is this going to benefit mankind in regards to
2 peace and environmental cleanup? Like this whole
3 idea?
4 MR. HARRIS: Do you want us to respond to
5 that, Chip?
6 MR. CAMERON: Well, I think that maybe you
7 could just say what you said at the beginning of -- or
8 maybe Lawrence said is what -- what we know of the
9 purpose of this program is.
10 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. If you look at the
11 purpose, purpose and need is to reduce the threat from
12 weapons -- nuclear weapons. So the whole project is
13 to convert it into a proliferation-resistant form.
14 That is, so people couldn't take it and do -- do bad
15 things with it. So you convert it into a form where
16 that can't happen.
17 MR. ENTERMANN: All right, I'll have to
18 think about what you said and do research, because I
19 can't really comment on that.
20 MR. CAMERON: Okay.
21 MR. HARRIS: It's discussed in the purpose
22 and need, if...
23 MR. ENTERMANN: Okay.
24 MR. HARRIS: Probably a couple of pages.
25 Shouldn't be too bad.

1 MR. ENTERMANN: Yeah. Right, right.

2 I recently sent out a letter like opposing
3 the plutonium launches in Cape Canaveral, I think, May
4 2nd, coming up. And I received the same letter back.
5 It's just the environmental impact. It says, "No
6 significant impact." I mean, it's just -- that's what
7 they always tell us. It's just -- it's just a way to
8 get around it, I guess.

9 MR. CAMERON: Well, I think what -- I
10 think what -- what you need to do is you need to -- to
11 look -- I don't think -- the NRC didn't start with the
12 answer, "No significant environmental impact," and
13 then cook up a rationale to match that. You have to
14 read the -- read the statement. You may disagree with
15 the analysis that's done in the statement. But, by
16 and large, there's an analysis there to look at, an
17 evaluation that led them to that particular
18 conclusion.

19 And you may disagree with it. And if you
20 do, we want you to tell us about that, because we
21 could be wrong. We could benefit from some things
22 that you tell us about where we didn't consider this,
23 where we had to put more weight on. But...

24 MR. ENTERMANN: Yeah. It just seems so
25 simple. Such a simple -- I just -- don't mess with

1 nuclear anything.

2 MR. CAMERON: All right. Okay, I think...

3 MR. ENTERMANN: But...

4 MR. CAMERON: ...let's -- thank you,

5 Andre.

6 MR. ENTERMANN: ...all right.

7 [Applause.]

8 MR. COBB: I made my statement earlier.

9 You don't need me to get back up and say it again; do

10 you?

11 MR. CAMERON: No, we don't.

12 MR. COBB: I think I can help this young

13 fellow understand. Outside of this meeting I'll offer

14 a few comments to you.

15 MR. CAMERON: That would -- thank you.

16 That would be very helpful.

17 And is there -- we have time for more --

18 for questions. But did I miss anybody in terms of

19 wanting to -- to make a comment? And I was being

20 facetious. I know that you made your comment.

21 MR. COBB: One real short, quick question.

22 MR. CAMERON: Right.

23 MR. COBB: When plutonium is transported,

24 how many tons can be transported on a truck during one

25 shipment? Do you know? Because I'm sure it's encased

1 and all these stuff. Can you -- I mean, typical
2 truck, can it handle 20 tons? You know, I mean, this
3 is almost like two shipments. Then, of course, it's
4 in lots of...
5 MR. HARRIS: The number's in the
6 transportation section, Kirk. But...
7 MR. COBB: Yeah.
8 MR. HARRIS: ...it's not one that's up
9 here. I'm sorry.
10 MR. COBB: Okay.
11 MS. BARCZAK: But it's a lot of shipments.
12 It's not one shipment.
13 MR. COBB: Right. It's probably hundreds
14 of shipments.
15 MS. BARCZAK: Yes.
16 MR. COBB: Right?
17 MR. HARRIS: If you look back in the
18 appendix in the transportaiton section...
19 MR. COBB: Okay.
20 MR. HARRIS: ...it tells you how many
21 shipments.
22 MR. COBB: That was my question.
23 MR. HARRIS: I mean, after the meeting
24 I'll -- I'll find the number for you.
25 MR. CAMERON: And I would -- you know, I

1 would call attention to -- again, to Sara's
2 organizations and her handouts. But also DCS has some
3 information back there. And one of them is
4 transporting mixed oxide...
5 MR. COBB: Okay.
6 MR. CAMERON: ...fuel. So there is --
7 there is information on this.
8 Sir?
9 MR. DUNHAM: How many different ways do
10 they transport -- transport it?
11 MR. CAMERON: You mean truck, rail, barge?
12 MR. DUNHAM: Truck, rail, and ships,
13 barges?
14 MR. CAMERON: Can we get a -- can we get
15 a clarification for Mr. Dunham on that, Tim?
16 MR. HARRIS: And actually that's a --
17 that's an answer I -- I hope I know the -- question I
18 know the answer to. I think we only considered truck
19 transprot.
20 MR. CAMERON: And as far as -- as anybody
21 who is with DCS or -- or Department of Energy, is any
22 other mode of transport being considered besides truck
23 at this point? I see a...
24 MR. BROMBERG: No, not in -- not in this
25 country.

1 MR. CAMERON: ...negative. Okay.

2 MR. BROMBERG: But it's shipped by what's

3 called safe, secure transport, which is a heavily-

4 armed convoy under satellite location at all times.

5 It's what's been used to transport nuclear weapons,

6 nuclear components, or special nuclear material for

7 probably close to 50 years. They've logged an excess

8 of 1.6 million miles without any radiation release.

9 It would be the same thing that would be used to

10 transport both plutonium as well as MOX fuel.

11 MR. HULL: Chip, I just wanted to add that

12 we had initially, in our -- the scoping summary report

13 we did, which came out, I believe, in August of 2001,

14 we -- we said we were also going to evaluate rail

15 shipmnets. But because of what the gentleman from DOE

16 just said, we decided that we only needed to evaluate

17 the truck transport, because it does have a proven

18 track record.

19 MR. CAMERON: All right, thank you. Thank

20 you, John.

21 Sara?

22 MS. BARCZAK: Sara Barczak.

23 I just wanted to make the statement that

24 one thing I thought about the user friendliness of the

25 draft environmental impact statement was that in the

1 Appendix I, which summarized basically almost like all
2 the oral and written comments you guys asked for from
3 the fall 2002 time frame, is that I -- and maybe it's
4 just me, but I would prefer to see the comments.
5 I mean, I know that like the Department of
6 Energy, when they did their plutonium disposition that
7 got us to this point, it was enormous, but you could
8 actually read through everybody's comments instead of
9 seeing a summary. And perhaps that might touch on
10 some of what Bobbie Paul and others had mentioned.
11 And I have received phone calls on this.
12 'Well, how do I know they actually read my comments?'
13 And I'll say, "Well, look in Appendix I and look under
14 the terrorism and you'll see that, you know, they
15 mentioned commentors, and you were one of those. But
16 I think people like to do a cross-reference to see if
17 they're all getting sort of the same answer. And I
18 would just highly recommend -- I like the summary
19 because it helps give a quick answer right there. But
20 I think for the final, I mean, it's going to make it
21 huge, but I think it's got to be in there so people
22 can see it, all the comments.
23 MR. CAMERON: Let me clarify, ask you
24 something to make sure we understand your
25 recommendation. Are you saying -- I don't think

1 you're saying that there should be a separate response
2 to each comment letter. You're saying that the
3 comment letters, themselves, should all be contained
4 in an appendix...
5 MS. BARCZAK: Uh-huh.
6 MR. CAMERON: ...to the -- to the EIS.
7 Now, all those comment letters are publicly available.
8 But we just don't package them. We'll -- we'll put
9 that up as a recommendation. And we had a number of
10 process recommendations, I mean, things that we were
11 going to do or try to do. And one was -- came from
12 Mr. Dunham, which is at least send this notice that
13 this was going on to the elected officials here.
14 Extend the comment period. There was a comment about
15 the independent, external review that falls in a
16 different category than -- than these two. But I
17 think the -- the fourth one we're hearing now is to
18 include -- either include the comment letters in the
19 draft, or to somehow make that available to people,
20 the verbatim comment letters. All right, I'll put --
21 I'll put that down.
22 Was -- let me ask the NRC folks whether
23 there was anything that they heard people say in their
24 comments that we -- we should clarify, in terms of
25 giving them additional information? Is there

1 anything?

2 The one thing that I think Mr. Cutter

3 brought up is that Tim's slide on -- on the

4 environmental justice talked about accident impact and

5 mitigating measures. I don't know whether it would be

6 helpful to -- to say a little bit about what those

7 mitigating measures are. I -- you know, I didn't know

8 if it was clear to everybody what -- what was going

9 on. And I think Mr. Cutter may have implied or

10 explicitly said that.

11 Do you want to say a little more about

12 that?

13 MR. HARRIS: Sure, Chip.

14 Chapter 5 of the EIS talks about

15 mitigation measures for all the impacted areas. And

16 it also notes who proposed the mitigation. So you'll

17 see DCS, where DCS said, "We're going to mitigate

18 these impacts by..." say like surface water impacts

19 from construction. They proposed to do sedimentation

20 control. Well, they're required by law to do

21 sedimentation control. But those measures will reduce

22 the impacts. The environmental justice impacts were

23 proposed by NRC, and that's one area that we're very

24 interested. And I appreciate Mr. Cutter's comments on

25 the specificity, and then taking that farther and

1 saying these detailed things should be included. And
2 as you read through the document and engage the
3 community more, if there's other things that come to
4 mind, please -- please submit them.
5 So, basically, the mitigation measures
6 that NRC proposed for environmental justice would read
7 that: focused information campaigns to provide
8 technical and environmental health information should
9 be directed towards low income and minority groups, or
10 to local agencies and representatives of those groups
11 that could help disseminate the information;
12 additional programs directed at local communities
13 providing emergency response services and other
14 emergency facilities to incorporate additional
15 measures to protect low income and minority
16 populations. And I think Mr. Cutter helped clarify
17 that with saying, you know, we'd like to see a clinic
18 there that -- if people are concerned. That's a great
19 comment. Thank you.
20 But those were the two big mitigation
21 measures that the NRC proposed, and through the help
22 of -- of your comments, hopefully we'll refine those
23 to -- to make them a better and...
24 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you for
25 providing that additional.

1 And we'll go to -- to Sara. But is there
2 any -- Dave, Lawrence, anything that you want to add
3 to what you heard Tim...
4 MR. HARRIS: I don't think there was
5 anything that anybody said that we felt required
6 clarification on our part.
7 MR. CAMERON: All right.
8 MS. BARCZAK: Is the NRC -- if this
9 operating license -- or construction license is
10 granted, is the -- like let's say you were just
11 talking about the mitigation procedures that you have
12 recommended on the environmental justice section. Is
13 the NRC going to be the regulatory body that goes
14 through and says, "DCS, you know, you weren't
15 distributing fliers and you weren't doing this and you
16 weren't doing that, and you're in violation," or where
17 do you -- are you the overseeing regulatory body to
18 make sure, even if you give the license the okay, do
19 you then oversee it?
20 MR. HARRIS: Yeah, typically, the way a
21 lot of these -- these things happen are through -- we
22 issue a license with conditions. You know, it says,
23 "You can do these things." And then it says, "You
24 shall do these things." And it's possible that those
25 mitigation measures could be under a license

1 condition. Certainly we don't feel that there's an
2 environmental justice concern with construction or
3 operation. So it would be doubtful that, if we issued
4 a construction authorization request, that EJ would be
5 directly considered, you know, mitigation, because it
6 wouldn't be timely. But there -- there are probably
7 going to be other mitigation measures relative to
8 construction that would be incorporated in any kind of
9 action the NRC took.
10 MR. CAMERON: But is the question also if
11 we license this facility, we're also going to...
12 MR. HARRIS: Right.
13 MR. CAMERON: ...regulate the facility?
14 MR. HARRIS: I'm sorry, I -- right.
15 MR. HULL: We've got an inspection and
16 enforcement program that applies to any licensee.
17 MR. HARRIS: Right. So our job is to make
18 sure that DCS complies with the conditions of the
19 license that we issue them.
20 MR. CAMERON: Is there -- there anybody
21 else who hasn't had an opportunity to say anything
22 tonight, that would -- that would like to say anything
23 or ask a question, or are there other -- other
24 questions out there?
25 (No audible response)

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, it always is
2 nice to -- to do a meeting in Savannah, because we
3 always get a lot of really challenging things to think
4 about in trying to do our job. So we just thank you
5 for -- for being here. And the staff will be here.
6 There are people here from the Department of Energy,
7 from Duke Cogema Stone & Webster. I mean, if you have
8 questions, you want to talk, I know we'll be here for
9 a while.
10 And thank you. Thank you all.
11 (Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at
12 10:05 p.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25