Final Marked Copy C.E. Noveluis 10/2/89 PUBLIC MEETING NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION HEARING AUGUST 24, 1989 JEFFERSON COLLEGE, HILLSBORO, MISSOURI Present: Charles Norelius Lee Rouse George Bidinger Jim Rode <u>L-40</u>

*[*_____

HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

MR. NORELIUS: Good evening ladies and 1 2 My name is Charles Norelius. I'm the director gentlemen. of the division of radiation safety and safeguard in 3 N.R.C.'s region three office near Chicago, 4 Illinois. The 5 purpose of our meeting tonight is to provide you with 6 information regarding plan changes in the operation at Combustion Engineering's plant at Hematite and also 7 8 information on the N.R.C. staff evaluation of the chances. I have with me tonight the following members of the N.R.C. 9 10 staff. Sitting first here is Lee Rouse, who is the chief of the fuel cycle safety branch out of our headquarters in 11 Washington. Next to him is George Bidinger. 12 He's the Headquarters. leader of the uranium fuel section also out of N.R.C. Λ^{1} Dave 13 McCaughey McCoule; nuclear processing engineer and Mary Horn 14 environmental engineer both at the base of staff of 15 headquarters, from our regional office, I have Dr. Bruce 16 Mallett. He's the chief of our nuclear material safety 17 Hallot. France branch and next to him is George Franks who is the project 18 inspector for the Hematite facility. In the front here is 19 Russ Marbito who is our public affairs man and I micht just 20 say if there are anyone here, reporters who are here Russ 21 should be your point of contact this evening. I would also 22 note that Combustion Engineering is participating with us in 23 24 this meeting and Mr. Jim Rode the manager of the Hematite 25 plant is sitting back here and he will be addressing you

2

ì

1	shortly. We also have Dave Bedang who is from the Missouri
2	Department of Natural Resources. Dave, okay. And if there
з	are questions pertaining to the state permit Dave will
4	answer those. Excuse me, would you please turn up your
5	speaker a little more or whatever you do to make it louder?]
6	Okay. We'll try that. Is that better? The
7	N.R.C. has a responsibility to show that popposed uses of
8	radioactive material can be carried out with due regard for
9	public health and safety off site by the N.R.C. is
10	accomplished through the review and approval of any planned
11	activity proposed by an applicant and through subsequent
12	field inspections of ongoing activities once they have been
13	approved. In the case of Combustion Engineering at Hematite
14	Mr. Rouse and his staff are responsible for licensing
15	activities and I $\frac{4}{10}$ my staff are responsible for onsight
16	inspection activities. Let me explain that there is a
17	difference between a public formal hearing as we are having
18	here tonight and a hearing which is provided for under part
19	two of our regulations. During this past June Senator Nixon
20	and the coalition for the environment requested a hearing to
21	address the proposed expansion of uranium processing
22	activities by Combustion Engineering at the Hematite site.
23	The request from the coalition was signed by Martha Dodson,
24	Karen Sisk and Arlene Sandler. These requests have been
25	10 CFR L evaluated according to $\frac{974}{974}$ part two sub part $\frac{1}{100}$ of our

3

-

;

. تربيه

ł

٠.

(

ſ

ı	regulations. And on August 18, 1989, Judge Beckhoffer
2	issued an order granting the request for a hearing to Martha
з	Dodson and deferring action on the other petitions. The
4	order also set out the time frame for continuing that
5	proceeding. The N.R.C. staff has perceived our based on the
6	previously mentioned letters input from the Missouri
7	Department of Natural Resources and supporting letters from
8	members of the U.S. Congress that a general meeting
9	conducted by the N.R.C. staff and open to the public would
10	be beneficial. Combustion Engineering also suggested that
11	such a meeting be held. That is our purpose here tonight.
12	The management of Combustion Engineering Hematite
13	planthas agreed to participate with us in describing the
14	operations at the plant. And we, the N.R.C., plan to
15	describe our evaluation of the safety of the operations. We
16	hope that the information presented this evening addresses
17	your concerns. In Judge Beckhoffer's order he acknowledged
18	that this public formal hearing was planned. He also
19	stated, and I quote, "that this meeting, of course, is
20	separate and apart from the hearing sought by the
21	petitioners in this proceeding. Attendance at the formal
22	meeting would not affect a petitioner's opportunity to
23	become a party to this proceeding. Or if a petitioner
24	through this formal meeting determined that any or all of
25	its concerns were not warranted it should so advise me."

יי ז

ł

ſ

t

HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

That's quoting Judge Beckhoffer. I would also note that while this is not a hearing as provided for in the regulations it is being transcribed so that if there is a need to refer back to the statements by individuals at this meeting at a later time we will have a record of the comments made here tonight.

ĩ

7 What we plan to do here this evening is first have 8 a presentation by Mr. Jim Rode plant manager as to the 9 changes they have made in or are planning to make in their 10 operation at Hematite. He also will address the specific, some of the specific questions raised by Senator Nixon in 11 12 recent letters both to the plant and to the N.R.C.. Specifically questions one through five and A through E 13 14 regarding waste storage. Secondly, Mr. George Bidinger will 15 describe the N.R.C. licensing process and specifically the 16 status of reviews as they relate to the Combustion 17 Engineering request. He will respond to the remaining 18 questions raised by Senator Nixon and to the issues raised 19 by the coalition for the environment in their request for a 20 hearing. After that time we will take statements by members 21 of the public who are here. I will first give opportunity 22 for statements from Senator Nixon and then from Martha 23 Dodson and Karen Sisk and after that I will take statements 24 from other people who are visiting here. We placed a pad of 25 paper back on the chair. It's probably under the chair now

> HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

where that gentleman is sitting and one back there. And if 1 2 you wish to make a statement tonight I would ask that you 3 sign up and we believe in that way we will give everybody a fair and equitable time to make those statements. 4 If we 5 still have time available after the persons who indicate they would like to make statements we will then open the 6 7 meeting for public questions and answers. 8 I believe we will proceed and I'll ask Mr. Jim 9 Rode if he will come at this time and describe the operations currently under way at the plant. 10 MR. RODE: Good evening. My name is Jim Rode. 11 12 I'm the plant manager for Combustion Engineering's 13 operations in Hematite. The Hematite plant and the C.E. employees have been members of this community for fifteen 14 15 years. I hope that we have been good neighbors and that we 16 will continue to be. The efforts that we are making to 17 modernize our plant are intended to make us even better 18 members of the community than we have been in the past. Ι 19 am pleased to be here this evening to talk to you about what 20 we're doing to modernize our facility and consolidate our 21 manufacturing operations. Our local applications for building permits and the cocuments we have submitted to the 22 Nuclear Regulatory Commission have been publicly available 23 for sometime but there is no substitute for face to face 24 25 discussion. We welcome and support this meeting.

Ł,

6

HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

I would like to start by briefly describing in 1 2 non-technical terms what we do at the Hematite plant and 3 just as importantly some of the things that we don't do. Our plant performs some of the manufacturing steps in the 4 5 process that transforms uranium or as it is mined from the 6 ground into suitable fuel for use in nuclear power plants. 7 We do what you might call the middle steps. The early step 8 uranium mining and milling transforms the ore into uranium yellowcake This part of 9 concentrate generally referred to as yellow-K. 10 the operation deals with daughter products and uranium refining plant and conversion to uranium hexaflouride 11 12 removes the daughter products. The daughter products are 13 somewhat hotter than the uranium that we process at our 14 plant. That uranium has been purified then sent on to the gaseous diffusion plant where we enrich, where the uranium 15 16 is enriched by the Department of Energy. Subsequently sent 17 to our plant as a solid in cylinders under vacuum. This Portsmouth 18 comes to us generally today from the Port-Smith gaseous diffusion plant in Ohio. Occasionally we receive uranium, 19 20 enriched uranium also from overseas enrichment plants. In 21 a series of steps we transform this material into a powder. 22 This powder is referred to as uranium dioxide. Some of this 23 powder is pressed into small cylindral pellets about this 24 big. We ship the pellets or the powder to the Connecticut 25 plant where the manufacturing process is completed. In

5

recent years we have been producing considerably more 1 2 pellets than we had in the past. Our plant has always however been converting the uranium hexaflouride to uranium 3 dioxide. We've been doing this safely for over fifteen 4 years and we have been pelletizing the uranium dioxide 5 during that time as well. It's important to note that in 6 7 our work we deal only with the forms of uranium that have 8 very low levels of activity. Both the material coming in and the material going out. We handle it with appropriate 9 10 caution and care. We continuously monitor the working 11 environment inside the buildings. Contamination is 12 controlled to levels well below those which might be hazardous to our employees. The air discharge from the 13 14 manufacturing process areas of the plant are filtered by double high efficiency filters to remove traces of low level 15 16 radioactive dust. The average releases from our plant 17 through the filtering system are about currently four 18 hundred milligrams per day. That is approximately the 19 weight of an aspirin. We have always remained well below the conservative limits set by the federal and state 20 regulations for release from our plant and we expect to 21 continue. 22 23 Now let me emphasize some of the things we do not

do. We do not handle highly radioactive fuel that has been in a nuclear power plant. As a matter of fact, we con't

even complete the manufacturing process for fuel assemblies. 1 We only produce uranium oxide powder or pellets that I 2 described. Our plant modernization does not anticipate 3 anything beyond this. Because of this, because we do not 4 5 handle highly radioactive material we do not need to take some of the extra nor extraordinary planning steps that are 6 7 done at nuclear power plants such as plans for off site evacuation. We simply do not deal with that type of 8 material. We do however, certain that we are prepared to 9 deal with accidents at the facility should they occur. 10 We 11 maintain an emergency response plan. It's been discussed 12 with the local sheriff, fire fighters, the local hospital personnel, Barnes Hospital, the State of Missouri Emergency 13 Management Agency and the local civil defense office. 14 We hold emergency drills once a year. We have our own site 15 brigade that's been trained by the Hematite fire department. 16 We have arrangements with local ambulance personnel and area 17 18 hospitals to transport injured personnel if they have been contaminated by some of the low level radioactive material. 19 20 I think it's fair to say that our emergency planning exceeds 21 that of most comparable industrial facilities in the area. Let me now talk briefly about the changes we are 22

9

in the process of making in our facilities. Basically they
fall into two catagories. We're installing more modern
equipment. After all, some of our equipment is thirty years

We are increasing our capabilities to produce and 1 old now. result 2 ship more pellets and less powder. As a rule our plant will 3 look somewhat larger. Our modernized facility will include additions in this central area. I would point out that the 4 5 pelletizing building, this building here, has been designed 6 to survive an earthquake of substantial magnitude. The 7 design standards are those of institutional buildings such as hospitals in the same seismic zone in Missouri. 8 Also our 9 new buildings are at a higher elevation than the existing 10 buildings and are above the hundred year flood level 11 established by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Now I'll show you the general floor plan in 12 somewhat more detail. This is the Hematite facility before 13 14 the modernization. There are several points that I would 15 like to make. One of them, you notice there is considerable 16 open space between the buildings. At one time this made 17 alot of sense when the plantwas built in the '50's. The 18 idea was to try and keep areas separated so that in case of 19 an accident you would limit the injury to employees. It has 20 alot of disadvantages. One of them is tracking of uranium 21 out of doors between the plants. We have already a pellet 22 facility and I'm not sure that you can see it very well. 23 Right there this building is the pellet line and our 24 expansion doubles the size of that building. The reason 25 that we're doubling the size of the building is that plant

> HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

is currently in operation and is required to satisfy the 1 2 requirements of our customers. We can't shut it down for 3 construction. The phase two pelletizing building has been erected and we are in the process and have been for some 4 5 while now of installing equipment in that building while we are continuing to produce in the pellet line. 6 In order to accomplish this the dark area that you see in the new 7 8 pellets building was our warehouse. This had to be removed 9 to make way for the new pellet building. To accomplish that 10 we had to have a new warehouse installed and the warehouse was installed then behind the existing building allowing us 11 to continue operations, continue shipping oxide and pellets 12 13 to the Connecticut plant. The warehouse is now operational. The pellet building is near operational and we are in the 14 process of excavating and decontaminating the ground in the 15 16 storage utility building area. It's a requirement that we 17 decontaminate the land before we can put up new structures 18 in the area. I would like to stress again the things that we are not doing. We are not changing the basic process 19 20 that we have performed here over the years. And as a result we should not increase the risks of an industrial accident. 21 22 We are not increasing the overall output of our facility. 23 The total amount of uranium that we have on hand will remain 24 There will not be an increase in traffic about the same. around the plant or a change in the traffic patterns. 25 We

expect the results of this program will be $\frac{\alpha_s}{two}$ followed. 1 2 First a more modern facility. One that is more efficient 3 and up to date and as a matter of fact this will be the 4 first time that we have had as an example adequate women's 5 locker facilities in the plant. This reflects the changing 6 nature of the work force as well as the age of the 7 facilities that we have been working with. We will continue 8 to train our employees and inform them of any hazards 9 associate with their work. We will continue to provide 10 radiation monitoring and annuals for all of our employees to make sure that we continue to stay within all federal 11 12 requirements. We'll be shipping more pellets and less 13 powder. The pellets are easier to handle. They are not readily responsible dispersable. They are easier to transport and 14 since the pellets will be produced here there will be a 15 16 somewhat smaller quantity, about ten percent less shipments 17 going to Connecticut. And the amount of material being 18 shipped back from Connecticut to our plant in Missouri for 19 rework will decrease.

I hope that these remarks have been useful and have provided you with some of the answers to your questions. Let me recount, though. We are installing more efficient air filtration systems to reduce emissions. Substituting indoor traffic patterns for outdoor traffic patterns and thereby reducing the spread of contamination

> . HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

We are decontaminating large areas of the 1 out of doors. 2 We have enclosed the UF6 vaporizer area to minimize site. the consequences of release of UF6. We are improving the 3 ventilation system to reduce work or exposure and installing 4 continuous air monitors to detect deviations in the air 5 6 concentration within the plant rapidly. Automating 7 pelletizing equipment to reduce operator exposure to the 8 uranium and we are reducing the shipping traffic. These 9 improvements would not be possible without the modernization 10 program which we have undertaken.

Now, I would like to address some of the guestions 11 that have been raised by Senator Nixon. First question is 12 why is Combustion Engineering requested permission to handle 13 14 fuel containing higher percentages of uranium than previously processed at Hematite? While the facility 15 16 modernization has nothing to do with the increased enrichment level we have, in fact, we have been, in fact, 17 handling the higher enrichment uranium up to five percent 18 19 now for well over a year. The utilities, we're doing this because the utilities uses slightly higher enriched fuel at 20 power plants to improve their fuel cycle economics. Other 21 fuel manufacturers also have licenses which allow the use of 22 five percent enriched uranium. Before we obtain our license 23 amendment to use five percent enriched uranium we performed 24 25 extensive analysis to show the adequacies of our equipment

and our procedures. And including criticality safety 1 2 These analysis are based on conservative analvsis. 3 assumptions approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 4 Question number two, the total discharged pollutants into 5 the river and air have decreased by substantial percentage In view of this fact why is Combustion 6 in the last decade. 7 Engineering requesting permission to increase air emissions 8 and water effluents? We were not requesting permission to 9 increase air emissions or water effluents. Our plant does 10 not release any significant amount of radioactive air 11 emissions nor do we discharge radioactive liquid effluents 12 from the production processes to the creeks. In fact, we 13 have always stayed well below the federal limits for 14 airborne radioactive releases stated in the federal 15 regulations 10CFR20. After the plant modernization these 16 limits will remain at the same low levels. But our ability to remain well within them utilizing our proposed state of 17 18 the art improvements will be enhanced. It's expected that 19 the nonradioactive sanitary and laundry waste water from the plant will increase about twenty percent. 20 This is largely due to the additional jobs created by the modernization of 21 22 the Hematite plant. The sanitary waste water from the plant passes through the plant sanitary treatment facility and is 23 then discharged to the creek. 24 The laundry waste water is 25 filtered, held in a storage tank and sampled prior to

> HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

release and will be going through the sanitary systems as 1 2 well. As a final point there will be no adverse effect on ground water quality since there are no plant activities 3 related to plant modernization that will introduce foriegn 4 5 substances into the ground water. The next question, has the State of Missouri given it's okay for any increased 6 emissions? This guestion assumes an increase where there is 7 8 none as I have stated earlier. The plant modernization will 9 not significantly increase airborne releases and radioactive 10 liquid discharges. What plans have been prepared to reduce 11 emissions? Once the modernization is completed and put into 12 operation the Hematite plant will use modern equipment and 13 controls which will enhance our ability to remain well below the established federal limits. 14 Has the state or national 15 agency requested such a plan? The answer is no. The 16 additional questions now deal with waste on site. It is my 17 understanding that large amounts of waste are stored on 18 site. If this is correct, how is the waste stored? All of our low level nuclear waste is put into N.R.C. approved 19 20 shipping containers and sent to license burial grounds while awaiting shipment. The low level waste is placed in 21 22 approved containers kept at the plant. What type of waste is stored? Low level nuclear waste, which generally is in 23 24 the form of solid. Any liquids that we have are solidified 25 before we store them. The present inventory is less than

t

15

HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

fifteen hundred cubic feet of current operational waste. 1 2 And a bit less than ten thousand cubic feet of 3 decontamination waste. Primarily decontaminated or contaminated earth, which we have removed during 4 5 decontamination of the retention pond behind the plant and excavation prior to N.R.C. release for construction on the 6 Unless some of this material is found to meet the 7 site. requirements for unrestricted release it will be shipped off 8 site to burial. Additionally there are about two thousand 9 10 to three thousand tons of spent limestone, a mixture of calcium flouride and calcium carbonate, which is stored on 11 12 the site awaiting release from the Nuclear Regulatory This material contains about the same low level 13 Commission. 14 of radioactivity as flash from typical coal fired utility Do you consider this a temporary or permanent 15 boilers. 16 At the present time we consider shipment of our solution? low level nuclear waste to Barneewell, South Carolina to be 17 18 a permanent solution. Are there plans to make a different 19 permanent disposal of the waste? Yes, if our low level 20 waste will not be accepted for burial at Barnewwell we plan to ship to the Midwest Compact State Facility. At present 21 22 we are in the planning stages to construct a temporary storage facility at the plant to hold the waste until the 23 24 Midwest Compact State Facility is operational. Is there a 25 clear record duplicable for state inspection of what and

> HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

I presume this refers to the where these wastes are buried? 1 2 burial grounds on the site at Hematite. Prior owners of the 3 Hematite site have recorded the burial of twenty-seven point 4 four 0 five kilograms grams of U235 in thirty-nine on site 5 burial pits. These pits were established in conformance 6 with the A.E.C. regulatory requirements in existence between 10 CFR 20.304 7 1957 and 1970, 10CFR20 point three 0 four and appear to contain in the burial pit that is approximately two point 8 9 five parts per million U235. There are burial logs 10 The boundaries of the burial grounds are available. defined in maps provided by the prior owners but not the 11 12 specific location of the individual burial pits. R.M.C. and 13 N.R.C. contractors conducted tests of the burial grounds in 1983 and concluded that the buried material was essentially 14 stable and that the burial pits had no detectable effect on 15 the population or the surrounding environment. 16 Subsequently we have determined that samples of water from wells on the 17 periphery of the burial grounds are not only within the 18 release requirements for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission 19 20 within the E.P.A. drinking water standards. There are currently no plans to decommission the burial pits. 21 22 MR. NORELIUS: Thank you, Mr. Rode. I believe 23 we will proceed right on and ask Mr. Bidinger if he would come and describe the N.R.C. licensing evaluations? 24 25 MR. BIDINGER: Good evening, ladies and

gentlemen. I'm George Bidinger section leader in the fuel 1 cycle safety branch. My section has the responsibility for 2 preparing or for performing the environmental and safety 3 reviews prior to our branch taking any safety actions. 4 Senator Nixon has invited us here this evening to discuss 5 potential health and environmental impacts of the Combustion 6 7 Engineering plant expansion and operation. Since protecting 8 the public and the environment is the primary responsibility of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission I think it's more 9 10 appropriate that we be here and discuss the proposed project with you people. Answer your questions, if we can. We're 11 certainly going to try and do that. Let you know a bit 12 13 about the Combustion Engineering license, The licensing 14 process and the status on the current project, the expansion. I wish we could have rehearsed our performances, 15 16 Mr. Rode and I could have rehearsed our performances together. Much of what he said I was prepared to say, you 17 18 will see it on my view graft but I intend to skip over it where I agree with him and even though it's been said it's 19 already been said, in the economy of time I'm not going to 20 repeat it but you will see it on the view graft. 21 After 22 discussion of the licensing process I intend then to respond to the rest of the questions from Senator Nixon and take up 23 24 the issues that have been raised by the coalition and the 25 two Jefferson County residents in their request for a

> HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

hearing. That does not affect the hearing process at all but I want to speak to those issues so that we pass the while information on to everybody why-we're here this evening. To understand what we were doing on the amendment process to approve or to consider approval of the project by an expansion.

7 I wanted to spend a few minutes going back and 8 discussing what was in the license at the time of the last 9 renewal which occurred in 1983. In the renewal process we 10 looked at all aspects of the Combustion Engineering 11 operations here at Hematite. We performed an environmental 12 assessment. We did a safety evaluation of their operations 13 looking at their organization and administrative practices 14 to protect people and the environment. We looked at their 15 health physics, the radiation protection program. We looked criteria at their nuclear safety graft to see that they had 16 17 criticality practices that were adequate in all respects in 18 handling and processing enriched uranium. At that time the 19 process as they are now consisted of processing the UF6 into 20 UO2 powder and/or pellets at the site and shipping those 21 products off to their sister plant in Connecticut. They 22 would receive scrap material back from that Connecticut 23 plant and in-the process that scrap and the scrap that they 24 themselves generated in their scrap plant. The enrichment, 25 the uranium enrichment that they were handling at that time

was four point one weight percent, U235. Another feature of 1 the license was that the environmental or excuse me, the 2 E.P.A. offsite environmental limits for fuel facilities and 3 retractors were reimposed on Combustion Engineering. 4 At 5 that time they were all subject to them and we reimposed those limits on Combustion Engineering. 6 Those limits are millinems very, very low. One of the limits is twenty-five Hilograms. 7 8 The whole body dose equivalent, sort of technical, but millivens 9 twenty-five kilograms is a very small number. It was 10 established by the Environmental Protection Agency and we have no choice but to impose that on our licensees. 11 12 Licensees, all licensees in the fuel cycle have no, have to In the process of type operations 13 live with that limit. 14 changed here we had to amend that license that was renewed 15 '83. There have been thirteen amendments. I'm only in 16 going to mention two or three of them this evening. Also 17 over a year ago we amended the license to authorize uranium 18 enriched five weight percent in the U235 isotope. This did not change their health physics program. It modified their 19 20 criticality safety program slightly because the uranium is slightly more reactive than the four percent but their 21 22 original responsibilities and administrator's responsibilities in the license remain unchanged. 23 The plant manager was still responsible to see if they operated with 24 25 written procedures. He was responsible to see that their

people were trained in safety practices and processing 1 2 He was responsible to see that audits were practices. 3 performed to see that they were living up to their license. I might divert just a minute. When I talk about the license Ļ 5 some of you may have no idea what we're talking by a 6 license. The license consists when Combustion Engineering 7 applied for the license back in 1982 they submitted 8 thirty-five pages of committments. We took those 9 thirty-five pages and incorporated them into the license. 10 We added roughly twenty-five additional conditions. We imposed, you might say, twenty-five more committments on 11 12 Combustion Engineering so our conditions and their own 13 thirty-five pages of committments became their license. So 14 when I talk about a license I'm talking about a big thick 15 And periodically it does get amended. document. So at the 16 time that this project started then we had basically a 17 facility that looked like this. You have already seen it 18 but the things that I want to point out here are that this little building right here, the little square building is 19 20 the oxide building. That's where all of the powder is 21 produced. That little building is not being changed by the 22 revisions to the plant site. This building here is where 23 the old pellet line was but then you notice that any scrap 24 produced in these two buildings had to be taken out into the 25 open over to the scrap building, an undesireable practice

> HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

1 because there is a chance for contamination spills, anything 2 else. So at the time that we started this project there were four buildings, four main production buildings on site. 3 4 As we, the first communication on this project came to us 5 formal way in July of '88 so we have been working on it now 6 for over a year. Since that time they asked us for 7 permission to tear down those two buildings in the middle of 8 the plant site. We required them to decontaminate the 9 buildings and provide us with surveys that they were 10 decontaminated. Our region three staff went out and conducted their own survey to make sure that the buildings 11 12 were decontaminated. Then they were allowed to put up the 13 shell of the building but they had to then, Combustion 14 Engineering then had to survey the soil, remove the 15 contaminated soil. And then our consultant, a contractor 16 from Oak Ridge, Tennessee, went to the site and performed an 17 independent soil sampling survey for ourselves. Once we 18 were convinced that the soil had been, the contaminated soil 19 had been removed they were allowed to pour the floor for the 20 phase two building, the pellet line building. That same process is now going on in the phase three area. We will 21 22 see that in just a minute. Our contractor has already been 23 out and sampled the soil. We're waiting for the results but 24 if the soil is properly or all of the contaminated soil is 25 picked up we will then authorize the or we expect then to

22

HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

authorize the pouring of the floor for the last phase. 1 So 2 we, okay. So then let's me move on then. Combustion 3 Engineering then applied for a license amendment. That 4 license amendment was to authorize them to operate the new 5 pellet line building, the phase two building with depleted 6 When we talk about depleted uranium we're talking uranium. 7 about the uranium that's had the U235 removed from it. Most 8 of the U235 removed from it. That U235 has been concentrated and will be used in reactors and what was left 9 10 over was the uranium depleted. And U235 has, and it is 11 being used, Combustion Engineering asked to use some 12 depleted uranium to test the new plant by using depleted 13 uranium to take away the risk of criticality safety. It's a 14 reasonable approach for them, the building with uranium but 15 not have any of the criticality concerns while you're I think there is also an economics incentive 16 testing it. 17 for Combustion Engineering to do it that way but that's 18 their business. They also presented with us a second 19 amendment application in May of '89. This was to operate the plant with the enriched uranium. 20 Once we received these 21 two applications we performed an enironmental assessment as National Environmental Protection Act 22 required by the the PAAC and our own regulations. In 23 performing this assessment we came to the conclusion that the doses that would be, let me change that slightly, the 24 25 uranium that would be released by the operation of this

1 plant would result in doses to the public that would be well 2 below the E.P.A. limits that have been mentioned before. millirem We're talking in terms of less than a kilogram to a real 3 person here in the Hematite area. Again remember that I ۵ 5 mentioned before the limit that E.P.A. has put out is a millirems twenty-five kilograms whole body dose. We're talking about 6 millirem 7 less than one kilogram dose or kilogram per year dose. 8 Because of this small increments in dose we made a finding of no significant impact and we published this in the 9 10 federal register. Now when we published this in May we had 11 to live with new rules which had been imposed on us by our 12 own commission and this recuired that when we publish a finding of no significant impact in the federal register we 13 opportunity for also have to publish a notice of a hearing. 14 We published 15 that notice of a hearing and we received two requests for a hearing from Senator Nixon and from the coalition and two 16 17 residents here in the county. Discussions with Senator 18 Nixon jot lead to this public meeting and here we are 19 tonight. Now, since that time we have gone ahead with our 20 safety evaluation, our safety review of the first 21 application for Combustion Engineering to test the plant with the depleted uranium and we have authorized Combustion 22 23 Engineering to test their new plant with depleted uranium. also 24 That was, that amendment was issued in July. We aiways are 25 reviewing their application to use the new pellet line with

the enriched uranium. That review, that safety review is 1 2 ongoing. We have developed some concerns. We have not communicated them formally to Combustion but we will do that 3 4 as soon as we're away from this public meeting. So if we 5 could look guickly at the view graft and you seen most of it 6 before but again the important features are that the oxide 7 area is still this small building. That's where all of the 8 powder is produced and that really limits the through put to 9 We're not changing the amount of uranium they the plant. 10 can bring on site in the amendments. This old pellet line The two new pellet lines will be here when 11 is still here. 12 phase three is completed. Then there will be one, 13 essentially one building and then all of the scrap from the 14 oxide line, the pellet line can be transferred over to the 15 scrap plant without going outdoors. It will be an 16 enhancement of environmental concerns on site.

17 I'm going to move now to the questions the rest of 18 the guestions that Senator Nixon has posed to us. We have viewgraphs 19 graft here; the questions are here, the answers are 20 here also. Some of them the answers are redundant with He's already explained 21 those that Mr. Rode have given you. 22 how their will be an increase in the volume of laundry and 23 sanitary waste because you have more people flushing toilets 24 and you have more clothes to be washed. All of that, the 25 volume of water will increase, the concentration of uranium

is not expected to increase. There will be no other liquid 1 2 released into the surface water here. All of the process wastes are solidified and sent to low level burial. 3 We don't expect any significant increase in airborne activity 4 5 except that again there is a larger building there is more 6 air being released but all of the new exhausts are being 7 filtered twice by very high efficient filters. We call them HEPA's. hepas. If I refer to them tonight I apologize for that but 8 they are very, very high efficiency filters at removing 9 particles of dust that are in the respiration range. 10 So there will be a very small increase in the amount of 11 12 contaminated air going out of the building, contaminated 13 material going out of the building in the very large volume 14 of air being exhausted from the building but the amount of 15 uranium going out is miniscule. The air and the liquid effluent, the air going up the stacks going into the surface 16 streams are all well below the regulatory limits. 17 Those 18 limits that are imposed by the N.R.C. and by the 19 Environmental Protection Agency. They are going to continue 20 at less than the E.P.A's limits. So therefore, we have 21 concluded that there are no significant impacts on the 22 health, public health or the environment. Our next question deals with the effects of the approval of the application on 23 24 water quality. The racioactive aspects of water quality are 25 regulated totally by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The

NPDES state issues an R.P.T.S. permit. 1 That's a National Discharge System Pollutant, Elimination Test Permit, you can understand, but Discharge 2 the state issues the permit for the chemical effluents going 3 To from the Joachim Creek. Those limits remain unchanged. 4 5 The volume of the water will increase again 6 because of more-of, increase again because of more employees. 7 But again no process liquids, those coming out of the scrap 8 plant which are the only wet process in the building, no 9 process liquids are being released to the environment. They 10 are all being solidified. The solids are being sent to waste burial. The conclusion is that water quality is not 11 12 being impacted by this proposed action. Will there be any change in transportation patterns. 13 Mr. Rode again has 14 talked about the ten percent less material that's being 15 shipped to Windsor and less material being shipped up there 16 and possibly becoming scrap. There will be less scrap 17 coming back from the Windsor Connecticut plant. There will 18 be some additional chemicals associated with pellet 19 production shipped to the site for the operation of the sintering eindering furnaces, for example. But overall there is going 20 be no significant change in the transportation patterns, so. 21 be perhaps a slight decrease from the number of radioactive 22 material shipped, a slight increase from the chemical 23 24 material shipments. Our next two guestions concern the 25 volume of waste produced at the plant and where would the

1 waste be taken for disposal. The waste that we're talking 2 about here consists of the solidified process, residue 3 filters, air filters that are contaminated with uranium. We 4 were told by Combustion Engineering people that they produce 5 about two thousand cubic feet of this waste a year. That's 6 equivalent to two hundred seventy fifty-five gallon drums 7 and it contains about eighty kilograms of uranium, not 8 uranium 235 but uranium. That's a hundred and seventy-six pounds that's shipped over to a licensed commercial burial 9 10 Each year this volume of waste is going to increase site. slightly. They have more filters, for example, in the 11 plant. Those filters end up as being waste and be shipped 12 off but they have estimated that waste at about one percent. 13 14 We don't have any reason to challenge it. All of the waste, 15 this kind of waste is disposed of at a licensed burial site 16 so whether it increases by one percent or ten percent it's only more expensive for them to ship ten percent more but 17 18 there is space available now for them to ship the waste. 19 There is an issue on the limestone. They have requested 20 that it be declared nonradioactive or that they be 21 authorized to dispose of it as nonradioactive waste. They 22 have done some studies that we have requested. We have not 23 made a decision yet on that request. Will the facility have capacity to store the waste if it is unable to use the usual 24 25 disposal site? Well, when you are talking about two

thousand cubic feet per year of solid waste and the big 1 2 warehouses that we saw in their drawings and our drawings 3 it's not, it's easy to store that volume of waste for 4 several years in their warehouses or bring trailers on site 5 to store it. We don't see it as a problem. I think some of 6 you may know that there are some of the waste disposal 7 issues are changing from day to day with waste compacts and all that maybe the basis for the cuestion, I'm not sure. 8 9 But even if they can't send it to Barneswell until the 10 Missouri compact is available they can store the waste for 11 two, three, four years at those volumes. It's not a difficult problem. Okay. The next two guestions deal with 12 13 is there going to be more production on site? Is there a 14 danger of increased accidents with the increased capacity 15 and are the accidents likely to be more serious? First of 16 all, in our response, our consideration of these questions 17 the possession limits the amount of material that they were 18 authorized to have on site does not change by and will not 19 change by this amount processed. When you think about it as 20 a production plant the way they want to make money is 21 convert the uranium hexaflouride into truck load quantities 22 of powder or pellets and ship it off to the next site and 23 get paid for it. So it's, we're not changing the possession I don't think their wanting to run up the inventory 24 limit. 25 in the plant but even if they run up their inventory we have

1 already established a maximum limit they can have in the 2 So the possession limits, at least, do not change. plant. Accidents, As far as acting emergency planning already considers first 3 or explanation, nuclear criticality reactions, uranium 4 releases, chemical releases and off site transportation 5 6 events. We haven't been able to think of any other accident 7 senarios that need to be considered in this, any other accidents of this magnitude that need to be considered. 8 And 9 there are no changes in the types, as far as we're 10 concerned then there are no changes in types or consequences of accidents for emergency planning. 11

The next question deals with emergency procedures 12 13 being revised. Combustion Engineering already has an 14 emergency plan and procedures backing that plant-up in This is a document of something like a hundred and 15 place. 16 I mentioned thirty-five page notice the rest fifty pages. 17 It's a big thick document. of their license. It deals with 18 the on site emergency organization. It deals with training 19 of people, the on site people and the off site people who 20 would respond to any emergency at the plant. It deals with 21 drills so that the people, not only trained, but they get to 22 exercise their training so that the N.R.C. and Combustion Engineering management can see that the training is 23 24 effective. It deals with arrangements for off site support 25 by the local police, hospitals, fire departments, ambulance

> HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

The plan also provides for dedicated emergency 1 services. 2 equipment on site that can be used in the event of an 3 accident. Now, there are going to have to be some emergency 4 procedures revisions. They have got, you know, new egress 5 door, doors where people leave the buildings. New equipment 6 that has to be shut down as people leave but these are all 7 minor procedural revisions that have to be made so we don't 8 see any significant changes having to be made in their Will the modifications require 9 emergency procedures. 10 changes in the local emergency response capability? Aqain 11 the local emergency response capabilities will remain the 12 same, okay. That includes the existing fire department, 13 hospitals, sheriff department and ambulance arrangements. 14 These are all part of the plan. We don't see any accident 15 new type senarios or new types of accidents that need to be 16 protected against so we don't see that there are any changes 17 needed in the off site response capabilities. I now want to 18 go through the issues that have been raised by the coalition for the environment Mrs. Dodson and Mrs. Sisk. This first 19 20 issue really deals with changing from four point one percent 21 uranium to five percent uranium. From a criticality safety 22 stancpoint this is really a small change. Granted it's my 23 opinion when I say that but I have worked in this field for 24 the last thirty years. I compare it to someone coming home 25 with eighty-nine octane gasoline and telling their children

> HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

not to strike a match around the gasoline. Don't pour it 1 2 down the drain, don't drink it. And the next week they come 3 home with ninety-one octane gasoline. The safety programs for your children are the same. You still don't strike 4 5 matches, you don't pour it down the drain, you don't drink 6 It's more powerful gasoline but it's not significantly it. 7 different. And going from four percent uranium to five percent enriched uranium is about the same. 8 It's more 9 powerful uranium. It makes the reactor run a little longer 10 but it does not change the basic rules for handling enriched 11 uranium in the plant. But if they jump up to ninety-three 12 percent enriched uranium like the plant used to handle many, 13 many years ago before it was Combustion Engineering's plant 14 that would be a major change and we would require a much 15 longer time to review their proposed safety limits. But 16 when you go a small change from four percent to five percent 17 it's not a big change from a criticality safety standard. 18 But in our safety evaluation review of the nuclear criticality safety principal the safety controls and the 19 20 limits were adjusted so that the same margins of safety were maintained in the plant. They already were used to dealing 21 To four percent. safely with like two A They had safety maintained in their plant 22 23 for two percent, three percent, four percent material and 24 when they added the five percent they added another line to mass quantity mass fuality to their table. They already had a 25 safe mas

> HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

standard in place. When they were dealing with two percent 1 2 they used the two percent limits. When they were dealing 3 with three percent they were dealing with the three percent limits, But-all-they-had_to_do-to-establish-effluent-by-the 4 5 -process-of-imposing-that-limit-on-material-and-process 6 remaining the same so by the nature of five percent enriched uranium and the control at four percent. The modifications in 7 going at five percent were not seen as a significant increase in 8 the potential to criticality accidents when we authorized 9 that amendment of June, '88. The next question is rather 10 long and it's going to appear on two slides. This has to do 11 with the lack of adequate emergency response capabilities of 12 13 Jefferson County and other counties within the state in the event of radiological accidents. Talking about inadequate 14 roads for evacuation, of emergency responders to plantour or 15 transport routes inadequate emergency health care facility. 16 17 First of all, the response requirements are not affected by 18 this plant modification. The quantity of uranium at the 19 plant is the same. The processes are the same. The responsible capability of the plant staff remains the same 20 so the basic response capabilities do not change. 21 As far as 22 the evacuation route goes really very little need for 23 evacuation. Even the potential for evacuation is very small 24 to begin with by any accident that would happen would be 25 basically a localized event much as a truck event where the

1 local police would isolate the accident but you would not 2 consider that to be an evacuation. The accidents that we're 3 dealing with here don't have the potential impact like you have with a reactor where you do evacuate over miles. 4 We're 5 talking about evacuation over meters or yards, hundreds of 6 feet. And Combustion Engineering does have the on site capability. We have already been through that so there 7 really is not a great deal of change there. As far as the 8 9 local emergency response capabilities we both have touched 10 on that. Combustion Engineering has arrangements with two 11 different hospitals, the ambulance, the sheriff and the fire 12 departments, two of them, so that the local response 13 capabilities of their own emergency responses and the local 14 support governmental agencies and service agencies are 15 adequate for the, deemed adequate for the current plant and 16 the changes to the plant as well. As far as the off site 17 response to transport the shipping containers that 18 Combustion Engineering are allowed to use are designed to withstand severe accident. If there is an accident, a truck 19 20 overturned the local police are equipped and qualified to 21 isolate the truck accident until there is assistance at the 22 site by either Combustion Engineering or while the federal 23 radiological assistant deals are ready to move. Frankly if 24 there was a truck accident in the state we would expect 25 Combustion Engineering to be on the way to lend radiolocical

1 assistance before we even heard about it back in Washington. 2 The next issue is the potential to increase in the plant an unplanned release was of radioactive and unradioactive dust, 3 liquid and gasses. We have already covered water. We have 4 5 covered the air going out of the plant. The one thing I want to address is raxdon. I think we all know that the 6 7 uranium that is in the ground is put there by mother nature does decay through a series of different elements and it 8 ends up with radium and finally raydon. And in some places 9 in the United States that is a problem. The uranium, 10 though, that we are dealing with here in the plant does not 11 have a random problem associated with it. If you remember 12 graph the first view graft that Mr. Rode put up he showed the 13 uranium coming out of the ground and going through a uranium 14 mill and then it goes on to a UF6 production plant before it 15 16 ever goes to the D.O.E. enrichment plant, before it goes to 17 the Combustion Engineering plant. And enriched-UFG, The radium that is associated with that uranium ore coming. out 18 of the ground is essentially left in the first two chemical 19 processing steps up there at the uranium mill, And then at 20 the UF6 production plant, About ninety percent of it stays at 21 the mill and that's why the mill talings are sources of 22 23 raxdon. Because all of the radium has been dropped out of 24 the process and left on the talings pile. So that the 25 uranium that arrives at this plant has had all of the radium

remove from it, all of the daughter product radium removed 1 from it. It takes something like, what is it, sixteen 2 hundred, sixteen thousand, sixteen thousand. The decaying 3 of the radium to raycon has a half life, this is sort of 4 technical but I have to do a little bit of that, has a half 5 life of sixteen thousand years, sixteen hundred is the half 6 life, okay, excuse me. Sixteen hundred years of half life. 7 So that means that for that equilibrium stage to develop 8 where there is radium and raxdon equilibrium takes something 9 like ten half lives or sixteen thousand years. 10 That uranium is not going to be in this plant that long so if it is 11 they're out of business. So radium is not an issue. 12 They're going to have, perhaps have more ammonia on site. 13 That could be a significant issue if they had_A ammonia 14 15 release. It can be knocked down by water and they have it. 16 The next issue the importing of radioactive and hazardous 17 material in. The only materials that they are importing is 18 uranium and the chemicals we have mentioned. There are no other hazardous materials being imported. The next issue is 19 the impact of the expanded operations of the health and 20 safety of employees. The N.R.C. safety standards are going 21 to be in place for the new employees as well as the existing 22 ones. Combustion Engineering radiation protection program 23 will apply for the expanded operations, new employees, new 24 25 uranium handling and combination techniques to improve the

employee's environment inside the plant. Our inspection 1 2 findings in the past since the renewal for that in health safety 3 and **staff**, in the area Combustion Engineering has had four 4 violations. That inspection program is going to continue 5 during the testing program and if we get around to it during 6 the operation with the enriched uranium. I'm not, the 7 impacts of floods and earthquakes have already been used by 8 Mr. Rode so I'm going to call it at this point. Thank you 9 I hope that this answers some of your guestions very much. 10 and all of your questions and all of your concerns. MR. NORELIUS: Okay. We will try to move 11 12 guickly into the statements and, Senator Nixon, welcome you I would ask

13 to start, if you care to make a statement. 14 again that for those of you making statements we would appreciate if you could limit them somewhat hopefully to 15 16 about five minutes to start with so that anyone who wishes 17 to make a statement to do so. And we ask that you sign up 18 on one of our sheets if you would like to make a statement. There is one back there and there is one here. So why don't 19 20 we go right to that. Senator Nixon, you're first. Would 21 those of you who make statements would you please state your 22 names and home town locations so we can have a record of 23 that, please.

24 SENATOR NIXON: My name is Jay Nixon. I 25 reside in Hillsboro, Missouri. I'm a State Senator

HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

representing the 22nd District which includes the plant 1 2 location of Combustion Engineering. I also like to give Mr. 3 Norelius a copy of the letter I sent on August 17th. This is the questions that they referred to and ask that it be 4 marked Exhibit A and be made part of the record. I want to 5 6 thank very much the members of the N.R.C. and P.R.C. staff 7 who have come down from Chicago and Washington and other 8 places around the country tonight to bequest us to answer 9 I would also like to thank Morris Case and the guestions. 10 people from the Environmental Protection Agency who have 11 answered the questions that have been posed to them. Ι would like to thank the Department Of Natural Resources 12 13 State of Missouri which has worked with us as 14 representatives here tonight and has answered also 15 separately in writing and I have available for anybody who 16 would like those the sixteen questions that I presented for 17 the hearing this evening and answer to those in writing to 18 me yesterday. I would also like to give special thanks to 19 the union stewart and fine workers of Combustion Engineering 20 who were very helpful in helping me to secure a tour and 21 going with me in the tour of the facility. Martha Dodson 22 and I spent the better part of four hours walking through 23 everything and frankly we were taken wherever we wanted to 24 co, I should note, and answered questions by workers as well 25 as members of management of Combustion Engineering as we

toured that particular facility. They were very courteous 1 2 and answered each and every guestion that we had at that 3 time. I would like to just very briefly indicate to everybody why I instituted the request for a hearing in this 4 matter and it all comes back to the May 24th publication in 5 the Federal Register. I would like to read very quickly 6 three sentences from that. One is under the environmental 7 impact of proposed action and it says trace amounts of 8 radioactivity entered the system from sinks and showers 9 10 control liquid for the liquid effluent radioactivity remains the same. However the volume increase would be 11 approximately twenty percent the impact from this liquid 12 13 discharge is expected to be minimal. Secondarily it said Combustion Engineering's objective is to increase pellet 14 production with no significant increase to existing raise in 15 16 effluent release. Our radioactive releases are expected to increase. With these statements being made in the public 17 18 record I felt it was essential as a State Senator 19 representing this area that we got the questions about these 20 things answered in open forum and I thank the folks for 21 being here tonight to help us with that. I wish that 22 everybody had the opportunity that I have had to review the records that I have done and spent the hours looking at the 23 facility as well as take the record and tour it. 24 It's a It has the capability of holding over fifty 25 going facility.

> HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

tons of product worth in excess of fifty million dollars. 1 2 One of my major worries when we began this process was the burial pits that had been referred to before containing the 3 4 waste from the ninety percent pure uranium that was used 5 there in years past not recently. I am very proud of the 6 State Department of Natural Resources in they answered my 7 questions concerning that issue, which is not directly 8 affected by what we're doing tonight. But I would like to treat the two sentences of Tracy Mehan's letter to me 9 10 yesterday concerning that material. It indicates the material may apply to this waste as well as the Missouri 11 12 Department of Natural Resources' position is that the buried 13 waste should be investigated under these laws and regulation 14 to determine what further action, if any, is required. The Missouri Department of Natural Resources will pursue this 15 16 issue with the N.R.C. and E.P.A.. I think that's an 17 allowable standard of their's and I think it's an important 18 step forward to move this thing forward in a very quick and 19 effective manner. The Joachim Creek valley is very 20 important to me. My grandmother lived within sight of the Joachim Creek at Victoria before World War One. My father's 21 22 family grew up in Hematite. My grandfather and cousin who was killed in the Vietnam war are buried in a cemetary 23 24 overlooking the nuclear plant. I have floated and fished 25 every inch of the Joachim Creek in Jefferson County in my

I am not here to, my purpose is to set the highest 1 life. 2 standards of cleanliness not merely compliances but complete cleanliness. I am an environmentalist and want to fight to 3 protect our environment. I know we can and must do better. 4 5 Meeting in hearings like this show we are interested. We 6 demand the best of Combustion Engineering, the N.R.C. and 7 the Missouri Department of Natural Resources. D.N.R. as I 8 had indicated promised me continuing inspections. Hopefully we will get the same treatment from the N.R.C.. We don't 9 want series of the types that has caused so much 10 environmental nightmares and fears of the past. Not just 11 12 compliance cleanliness, not secrecy but open cooperation. 13 Not just permissable levels but improving limits of waste 14 throughout this system. Our county ranges thirty-second in the entire country of all counties in toxic waste and I was 15 16 elected to fight that and I'll continue to fight that and try to clean up the best we can and tonight is not for me it 17 18 is for you to ask the questions that you have concerning 19 this process. And I thank you for coming and look forward 20 to you getting the answers to the guestions that you need. 21 Thank you. 22 MR. NORELIUS: Thank you, Senator Nixon. 23 Martha Dodson, would you like to come up here and make a

24 statement?

25

;

MS. DODSON: May I speak from here?

. MR. NORELIUS: Why don't you try it and if we 1 2 can't hear we'll do something else. 3 MS. DODSON: I'm Martha Dodson. I am one of 4 the requesters for a hearing this evening as others. I am 5 very pleased that you called and I thank you from Jefferson 6 I have very little knowledge of nuclear fuel County. 7 production and rely heavy upon your expertise. I have no 8 complaint against Combustion Engineering but I do know that 9 they are in the business of business and therefore it is 10 essential to me as a citizen living in close proximity to 11 the plant to have someone who is not in the business and 12 hasn't been in the business for thirty years guarding me. 13 That's what I understand your role to be. I am fully 14 convinced that it is essential to me as a citizen that 15 experts not in the business inspect the plant regularly with and without notification and monitor all of the emissions 16 17 waste and products of the operation. Does the N.R.C., you hands are people that I can really shake house with and talk to. 18 19 Do you make those on site inspections? If you have not been able to do so it would seem to me that common sense would 20 21 dictate that expansion permit would be withheld until existing facilities were determined to be safe. 22 That is to say if air must exist it must exist on the safe side as what 23 24 is done in Hematite cannot be undone. Do you agree? It was 25 with great dismay that I read last week that Jefferson

> HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

County ranks number thirty-two among the nation's 1 2 approximately four thousand counties in toxic chemical release. It is impossible for Jefferson countians not to 3 wonder why we have achieved this dubious distinction and 4 5 perhaps make more serious demands upon our protective 6 agencies to say enough is enough. Is that not reasonable? 7 In much of my reading and much of what I have heard this 8 evening I am struck by phrases acceptable permissable 9 regulation levels. Permissable levels of radiation, 10 permissable levels of toxic releases to air, permissable levels of water pollutants. I can't understand permissable 11 12 but must concentrate on safe. Safe levels of radiation, 13 safe levels of toxics, safe levels of water pollution. Can 14 you tell me that the air and water emissions and the waste 15 on site above and below ground at Combustion Engineering and 16 surrounding areas are safer? Let me, let us try quickly to 17 MR. NORELIUS: 18 respond to those questions before we go to the neck speaker. Since I'll deal with this subject of inspections we have and 19 20 continue to make routine unannounced inspections at the 21 plant. We get there two to three times each year and the areas that we have covered include radiation protection,

23 nuclear criticality safety, management organization,

22

24 controls operations, training and operator retraining,

25 maintenance and surveillance activity at the plant, the

transportation of radioactive materials and environmental 1 2 activities, emergency preparecness, the management of liquic 3 and solid waste and emergency preparedness. We do those 4 sometimes separately sometimes with a team so those are the 5 issues that we have covered. Mr. Franks here, who I 6 introduced as our project inspector, you asked for a person 7 who you could shake and he's our head inspector. We have 8 our specialists who come from time to time. Mr. Rouse will 9 address the second part of your questions. 10 MR. ROUSE: Thank you. Lee Rouse. I wanted to add one thing. By the way part of your question Mrs. 11 Dodson had to do with are the inspections announced or 12 13 unannounced. Most of those inspections are unannounced. France 14 The plant does not know that George Franks is here until he shows up at the gate. I certainly appreciate the second 15 16 question. In-a world of radiation protection and alot of 17 other scientific areas you will hear people say permissable 18 and acceptable and I suppose we are guilty of that tonight 19 and in some of our documents certainly you have seen that. 20 I don't set the limits for this plant. As you indicate or As I think George indicated the limits in the nuclear fuel 21 22 cycle including the reactors are established by the 23 environmental protection agency in which the federal agencies 24 including the N.R.C. have to implement. The limits that 25 we're talking about as opposed to some of the ones in the

1	today older days, The limits tonigh t are based on a risk
2	approach. I can't tell you honestly that the risk is zero
з	but I can say honestly in my view the emissions from this
4	plant, C.E., are safe. When you compare them with the other
5	risks that we face each and everyday and I'm only going to
6	give you one comparison I'm not going to throw out alot of
7	numbers, I just note that the radiation that we have
8	projected from this plant even with the expansion of the
9	millirem pelletizing lines will be less than one millogram for the
10	residents in Hematite. The closest residents are less than
11	millirem one millogram per year. The background radiation on the
12	average throughout the United States and I assume it's about
13	millivens the same here in Hematite, is about three hundred millograms
14	per year. That's a whole body equivalent. That's the only
15	comparison I'm going to give you but I consider the levels
16	at this plant as operated and emissions we project for the
17	expansion to be safe. Thank you.
18	MR. NORELIUS: Karen Sisk, would you like to
19	come next? We would appreciate you coming up here.
20	MS. SISK: Hi, my name is Karen Sisk. I'm
21	from Imperial, Missouri. I'm a registered nurse. I have
22	two kids five and seven who have allergies and my concern
23	basically living in Imperial is air effluent. I have a past
24	history of contaminated ground water from wells that have
25	affected my children so I'm also concerned with the water

4

i

(

1

.

.

I have basically been involved with organic waste 1 quality. as far as the water is concerned. I don't have resources to 2 test for chemicals. I do have a few guestions as far as the 3 one thing I'm concerned is basically the safety of the 4 plant. Like Mrs. Dodson I am not that familiar with the 5 plant I'm just learning about it. I wondered when the 6 E.P.A. limits were originally set what year as to when these 7 8 were actually set and to what amounts. My other question was as far as the old pellet building is that going to be 9 utilized and that is this state of the art as the new one is 10 11 is it earthquake resistant. And as Jay Nixon also discovered the decontamination of the previous evacuation 12 pond and such is concerned with also and contaminating the 13 ground water. And the other guestion was there was a 14 statement that there would be no change in the increase of 15 16 the products brought to the plant but it was also mentioned 17 that there would be a maximum amount of the product that was going to be allowed unless I misunderstood. And I was 18 19 curious as to what the maximum amount was going to be allowed. And other than that that's basically all I have to 20 say and I appreciate everybody coming in. 21 22 MR. NORELIUS: Would you run through your 23 guestions guickly again. I think we can address them quickly. 24 25 MS. SISK: The first one was when the E.P.A.

limits were set what year and how did they come about these 1 The other one was is the old pellet building that 2 limits. they were originally using is it as state of the art as the 3 new one, is it earthquake resistant as these are. 4 The decontamination I already mentioned and what is the maximum 5 6 amount of the product that's going to be allowed to be 7 brought to the plant. Right now there is not going to be a change but what is the maximum amount that will be allowed? 8 Rouse: MR. NORELIUS: Jim, you don't get off the hook 9 10 here. Come on down, Jim, I would rather have you speak to the old pellet plant. Wait a minute, Jim Rode the plant 11 12 manager is coming down to help us out. Let me answer the first question, when were these E.P.A. limits that we were 13 14 referring to set? The particular limits we're talking about, uranium fuel cycle standards were put into application by 15 (EPA) 16 the environmental protection agency, in 1979, became December, 1979 17 effective in December, 1979. In January of 1983 N.R.C. 18 issued an order to C.E. here at the Hematite plant with an evaluation and some action levels to assure that they were 19 20 well within that limits. So it's been since 1980 that that particular limit was established. Before I turn it over to 21 22 Jim I wasn't guite sure of the guestion about 23 I may have missed that. Did decontamination of the ponds. 24 you get it? The guestion related to decontamination of the 25 ponds?

When I talked to Martha Dodson 1 MS. SISK: 2 and Jay Nixon when they had viewed the plant the evaporation ponds were still present with the sludge and I was wondering 3 how and when they were going to evacuate all of that. 4 Ξ 5 thought that was taken care of in 1979 as far as getting 6 rid of the contaminated sludge. 7 MR. ROUSE: I'm going to have to turn that 8 one over to Jim also. Let me answer one question and then I 9 may help him out. The maximum amount, of the possession 10 limits of the license is eight thousand kilograms of uranium 11 235. as-contained-in-the-uranium-process. Jim, you want to 12 go? 13 MR. RODE: Martha, do you understand what her 14 guestion is about the ponds? I'm not guite sure I 15 understand that. 16 MS. SISK: Evaporation ponds, what do you 17 expect to do with the evaporation ponds? ESPRIMEE : MR. RODE: Okay. 18 The sludge has generally been removed from the ponds. We have surveys of the ponds 19 that have been completed. The submission of the data on the 20 ponds I believe is at present incomplete. We are putting 21 22 together the plans for finalizing, that is dedicating the waste ponds at this point. We have among the burials that we 23 24 listed the less than ten thousand cubic feet of 25 decontamination materials. Among that is the remaining

earth that was removed from the ponds. Martha, did you see 1 2 the ponds when you were there? MS. DODSON: I did in fact see the ponds 3 4 when I was there, yes. 5 The depth of the original pond MR. RODE: 6 was about three feet as I recall below grade. We are guite 7 some distance below that at this point and have achieved levels which will allow us to make it a dedicated site 8 9 within the regulations. The old pellet building is not 10 designed for any special earthquake requirements. That's one of the advantages that we have for modernizing the 11 facilities. One that will accrue to us. 12 It is not a state 13 of the art plant. It was a state of the art plant in 1959. 14 MR. NORELIUS: Let me just add that we will continue to monitor the activity regarding those ponds and 15 16 the sludge material that is there. Okay. I have some 17 other people who have signed up and I may do damage to your 18 names so I would ask that you again repeat your name and say 19 it right and give the location of your home. Greg Pernoud. 20 MR. PERNOUD: Okay. I'm Dr. Greg Pernoud and I'm a practicing oral maxillofacial surgeon in the community 21 22 so I kind of represent the dental community as well and I 23 have a couple of guestions to ask Combustion Engineering. 24 Certainly Mr. Rode has presented us with fine answers to 25 many cuestions. At least we have certainly met alot of

standards here tonight I think. Whether those standards 1 2 are appropriate or not we don't really know. Years will 3 test that. But my guestion has to deal with another chemical that hasn't been mentioned tonight. 4 If you look at 5 the original slide we have a chemical hexaflouride going to 6 a dioxide. Now if my chemistry serves me correctly there is 7 about two and a half molecules of flouride produced for 8 every molecule of U232 or whatever. 235, excuse me. And 9 there has been no guestion or no answer either raised to 10 what happens with all of this flouride. In this community as a dentist I have seen quite a bit of flourisis. 11 Now, I 12 am not making any accusations here but it does exist and it 13 does exist other places as well. I would like to know what 14 exactly happens to the flouride that is produced. I also 15 know that many states have regulations regarding the output 16 of flouride in their state. Missouri does not. There is 17 also a machine that will take flouride out of the air 18 discharged by these types of plants. I would like to know if this modernization that we have heard about tonight does 19 20 include this machine to take the flouride out of the air. So my guestions are that as well as how many hundreds of 21 22 pounds of flouride maybe discharged from the plant currently 23 and how much will it increase and if you have any studies on 24 the environment from flouride and what exactly happens to it 25 and does not end up in our drinking water.

1	MR. RODE: Give me a moment to get my data
2	together. I do happen to have some of the environmental
3	monitoring data which we do routinely. I'm relatively
4	certain that the data is kind of data that you want. I'll
5	have to find the specific samples, the sample results. The
6	first answer that you are looking for is really do we scrub
7	the off gasses from the plant to remove the flouride from
8	those gasses. The answer is yes. They are passed through
9	crushed calcium carbonate limestone rock. The calcium
10	carbonate reacts with the gasses which are systic hydrogen
11	flouride producing calcium flouride which is an extremely
12	insoluable form of flourice. We subsequently do monitor
13	both the soil and we monitor the run off water for flouride
14	levels. It is all drained with the water from the plant,
15	put out into a pond and we sample at the exit from the pond
16	and I'm trying to locate that flouride level. Do you have
17	that information, Harold?
18	Escaloge Eskridge, MR. ESTRICE : I'm Harold Estrige , manager of
19	licensing and safety at the plant. As Jim said we routinely
20	monitor the storm water and drain water run off absorbing
21	any flouride emissions from the plant. This is required
22	also by our N.P.D.E.S. permit any levels generally run less
23	than one part per mill which I understand is guite
24	acceptable.
25	MR. PERNOUD: You didn't answer my other

٠

i

(

÷

.

question. How many hundreds of pounds is put out the calcium carbonate that you use? Is not the standard of care as you might say to reduce of flouride emissions out of smoke stacks? The machine I'm talking about does not run on calcium chloride or calcium carbonate and do you plan on modernizing it with this machine?

7 MR. ROUSE: Well, when Jim comes back up to 8 respond to the quantities which he's going to know alot better than I. I would like to make one comment. A the 9 environmental assessment the N.R.C. did for the renewal back 10 in 1983, we did make an assessment of the quantity of 11 flouride being released. Even after being treated with the 12 calcium carbonate we recognized that the state and we were 13 14 looking at the gaseous emissions where most of it would be released, the State of Missouri does not have a standard, at 15 the releases least at that time, we compared it against the standards that 16 the state of Washington established. A State of Washington 17 18 had established and I'm not, I don't know the numbers, you 19 know, but the state of Washington was very sensitive to 20 flouride releases because of the aluminum plants up there, which because of the nature of the process were releasing 21 22 large quantities of flourides. So we compared it against standard, concluded that, and we arrived at that very close into the plant, very 23 close in essentially within the site perimeter, Mou might 24 see something pulled in the vegetation. I don't know that 25

	5
ı	The referenced it was below this amount by amount standards. We compared
2	standard when it with the state of Washington, subsequently to that then they
3	did do some sampling of the vegetation. I'm not sure they
4	still oo it.
5	MR. RODE: Yes, we do.
6	were MR. ROUSE: And the results have been -
7	didn7 obviously lower than we projected because they don't see IT
8	in the vegetation as much as we projected. Go ahead, Jim.
9	MR. RODE: I'M not sure what I can say about
10	a system for scrubbing the flouride out that you don't know
11	what the system is or any information about it. The use of
12	calcium carbonate is something that we have developed we
13	have used and to our knowledge it has been more effective
14	and a better system than waste used more broadly. Now, you
15	may be discussing or thinking in terms of the aluminum
16	industry which put out several orders of magnitude higher
17	quantity of flouride than our small plant does. Their
18	flouride emissions in many cases are larger than our plant
19	through put of all material and I can't answer a question
20	without something a little more specific, I'm sorry.
21	MR. PERNOUD: Well, how many pounds are you
22	talking, hundreds of pounds, are you talking about a day.
23	MR. RODE: The scrubbing efficiency AS I
24	recall is rated to be about ninety percent we are putting
25	out in the course of a year. In the course of a month

r

,

Ć

HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

somewhere in the neighborhood of one to two thousand pounds. 1 2 MR. NORELIUS: Next we have Herb Bieble. MR. BAIHLE: Herb Beihle and I live in the 3 4 DeSoto area. I am chief shop steward at Combustion 5 Engineering in Hematite. I'm also a Jefferson countian and concerned Jefferson countian. I have worked for C.E. for 6 7 eight years and during those years I have seen alot of changes. The changes I speak of are improvements to the 8 Nuclear 9 plant, some of them required by the National Regulatory 10 Commission and all have been to improve the health and 11 welfare of the employees and the surrounding community. Our safety record with the N.R.C. has been outstanding. 12 As I 13 look around I see a lot of fellow employees. The reason for their attendance is of concern. Concern for the expansion 14 15 of their plant. The Hematite plant has been a small arm of 16 the nuclear power submission of C.E.. We at Hematite feel 17 that this expansion is a definite security of our jobs and 18 also improves the environmental impact on the community as 19 well as the safety at the work site. I also see some of the 20 residents of Hematite. Some of these are employees who 21 would not have moved or built so close to the plant had they felt there were hazardous conditions. 22 Their knowledge of 23 the safety at the plant as well as the safety factor 24 employed by the plant as set by the N.R.C. are reason of 25 their saying that living in the area is safe. As said by a

54

HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

neighbor of C.E. it is the fear of the unknown that 1 2 frightens people. C.E. has strived to be a good neighbor to 3 the community. In closing the future of the Hematite plant 4 is also the future of the fifty-five union and sixty company 5 The company is also in the process of hiring a employees. 6 number of new employees. This is an economical plus to the 7 county in addition the safety factors of the new equipment 8 being installed at the time. Thank you. 9 MR. NORELIUS: Next we have Gary Surdyke. 10 MR. SURDYKE: That's better than some people 11 have done. My name is Gary Surdyke. I'm from Hematite, 12 Missouri. Live with my wife and our family of ten have 13 lived there for about twenty years, close to it. I come 14 here representing nobody but myself, my family and my kids. I have been asked and have agreed to both sign and to 15 16 present to this body a petition of approximately eighty plus 17 signatures of people who and let me read what it says. We 18 the undersigned petitioners do hereby give notice to all 19 concerned that as local neighbors of Combustion Engineering, 20 Incorporated we support their efforts to modernize and expand operations at the Hematite, Missouri plant. 21 I would 22 like to present this. Also there is a letter in there from 23 one of the residents, one of our Hematite characters. Okay. 24 I share Senator Nixon, Martha Dodson, Mrs. Sisk's concern 25 about Jefferson County. I think that it is something that we

need to be concerned about. The county does have some 1 2 problems. Dr. Pernoud brought up something that's guite interesting that sometimes with our focus on nuclear because 3 Č, nuclear has become such a hot word that we lose sight of the 5 real problem and it could be that the real problem is 6 flouride, it's not radioactivity. It may well be. Sounds 7 like it is something that's been looked at and considered. 8 I believe that the objective of the coalition for the 9 environment is to stop nuclear in its tracks and to 10 eventually eliminate it completely. Why else would they 11 come after an operation as inoccuous as the Hematite plant 12 and not take time to compare nuclear to petroleum, coal and 13 wood as sources of energy as far as the potential damage to 14 the environment. We all are much aware of some of those 15 I believe that the coalition for the environment problems. 16 is part of the problem rather than part of the solution as 17 it applies to energy production and use. I believe that 18 the, their time, the coalition for the environment's time 19 would be better spent concerning themselves with sewage, 20 trash and litter dumped in our beautiful county and maybe 21 flouride. If they did I imagine that everybody in this room 22 would join them in their endeavor. Nuclear has the 23 potential that would eliminate the environmental damage done 24 to our planet by the use of oil and coal. I predict that 25 sometime in the future whether it be not too distant future

1 or centuries and centuries it may depend upon how successful 2 the coalition for environment is, that sometime in the future our personal transportation vehicles, our cars our 3 motorcycles, I am in that business, will run for years on 2 5 the electricity generated by very small amounts of nuclear 6 energy. Now, my goodness are we going to do away with 7 something that has such great potential. There is no compromise with the antinuclear people. There is great 8 9 lengths, there is a tremendous body and tremendous effort of concerned people and a part of our government a tremendous 10 amount of its budget is spent to insure to protect us from 11 12 the potential hazards of nuclear. But I have confidence 13 that that's being done at Hematite and in the industry as a 14 whole because the industry as a whole has a very good safety If the coalition for the environment is successful 15 record. 16 we will be much more dependent on oil and coal and what will I recall in the late '40's and early '50's 17 that bring us. 18 going into St. Louis with my father and a dark pale hung over the city in the winter time and it was because of coal. 19 20 Most everything was coal fired. Now I just wonder what 21 department of the government was or citizens committee that 22 eliminated that. Well, gee I think it was the market place 23 because we come up with oil and we come up with natural gas 24 and we come up with fuel oil and electricity. Where would Where would 25 the coalition for the environment have us be?

57

\$

1 they back the clock up to? That's all I would like to know. 2 I have more hope in mother nature in the future lead by 3 people who are concerned than I do about the doom sayers and 4 the chickens littles of the world. Thank you. 5 MR. NORELIUS: Next we have Phillip Crow. Sgrer. MR. CROW: My name is Phillip Crow. I live in 6 I really wanted to come to this hearing tonight, 7 Hillsboro. 8 this meeting tonight. I did not have any prepared I wanted to come and listen with openess and 9 ouestions. 10 were genuine respect for all of the parties that are 11 involved. And I'm somewhat saddened at the question of the 12 integrity of one of the bodies that was brought into body by the last speaker. But what I would like to share with you 13 14 is that I'm here for a couple of reasons. One of them is that at night when I look at the awesome beauty of the stars 15 16 and during the daytime and during the daytime when I look at the beauty of nature I'm still with a sense of wonder and of 17 18 an increasing awe for the God that could create this. And 19 the other reason that I came here tonight was that I have a 20 real concern about the safety of people who work in the 21 plant and about the citizens of our community. For a long, 22 long time now certain kinds of issue have needed to be 23 discussed. Missouri began to talk about participation in the low level radioactive nuclear waste. 24 In fact, I was a member of the board of directors of the coalition of the 25

> HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

environment at the time and introduced the motion to have 1 2 the coalition oppose Missouri's participation in should 3 impact the relevance of that. As we were told tonight that 4 there is the possibility if the Barneswell facility cannot 5 take the waste then in fact Missouri may in time participate 6 in the compact and until then the waste will be left on site 7 and after that it will be part of the compact. The difficulty that I and others have with the compact was three 8 9 fold in its nature. One, the issues related to the safety 10 of the storage, two, issues related to the safety of transportation and third, the ethical issue. 11 And very 12 briefly the ethical issue is I don't think my God allows me 13 to say if I don't want waste here that. I have a right to get 14 you to take it by taking an economically depressed community 15 and telling it if it desperately needs jobs it has to 16 surrender the potential safety of its workers and residents in order to be able to have increased income. I don't like 17 18 that kind of ethical trade off. What happened though is 19 that we have talked about low level radioactive waste and as 20 I began to do things like, for example, debate the assistant 21 director of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources I 22 have the same kind of ambiguity that I have when we use 23 words without definition. Like say the reason that I am 24 bringing that up is when I would ask them would you please 25 define for me low level waste. Most frequently the response

lawer 1 I got was low level waste is that waste which is higher than 2 high level waste. Is that the kind of definition that we 3 want safety based on. Yes, there are technical responses 4 that can come but I don't like to see the safety of people 5 in my community nor the safety of people in plants based on 6 the kind of language that has that ambiguity that can be 7 used very deliberately but in turn impact upon the health of 8 That's one of the concerns that I had. Was that we people. 9 hear some definition of what low level waste means in terms 10 of this future of facility. Because the amount of it at the 11 facility on site seems large at least in terms of volume. 12 I'm not questioning the integrity of any of you. I respect 13 your integrity and I deeply respect your expertise. I do 14 have a concern about the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and 15 its vigilance in protecting us based on its past record. 16 For example, the studies that told us that the kind of 17 accident that occurred at the Three Mile Island could not 18 occur, right. The same experts that the N.R.C. relied on 19 for that safety figure for that was then hired for a dam and 20 he gave the same figures for the safety of the dam. The dam 21 also broke and people died in the flood. My point is simply 22 that the N.R.C. has not always been our guardian but at 23 times has been the guardian of the industry. So I think we 24 have a right to say to the N.R.C. we appreciate your openess 25 tonight. We respect your integrity and expertise but we

60

HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

know that your track record is that sometimes you have a 1 2 little more vigilant defending the industry rather than 3 defending us. In closing I would like to say that I moved 4 to this area recently to become a teacher. I'm an educational therapist. I teach children with behavior 5 6 disorders and learning disabilities and what I hope for 7 those children is that we can one offer them the environment 8 that's more conducive to their health than growing up in the 9 county with the twenty-eight highest degree of toxic waste in America. I think we owe that to them. I think we owe a 10 more responsible worship to our God for our environment and 11 what I ask you to do is please, if you could, join with us 12 in being part of the process in protecting our community to 13 14 define more to us with less ambiguity word like low level Because my friends low level waste can and does kill 15 waste. 16 people and that's my point is that low level waste has the capacity to kill human beings and that's why I'm concerned 17 18 about it. I'm not saying that the waste there does. I'm 19 just saying that when we use words as ambiguously as we did 20 tonight we need to have a little bit greater clarity because you have some very, very powerful substances that are low 21 22 level waste that even N.R.C. says that are dangerous to 23 That's why I came here tonight. I notice some were health. 24 I think the coalition cares deeply. in opposition. You may or may not agree with its position but it's been my 25

1	experience that the people who give their time to the
2	coalition aren't there because of personal gain. The names
з	aren't known in the community and they don't make money
4	because they participate on the board. It's simply that
5	they, you and I are concerned about the environment. The
6	major conflict resolution along time ago so people could
7	Ways learn how to resolve conflicts in waste that all parties
8	won. I don't think anybody wins when we begin to question
9	the integrity of each other. Thank you.
10	MR. NORELIUS: I think in the interest of
11	having everybody be able to make a statement we will move
12	on. We have three other who have signed up. Bill Schifler.
13	SCHEIFLER MR. SCHIFLER : Yes, sounds like everyone can
14	Scheifler. hear me. My name is Bill Schifler . I live in Hillsboro,
15	Missouri. I'm speaking only for myself as a private
16	citizen. And I have three points or questions to make.
17	This particular piece of property has passed through several
18	owners and each owner has passed its liability onto I would
19	suppose the current owner Combustion Engineering. Part of
20	that liability are the waste pits. Now, I take some issue
21	with using the federal funding to clean up these waste pits.
22	This appears to be a liability that Combustion Engineering
23	has purchased along with the property. And I think it is
24	morally correct for Combustion Engineering to set a schedule
25	and set aside escrow money for the cleaning up of these

,

(

:

2

۰.

I think we can plainly say that this is nothing more 1 pits. 2 than a waste cump. And I get the impression it might have been a high level waste dump to leave these pits in our 3 water shed to contaminate our deep wells where most of the 4 5 private citizens are using deep wells I think is I mean 6 morally disgraceful. I'm a little disturbed that the 7 regulatory commission is issuing expansion plans without 8 having some plans for the removal and cleaning up of these 9 waste pits. I am also somewhat surprised that the 10 regulatory commission without hearing is issuing expansion plans and reissuing their licensing without providing escrow 11 funds for the emissions and clean up of this plant at the 12 13 end of its life cycle. Now these are normal liabilities of 14 any company that is in this industry. And to ignore these 15 liabilities is improper and it appears that the regulatory 16 commission is ignoring them as well as the company. These 17 waste pits should be removed and taken to a proper site. Because a mistake was made back in the '50's in burying it 18 it does not make it correct today. Part of the clean up of 19 20 the plant site should be the clean up of the waste pits and definitely an escrow account should be made for the 21 22 emissions and cleaning up of this plant at the end of its 23 life cycle. Those are two of my points. The third question 24 I have, we have drugs prevelant in the area. I think it is 25 a normal question to ask does the plant have a drug policy

۰.

1 within its plant? Thank you.

MR. ROUSE: I'm going to try the first two 2 and then I'm going to let Jim talk about the last point, 3 4 Mr.Schifler. I have no cuarrel at all with your two points 5 about the burial pits. First of all, the burial pits are the responsibility of C.E. notwithstanding that C.E. as a 6 corporate entity was not the one that put that uranium 7 contaminated material in those pits. They are now the 8 They over took the responsibility for that site. 9 licensee. 10 CFR 20.304 burials, These 123.304 and I use the term that was, the regulation 10 the burials that permitted this is no longer in affect. 11 As you might have heard it really went out of use for any fuel cycle 12 13 facility in about 1970. Nevertheless we have a few of these concern around the country and they are a bother to the regulatory 14 To the And in very recent testimony at congress, our new 15 agency. Synar Chairman, Chairman Carr committed to Congressman Zifer of 16 Oklahoma that before any of the plants were decommissioned 17 and the license terminated that something would have to be 18 done with these 20.304 burials. They would have to be 19 20 assessed, determined what would be done with them, Whether there would have to be some restrictions on the land or 21 22 whether that waste would have to be removed by the licensee. 23 Number two, on the decommissioning again you're absolutely right and as a matter of fact about a year ago the N.R.C., 24 25 maybe a little belatedly, but now has a rule that we will

1999 - 1997 - 19

firms require a decommissioning funding plan from first like 1 Combustion Engineering Hematite which will have to estimate 2 the cost of the emissions and then provide assurance under 3 specified mechanisms that that funding will be available at 4 It will the time that the plant ceases its life. And be a few years 5 6 before that comes into play, but there is no indication that C.E. Hematite is going to go out of business, but I assure 7 you that that rule covers full funding of whatever it takes 8 to meet the decommission requirements of the N.R.C. at the 9 time and then it has to be updated about every four or five 10 11 years. SCHEIFLER 12 MR. SCHIFLEY: May I rebuttle there a 13 moment? Why was this expansion plant approved, without some. 14 provisions for those pits to be cleaned up along with the plant site that's being constructed on? Why wasn't that 15 16 held up until committments were made on those pits? We know 17 there were there. We know they exist. Granted they were 18 under license in '53 but I can't visualize you issuing 19 expansion plans and not including total clean up of that 20 plant site before they were issued. MR. ROUSE: I can't say anything other than 21 22 the plant is an active plant. Some of these decisions with 23 respect to these burial grounds have only been recently 24 considered. And number two, as long as the licensee is 25 there and operating those plants, those burial -arounds-

the burial grounds have had our studies and their studies have shown no impact 1 site. 2 MR. RODE: With respect to drug testing C.E. Hematite does have a policy of testing new employees for 3 drugs. We also have a general policy dealing with fitness 4 5 for duties. This policy dictates our answers when we detect that someone at the plant is unfit for work in the plant and 6 7 this may not seem that it has any association with drugs but 8 I assure that it does. It is not possible to unilaterally 9 implement a drug testing program. This may come to pass in 10 the future. 11 MR. NORELIUS: Next we have Pete Okay. 12 Pappin. MR. PAPPIN: My name IS Pete Pappin. 13 I was called by a member of Senator Nixon'S staff to make sure 14 15 that I would be here tonight. I responded in the local 16 paper the Courier Journal that Mr. Surdyke wrote a couple of 17 weeks ago and I have two things to say. The first one is as I look around tonight I see some red and white caps that say 18 19 guality is our future. They are all brand new. How long 20 has this been your motto. I would like to read my response 21 to Mr. Surdyke and it's also a response to Combustion Engineering. It is ludicrist for Gary Surdyke to compare 22 23 the coal industry to uranium processing facilities. That is like comparing apple to oranges. It seems as though Mr. 24 25 Surcyke has little or no regard for the safety of the

1 residents of Jefferson County. Our county has been a 2 cumping ground for far too long. It's time to slow down and 3 consider just exactly what needs to be done so that the 4 Combustion Engineering plant is a safe and welcome neighbor. 5 Which he tried to slip an expansion of their plant past the 6 residents of Jefferson County that would double the amount 7 of processing done at the Hematite location. No 8 environmental impact study was to be done until Senator 9 Nixon required one to be completed before further 10 construction. To my knowledge C.E. has no evacuation plan, 11 no way to notify the surrounding communities of a nuclear accident. They don't even have a fence around their 12 13 perimeter. They have four unlined waste pits that no one 14 knows the exact location of. This is not what I call 15 stringent regulation. I suppose the Exxon Oil spill sounds 16 okay with Mr. Surdyke. With the oil industry is highly regulated with friends like Exxon, Dow Chemical and 17 18 Combustion Engineering who need enemies. The human race is 19 rapidly condeming itself through irresponsible polutting of 20 the land, air and water and this is something no one has said tonight. Our children, our grand children will inherit 21 22 the earth from us. Let's make sure that there is something 23 worth while to inherit. I'm sure that the polluters of the 24 world wish that there were more people like Mr. Surdyke and 25 the people that signed that petition, people who do not care

about the environment. People who disregard the warning 1 2 signals that our mother earth is sending to the human race. 3 We won't get many more second chances. 4 MR. NORELIUS: Pam Midget. MS. MIDGETT. My name is Pam Midgett. My 5 6 husband, Dennis, works for Combustion Engineering. We also 7 are residents of Jefferson County. We live in DeSoto. Ι speak only as a mother. We have three children and I 8 9 wonder, also I wondered when Dennis took this job of parents 10 does it was an unknown job. Whenever he mentioned radioactivity I kind of freeked at first. I mean who 11 wouldn't and whenever I did meet Mr. Rode and I see alot of 12 13 the people that work with Dennis we are all real people. 14 You can walk up and shake our hands. I mean we have 15 children. We are raising our kids here. We're not running 16 off hiding. I worry about Dennis when something happens. 17 The worse thing I are think he did was sprain his back at 18 work, which they took care of that. They sent him straight to the doctor. He was paid for it. We have two children 19 that we're born with disabilities before Dennis even worked 20 here and, you know, I mean I don't think it's fair that we 21 22 could blame Combustion Engineering. I know for a fact that 23 the guys and the ladies and gentlemen wear patches on their 24 clothes that monitors radioactivity. I get the letter in 25 the mail telling me that Dennis is way blow and he is right

l	with it along with everyone else that works there or right
2	with it. And I understand the community being scared but I
3	also understand that the guys and the ladies that work with
4	this stuff would be more contaminated than the rest of us
5	and I'm not saying that every place is perfect but I do know
6	what I know is that Combustion Engineering is safe. As safe
7	as any place like this could be. And I also have a question
8	for the lady. The plant did not hide its expansion. I mean
9	anybody that travels that road could see it for over a year
10	and if they did not expand would this have ever happened and
11	that's my question?
12	MR. NORELIUS: Okay. That completes the
13	list of people who asked to make a statement. It's getting
14	near ten o'clock. Our purpose in coming tonight was to try
15	to provide information to those of you who have an interest
16	and from the size of the group that is assembled it's
17	obvious that many of you do have an interest. I think
18	that's a healthy sign. I appreciate the sincerety of each
19	person who made a statement but one thing that strikes one
20	in listening to it is that there are many people who
21	sincerely come to this problem from quite different
22	approaches. And I think what that means is that this like
23	alot of questions are not easily answered. There are
24	difficult problems they require judgement and they require
25	study and they require alot of thought in order to make the

· .

(

HILLSBORO REPORTING COMPANY 789-2684

proper decisions. We have a responsibility as I said at the beginning of assuring public health and safety and we take the input that we receive and try to evaluate that and come to conclusions with regards to the standards that have been set. So I do appreciate your participation tonight and your attendance and again I will just say that I hope it has been helpful for each of you. Thank you very much.