

ORIGINAL

DCS
Docket 70-2909

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

EIS SCOPING MEETING RELATED TO THE
PROPOSED WESTINGHOUSE FUEL FABRICATION PLANT IN
PRATTVILLE, ALABAMA

Council Chambers, City Hall
101 Main Street
Prattville, Alabama

Thursday, March 27, 1980

8004180098

PARTICIPANTS1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. C. M. GRAY, MAYOR
City of Prattville
Prattville, Alabama

MR. WILLIAM CROW
Uranium Fuel Licensing Section
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H Street, NW
Washington, D. C.

DR. E. Y. SHUM
Environmental Project Manager
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H Street, NW
Washington, D. C.

MR. FRANK CELLIER
Alabama Nuclear Fuel Fabrication Plant Project
Westinghouse Electric Corporation

MR. ROBERT WILLIAMS
Alabama Nuclear Fuel Fabrication Plant Project
Westinghouse Electric Corporation

DR. MINTON KELLY
Oakridge National Laboratory
Oakridge, Tennessee

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1		
2	<u>STATEMENT OF</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
3	Mayor C. M. Gray	3
4	Mr. William Crow	4
5	Mr. Frank Cellier	7
6	Mr. Robert Williams	11
7	Dr. Minton Kelly	20
8	Susan Sinburg	25
9	Flemming Blackburn	27
10	Susan Brannon	28
11	Randy Aronov	29
12	Marilyn Butler	30
13	George B. Allison	31
14	Jim Zeigler	32
15	Robert Campbell	35
16	Jack Naftell	40
17	Darryl Smith	43
18	E. S. Fried	44
19	Donna Popwell	45
20	Debra Gordon-Hellman	49
21	Mack Wainwright	54
22	Judy Comby	54
23	David Arrett	58
24		
25		

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554-2345

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MAYOR GRAY: Ladies and gentlemen, we are proud to
3 have you all here tonight. We welcome all you folks from out
4 of town.

5 I shook hands and introduced myself -- and I almost
6 know everybody in here -- but I told the gentleman up there if
7 he asked me to introduce everybody that I had been introduced
8 to that I was going to go home; there's no way for me to do it.

9 So we are proud to have you all here. We see a lot
10 of our friends out of Montgomery, and some farther off than
11 that. We are proud to have you here.

12 It's a bad night; it's raining, and it's good to have
13 this group here.

14 Just in a word or two, and then I'm going to get
15 down from up here and let these gentlemen get on with their
16 meeting because they've got a busy day, but just to tell you
17 in a few words, if I can, actually what this meeting is for.

18 The purpose of the meeting is to brief federal,
19 state, and local agencies, and other interested parties,
20 concerning proposed Westinghouse facilities, and to solicit
21 any suggested issue that these agencies and people wish to
22 see addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement. That's
23 really what this meeting is for, is to acquaint everybody here
24 that's not acquainted with what this plant is and what it's
25 going to do, and so forth and so on.

1 Now, that's all I'm going to tell you, and at this
2 time I'm going to introduce to you, and turn this meeting over
3 to, Mr. Bill Crow, this gentleman right here.

4 He's head of the Uranium Fuel Licensing Section,
5 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D. C.

6 Mr. Crow.

7
8 MR. CROW: Thank you, Mayor Gray.

9 It's a pleasure to be with you this evening, ladies
10 and gentlemen. I appreciate the fine attendance.

11 As Mayor Gray said, my name is Bill Crow, and I am
12 a member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff. My
13 group has the responsibility for reviewing Westinghouse
14 Electric's application for a license to possess and use
15 enriched uranium at the proposed facility here in Prattville.

16 NRC regulations require that an Environmental
17 Impact Statement be prepared before taking any action on this
18 license application. As the Mayor said, the purpose of this
19 meeting is to brief state, federal, and local agencies, and
20 other interested parties, concerning the proposed project, and
21 to identify early in the assessment process specific concerns
22 that you may have so that they may be dealt with, together with
23 issues already identified by the staff as being significant.
24 So that when a decision is made, based on the Environmental
25 Impact Statement, a more complete record will be available

1 representing issues which otherwise might be neglected or
2 overlooked.

3 With me here tonight is the Environmental Project
4 Manager, Dr. Edward Shum, who is also a member of the NRC
5 staff; Dr. Minton Kelly of the Oakridge National Laboratory,
6 with whom NRC has contracted to assist in the preparation of
7 the Environmental Impact Statement, and representatives of
8 Westinghouse Corporation, Mr. Bob Williams and Mr. Frank
9 Cellier.

10 The agenda for this meeting will be as follows:
11 First, Westinghouse Electric Corporation will briefly describe
12 the proposed activities of the Prattville facility. The
13 Oakridge Laboratory personnel will discuss the content of the
14 Environmental Impact Statement and identify the important
15 issues they plan to address.

16 Upon completion of this briefing, there will be a
17 short break, after which each organization and interested
18 party will be given an opportunity to identify areas of
19 particular concern that they would like to see emphasized in
20 the Environmental Impact Statement; to suggest other alterna-
21 tives that should be considered.

22 Please address all comments and questions to me and
23 I will then ask the appropriate individual to respond.

24 Please note there was a sign-in sheet at the door
25 with a place to indicate whether or not you wish to make a

1 comment. We will gather these sheets up during the break and
2 call on the people in consecutive order.

3 It's important to remember that only the proposed
4 action, and that is the construction and operation of the
5 fuel fabrication plant, is to be addressed during this scoping
6 processing. Generic issues will not be considered at this
7 scoping meeting, or in written comments.

8 Since this meeting is being recorded, any person
9 who wishes to make a comment, I ask them to come up here to
10 the microphone, state their name, the organization they repre-
11 sent, if any, and then proceed with his or her comments.

12 Since time is limited, some ground rules must be
13 observed. First, please, no interruptions from the audience
14 and no audience cross-discussion. Everyone should come up
15 here to the podium to speak.

16 Second, be as brief as possible; remember that
17 written comments will be accepted later on.

18 Third, if several representatives of one organization
19 are present, please appoint one spokesman. Up to fifteen
20 minutes of time will be allotted for such a spokesman, and more
21 time will be available if time permits.

22 Now, I would like to turn this meeting over to
23 Mr. Frank Cellier of Westinghouse Electric.

24 Frank?

25 MR. CELLIER: Thank you, Bill.

1 STATEMENT OF
2 MR. FRANK CELLIER
3 WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION

4 MR. CELLIER: We are here tonight to tell you about
5 our proposed nuclear fuel fabrication facility. First, let
6 me give you some background information.

7 There are 72 nuclear power plants licensed today
8 in the United States, generating 10.6 percent of this nation's
9 electricity.

10 The fuel for many of these nuclear power plants
11 was fabricated at our plant in Columbia, South Carolina, built
12 back in 1969.

13 The Columbia facility currently employs some 950
14 people and can produce 1000 metric tons of uranium, nuclear
15 fuel, each year. This is the energy equivalent of 340 million
16 barrels of oil, or about the amount of energy it would take
17 to power Alabama for more than three and a half years, based
18 on its 1978 consumption.

19 Our most conservative forecasts show that demand for
20 nuclear fuel will exceed the capabilities of the nuclear fuel
21 fabrication plants currently in existence. This increased
22 demand will result from two sources.

23 First, there is the initial nuclear fuel required to
24 begin plant operation. We call this fuel the first core.

25 Today, there are over 80 nuclear plants under
construction, each will require a first core fuel loading. The

1 plants are scheduled to come on stream within the next ten
2 years. In addition, each operating plant will be refueled
3 every 12 or 16 months, and one-third of the fuel will be
4 replaced.

5 The reload fuel business is a growing one.

6 To meet this demand, the nuclear industry will
7 require additional fuel fabrication capacity. In 1977,
8 Westinghouse recognized this industry need, and in early 1978
9 the site selection process was initiated for a second
10 Westinghouse facility.

11 The Prattville area was selected because of what it
12 offers in terms of available skilled labor, suitable property,
13 tax structure, related economic incentives, and state-supported
14 industrial training programs.

15 The plant will be located near Prattville in
16 Autauga County, on an 800-acre site along the Alabama River,
17 adjacent to the Union Camp property.

18 The property is outlined here by the yellow boundary
19 line. The square marks the location of the plant on the
20 property.

21 This is an artist's concept of the facility, and the
22 fuel assemblies will be manufactured in the larger building at
23 the left.

24 Although the license application specifies a plant
25 capacity of 1000 metric tons per year, initial operation is

1 planned for 400 metric tons per year. That's the energy
2 equivalent of about 135 million barrels of oil.

3 At the planned initial capacity, we would employ
4 about 400 people, the majority of them being locally recruited.

5 Now, let me show you the produce we will produce.
6 These are the fuel assemblies the plant would manufacture.
7 Fuel assemblies are made up of fuel rods held by a skeleton
8 of grids. Each rod contains nuclear fuel pellets, which look
9 like this.

10 Let's focus on our Columbia facility to give you
11 an idea of what will go on inside a fuel fabricating plant.

12 We receive cylinders of low-enriched uranium from
13 the U. S. Government facility like the one at Oakridge,
14 Tennessee. Low-enriched means it is only slightly changed
15 from the way it existed in nature.

16 When in a cylinder, it is in a solid form. We then
17 heat the uranium in a steam chest to change it into a gas.
18 The next step in the process is to convert the gas into uranium
19 dioxide powder.

20 A machine, much like one that makes aspirin tablets,
21 presses uranium powder into pellets. Then the pellets are
22 baked in a furnace and ground to exact dimensions. This is the
23 way the pellets look after they are baked.

24 The finished pellets are loaded, some 200 of them,
25 into long metal tubes, and then sealed. Since the enrichment

1 of the pellets is low, the amount of radiation they emit is only
2 slightly higher than the natural ore itself.

3 Radiological and environmental technicians monitor
4 the air inside and outside the plant around the clock, seven
5 days a week. This is only one step in the measures routinely
6 taken to document our compliance with environmental standards.

7 We operate within the lowest quarter of the government
8 standards. That's a record we're proud of.

9 This employee wears a radiation detection badge as
10 she loads completed fuel rods into the support structure of
11 the fuel assembly. The badges are another part of the continuing
12 monitoring of the worker's health and the plant environment.

13 Here, a quality control supervisor for the final
14 assembly area checks every step of this important operation.

15 After inspection, the assemblies are taken to the
16 fuel storage area where they await shipment.

17 The final product is transported by truck to the
18 electric utilities in specially designed containers. The fuel
19 assemblies are then placed in a reactor and a controlled chain
20 reaction takes place to generate the heat to drive a steam
21 turbine.

22 The fabrication of nuclear fuel is a precision
23 operation demanding the highest quality standards. Every
24 component is checked and rechecked numerous times so that
25 quality standards can be achieved.

1 The Westinghouse fuel plant at Columbia has received
2 a number of federal and community awards for its safety and
3 environmental programs, including the Governor's first
4 Distinguished Safety Award. And, for the past three years,
5 the facility won first place in the South Carolina State
6 Chamber of Commerce Safety and Health Awards.

7 the end of 1979, Columbia had accumulated over
8 eight million manhours worked without occupational injury or
9 illness.

10 We are looking forward to becoming a part of the
11 Prattville community. As with any new facility that would
12 be built here, the Westinghouse plant will have an impact on
13 the community.

14 What are the benefits of this plant? First, the
15 initial creation of 400 new jobs is expected to generate an
16 increase of two million dollars in local retail sales. And,
17 according to the U. S. Chamber of Commerce figures, a plant of
18 this size will support an additional 300 workers in service
19 and retail businesses.

20 The 400 people we will initially employ at this new
21 plant will produce about 400 metric tons of nuclear fuel per
22 year, the energy equivalent of 135 million barrels of oil.
23 That's an important contribution to the energy needs of this
24 country.

25 We will continue to work diligently with the

1 regulatory bodies so that all licensing and environmental
2 requirements are fully satisfied for this plant.

3 This is one reason we are here tonight. As part
4 of the licensing process, the NRC must assess the environmental
5 impact of the proposed facility. To provide information that
6 is essential to their assessment, Westinghouse has submitted
7 a report on the potential environmental effects of the pro-
8 posed plant and associated facilities. The report and
9 license application were filed with the NRC in December of
10 1979.

11 Now, I would like to introduce Robert Williams,
12 one of our Project Engineers, who will describe the contents
13 of the environmental report and the license application.

14 Bob?

15
16 STATEMENT OF
17 MR. ROBERT WILLIAMS
WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION

18 MR. WILLIAMS: A major part of the Alabama Nuclear
19 Fuel Fabrication Plant Project is being devoted to meeting
20 federal, state, and local licensing and permitting requirements.

21 A significant milestone in this Phase I effort was
22 achieved in December, 1979, when an environmental report and
23 a license application were filed with the United States Nuclear
24 Regulatory Commission for review and approval. This achievement
25 represents about fifty percent of the Federal Special Nuclear

1 Materials License preparation, at a cost of greater than
2 \$530,000 and an expenditure of some 8500 man-hours of effort
3 to date.

4 Fifteen technical reports have been prepared, or are
5 in preparation, to support the environmental report and
6 license application. These reports, and the field studies
7 which they summarize, were prepared by recognized experts in
8 their respective fields of endeavor. From these reports,
9 environmental considerations and evaluations have been made.

10 Before authorizing uranium fuel plant construction,
11 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is required to assess the
12 potential environmental effects of the proposed activities
13 in order to insure that issuance of the license is consistent
14 with national environmental goals as set forth by the National
15 Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

16 To obtain information essential to this assessment,
17 the Commission requires each applicant for a license to submit
18 a report on the potential environmental impact of the proposed
19 plant and associated facilities. The environmental report
20 for the proposed Alabama Nuclear Fuel Fabrication Plant
21 presents such information in nine major sections.

22 In the general information section of the report,
23 the scope of Westinghouse operations and its organizational
24 structure are discussed. The need for the new facility is
25 presented, and existing Westinghouse nuclear fuel manufacturing

1 operations are described.

2 In the section on the site, the physical, biological,
3 and human characteristics of the area environment that might
4 be affected by construction and operation of the nuclear
5 fuel fabrication plant on the proposed site are described.
6 To the extent possible, the information presented reflects
7 observations and measurements made on location.

8 In the section on the plant, facility characteristics
9 are described. Since environmental effects are the primary
10 concern of the report, the plant effluents and related systems
11 that interact with the environment are described in particular
12 detail.

13 Section 4 of the report presents and analyzes effects
14 of site preparation, plant construction, and operation in
15 detail. Measures planned to reduce potential adverse effects
16 of the total project on the environment are fully addressed.
17 The impact of construction and operation of the proposed plant
18 are quantified to the fullest extent practicable, and are
19 presented systematically, and the relationship between local
20 short-term uses of man's environment, and the maintenance and
21 enhancement of long-term productivity, are discussed. Through-
22 out this section, the cumulative and long-term effects of
23 the proposed action are assessed.

24 In Section 5 of the report, the environmental effects
25 of postulated accidents, at the plant or during the transportation

1 of materials to or from the plant, are discussed. Particular
2 attention is devoted to placing effects of postulated accidents
3 in the proper perspective.

4 The purposes of the section on effluent and
5 environmental measurements and monitoring programs are, first,
6 to describe the means by which the initial or baseline data
7 presented in other sections were collected, and second, to
8 describe plans and programs for monitoring the environmental
9 impacts of site preparation, plant construction, and plant
10 operation.

11 Section 7 of the report specifically discusses
12 alternatives to site selection, plant design, construction, and
13 operation, and waste treatment options.

14 The first six sections of the environmental report
15 describe the site, the plant, the environmental effects of
16 normal operation and unusual occurrences, and the monitoring
17 program for the proposed facility. The seventh section
18 describes why the specific plant design, on the particular
19 site, is the most desirable combination of alternatives.

20 Section 8, Benefit-Cost Analysis, demonstrates why
21 the aggregate benefits outweigh the aggregate costs. Benefit
22 cost is discussed from the viewpoint of both national impact
23 and local effect.

24 The environmental approvals and consultations section
25 of the report lists all licenses, permits, and other approvals

1 of construction and operation required by federal, state, local,
2 and regional authorities for the protection of the environment.

3 The environmental report provides information to
4 enable independent environmental assessments of facility
5 operations, in over 380 pages of data and analyses which will
6 support the conclusion that "the numerous major benefits to be
7 enjoyed by the neighboring communities will totally recompense
8 the minor social and environmental costs to the local area
9 that will result from the construction and operation of the
10 Westinghouse Alabama Nuclear Fuel Fabrication Plant."

11 The license application provides information to
12 enable independent safety assessments of facility operations.
13 Before issuing a license authorizing uranium fuel fabrication
14 plant operation, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is required
15 to access health, safety, and safeguards capabilities of the
16 proposed activities in order to determine that issuance of
17 the license is consistent with the regulations, prudent
18 practice, and the philosophy of requiring every reasonable
19 effort to maintain radiation and radioactivity exposures,
20 and releases of radioactive materials and effluence to
21 uncontrolled areas and environs, as low as is reasonably
22 achievable. The license application for the proposed Alabama
23 Nuclear Fuel Fabrication Plant will present such information
24 in a base document of twenty-one major sections and an
25 ancillary report, two ancillary manuals, and four ancillary

1 plans.

2 Section 1 of the license application presents such
3 licensed activity information as applicant identification,
4 term of the license, amending the license, unique definitions,
5 and a commitment to total compliance with license conditions.

6 Section 2 of the license application specifics the
7 type, form, and quantities of the nuclear materials the
8 facility proposes to use or produce.

9 The Authorized Activities part of the license
10 application, Section 3, specifies the activities for which the
11 special nuclear material license is requested, and the locations
12 at which each activity is to be performed.

13 Section 4 of the license application specifies the
14 technical qualifications, including training and experience,
15 of key facility staff who engage in the proposed activities
16 in accordance with the regulations. This section also specifies
17 the administrative and managerial controls necessary for the
18 safe and efficient operation of the facility.

19 The health and safety engineered controls and technical
20 specifications section of the license application stipulates
21 the facilities and equipment which will be used at the plant
22 to protect health and minimize danger to life or property. This
23 section also specifies proposed procedures to protect health
24 and minimize danger to life or property.

25 Section 6 of the license application specifies the

1 key elements of the program of positive action of Westinghouse
2 management's commitment to make every reasonable effort to
3 maintain radiation and radioactivity as low as is reasonably
4 achievable.

5 Section 7 of the license application specifies the
6 facility management commitment to prepare and follow an
7 approved comprehensive plan for control and accounting for
8 special nuclear material.

9 Section 8 of the license application specifies the
10 facility management commitment to prepare and follow an
11 approved comprehensive plan for physical protection of special
12 nuclear material at the facility and in transit.

13 The quality assurance section of the license
14 application specifies inspections and tests to control quality
15 of safety related instrument calibrations, of bioassay and
16 personnel dosimetry measurements, and of shipping containers.

17 The shipping and receiving section of the license
18 application specifies requirements for surveying packages
19 received and packages prepared for shipment, for opening
20 packages of dispersible materials, and for delivery of special
21 nuclear material to a carrier, including Westinghouse, for
22 transport.

23 Section 11 of the license application specifies the
24 facility management commitment to prepare and follow approved
25 plans for coping with emergencies.

1 Section 13 of the license application requests specific
2 exemptions from certain regulations. An example of this is
3 an exemption from the requirement to notify NRC thirty days
4 prior to first use of respirators, since the notification is
5 already contained in the license application which has already
6 been submitted.

7 Section 14 of the license application introduces the
8 environmental report, which I have previously discussed in
9 detail. As mentioned, this report was submitted to the
10 Commission as a separate document in December, 1979.

11 Section 15 of the license application introduces a
12 comprehensive safety analysis which will provide a detailed
13 demonstration of how organizational and administrative controls
14 are blended with health and safety engineered control and
15 technical specifications to create a viable system for
16 protecting health and minimizing danger to life or property in
17 the facility and its environs.

18 This analysis is currently in preparation and is
19 scheduled to be submitted to the Commission later this year
20 for incorporation into the base license application document.

21 Section 16 of the license application introduces
22 a regulatory compliance manual, which will demonstrate technical
23 information generic to radiological safety, nuclear safety,
24 and occupational safety and health practices at the licensed
25 activity.

1 This manual, and the following manuals and plans,
2 are currently in preparation and are scheduled to be submitted
3 to the Commission later this year as separate documents in
4 support of the license application.

5 Section 17 of the license application introduces an
6 ALARA Manual which will demonstrate details of the program
7 for maintaining radiation and radioactivity as low as is
8 reasonably achievable at the licensed activity.

9 Section 18 of the license application introduces
10 a comprehensive nuclear materials control and accounting plan
11 which will demonstrate a detailed program for maintaining
12 accountability of special nuclear materials at the licensed
13 activity, including material balance, inventory, and records
14 requirements, measurement controls, and fundamental nuclear
15 material controls.

16 Section 19 of the license application introduces
17 a comprehensive physical security plan which will demonstrate
18 a detailed program for maintaining physical protection of
19 special nuclear materials, both while at the plant site and
20 while in transit to or from the plant.

21 Section 20 of the license application introduces an
22 emergency plan for coping with credible facility emergencies.

23 Section 21 of the license application introduces a
24 decommissioning plan which will demonstrate general intentions
25 for ultimate decommissioning of the facility at the end of plant

1 life, including financial arrangements to assure adequate funds
2 to cover the cost at the time of decommissioning.

3 This then is a general outline of the format and
4 content of the Westinghouse Special Nuclear Material License
5 Application, including an environmental report, so that
6 Westinghouse can construct an operate the nuclear fuel
7 fabrication plant in Alabama.

8
9 MR. CROW: Thank you, Bob. As Bob mentioned,
10 Westinghouse has provided the NRC with an environmental report;
11 however, NRC is required by law to independently assess the
12 impact of this proposed plant on the environment.

13 Here to discuss the content of this environmental
14 impact statement is one of our consultants, Dr. Minton Kelly,
15 of the Oakridge National Laboratory.

16
17 STATEMENT OF
18 DR. MINTON KELLY
19 OAKRIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY
20 OAKRIDGE, TENNESSEE

21 DR. KELLY: Actually, some of the previous speakers
22 have covered some of the material that I will cover, so I may
23 be a little bit redundant in places.

24 Many of you, I don't think, know what an Environmental
25 Impact Statement is. The National Environmental Policy Act of
1969, December, 1969, said that every federal action which might

1 have a major impact upon the environment should be discussed
2 in detail and its effects examined, so that the agency con-
3 cerned could make a proper judgment as to whether or not such
4 an action should proceed.

5 In July, the 29th, of 1979, the President's Council
6 on Environmental Quality came out with new guidelines on
7 how Environmental Impact Statements should be prepared, and I
8 intend to discuss, to some extent, what we do and how we are
9 involved in this situation.

10 We are under contract to the Nuclear Regulatory
11 Commission, and when I speak of staff during my talk, that means
12 both NRC personnel and the interdisciplinary team at the
13 Oakridge National Laboratory which will physically prepare
14 the environmental statement.

15 The new CEQ guidelines call for all such actions
16 to consider alternatives to a requested action, together with
17 the proposed action. In this case the proposed action is the
18 application to build a fuel fabrication plant in Prattville.
19 Among the alternatives which must be considered is the
20 alternative of no action. This, of course, concerns itself
21 with the need, and whether or not the action can be taken while
22 properly protecting the environment.

23 There is the alternative of siting of this facility.
24 In other words, is the site that is chosen proper, or is there
25 a better site where there would be less environmental impact.

1 We will look at the alternatives of the plant design
2 proposed by Westinghouse. We will look at alternatives to the
3 plant operation as proposed by Westinghouse. We will look
4 at alternatives to the waste treatment processes and waste
5 disposal methods.

6 Some of the criteria we will use when we do this
7 are to protect the public health and safety and to protect the
8 environment as much as possible during normal operations.

9 We will check to see whether chemicals and radiological
10 effluent releases are as low as reasonably achievable. We
11 will check to see if there are potential accident situations
12 which might expose the public or employees to risks which are
13 not acceptable under regulatory guidelines.

14 We will look to see if the operation proposed, or
15 as modified by the staff -- and remember that we will, if it
16 is deemed necessary, change Westinghouse's proposal to what
17 we consider a better proposal.

18 Is it able to comply with all federal, state, and
19 local requirements and regulations?

20 The Environmental Impact Statement, later in the
21 Statement, describes the environmental consequences of
22 construction and operation of the plant after the staff has
23 chosen what they believe to be the best choices of available
24 alternatives on an overall project basis, and after the staff
25 has specified monitoring and mitigating measures to protect the

1 public and the environment.

2 The consequences we will talk about are the effects on
3 air quality, land use, surface and ground water, socioeconomics,
4 and the potential effects on aquatic and terrestrial biota,
5 including man.

6 The staff will place special emphasis on chemical
7 and radiological releases, both during normal operations and
8 under potential accident conditions to be sure that regulatory
9 guidelines to protect the public will not be exceeded.

10 After the initial draft of the environmental statement,
11 it is issued for circulation to federal agencies, concerned
12 environmental groups, and interested individuals that request
13 copies of it for comment.

14 These individuals will comment on things they think
15 are not right, and eventually we will have to resolve their
16 comments and prepare a final environmental statement, which
17 actually becomes the guide to the decision-maker on the
18 decision as to whether or not to let the process go forward.

19 This scoping meeting tonight is an effort by CEQ,
20 and indeed by NRC, to find out public concern which we might
21 not otherwise think about, so that they can be properly
22 prepared and covered in the environmental statement.

23 At the Oakridge National Laboratory this particular
24 project will be covered by a five-member team. I'm not going
25 to give you their titles and degrees, but I would like to

1 introduce them to you.

2 Larry LaMonica, chemical engineer, who will cover
3 all the engineering aspects.

4 Sam Martin, an economist, also an engineer, who will
5 cover socioeconomics and some of the alternative issues.

6 Jeffrey Baldwin, a geohydrologist, who will cover
7 ground water and seismology, and this type of thing -- anything
8 to do with the earth sciences.

9 Larry Vorhees, the terrestrial ecologist, who will
10 cover all the terrestrial impacts.

11 And Steve Goff, an aquatic ecologist, who will cover
12 all the aquatic effects.

13 Thank you.

14

15 MR. CROW: Thank you, Minton.

16 Ladies and gentlemen, as I mentioned earlier, we will
17 take a short ten-minute break -- well, why don't we reconvene
18 at about ten minutes of eight -- and at that time we will
19 take comments from the people in the audience.

20 Remember, if you wish to make a comment, and you
21 haven't signed the sign-in sheet in the back of the room, please
22 do so, and we will pick them up at the end of the intermission.

23 Thank you.

24 (A brief recess was taken.)

25 MR. CROW: If we will get back to our seats, we will

1 get on with the meeting.

2 Unfortunately, when we put these sign-in sheets at
3 the door we didn't number them and I have no idea who signed in
4 first to speak. During the break, the Court Reporter wanted to
5 get a copy of all the names of people who wanted to speak, so
6 I gave him the sheets and asked him to shuffle them any way
7 he wanted to and put a number on them and I would call them
8 in consecutive order.

9 Everyone will be called, and I apologize if someone
10 signed in first and doesn't get called until last. It's
11 strictly my fault.

12 The first person to speak is Susan Sinburg, 651-A
13 Hubbard Street, Montgomery.

14
15 STATEMENT OF
16 SUSAN SINBURG

17 MS. SINBURG: I'd like to ask --

18 MR. CROW: Would you state your full name and any
19 organization you represent?

20 MS. SINBURG: My name is Susan Sinburg and I'm
21 representing myself, or any general citizen in Montgomery or
22 Prattville or any area.

23 Will there be any use of plutonium in the Prattville
24 facility at opening date or at any time in the future?

25 MR. CROW: The license application does not address

1 the use of plutonium for that facility.

2 Before plutonium will be allowed, Westinghouse would
3 have to get an amendment to the license to authorize them to
4 use plutonium.

5 MS. SINBURG: Can I say something?

6 MR. CROW: Yes, you may.

7 MS. SINBURG: So, there could be a possibility that
8 plutonium could be used in this plant?

9 MR. CROW: I don't think so.

10 MS. SINBURG: But there is a possibility?

11 MR. CROW: There might be a possibility.

12 MS. SINBURG: Do you know the effects of plutonium?
13 A small amount of plutonium?

14 You know, one pound of plutonium can cause, I
15 believe, cancer in every person in the United States.

16 MR. CROW: Let me make this statement, and I
17 apologize; time is short.

18 Before plutonium will be authorized to be used in
19 that plant there will be an Environmental Impact Statement,
20 another scoping meeting, and there will be an opportunity for
21 people to comment on the use of plutonium.

22 MS. SINBURG: Thank you.

23 MR. CROW: Flemming Blackburn. Is Mr. Blackburn
24 here?

25

STATEMENT OF
FLEMMING BLACKBURN

1
2
3 MR. BLACKBURN: My name is Flemming Blackburn, and I'm
4 from Auburn.

5 I'd like to know how much transportation there will
6 be in bringing materials to the plant, and then again when the
7 fuel rods leave, and whether these fuel rods will be supplying
8 plants only in this state or is this plant going to supply
9 enough fuel for the Southeast?

10 MR. CROW: As far as the license goes, the use of
11 the fuel will not be restricted to any specific area, to my
12 knowledge. That won't be part of our licensing process. It
13 would be a decision by Westinghouse, a company decision, on
14 where the fuel would be supplied.

15 MR. BLACKBURN: They are just a supplier and they
16 can sell to whoever is in need of the fuel?

17 MR. CROW: Yes. They will supply to their reactors
18 which are located all across the United States.

19 MR. BLACKBURN: How many of these plants are around?
20 These type of fuel plants?

21 MR. CROW: There are five major facilities in the
22 United States.

23 MR. BLACKBURN: What would the life of this plant
24 be? How long will it be here in Alabama?

25 It's limited, isn't it?

300 7TH STREET, S.W., REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024 (202) 554 2315

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. CELLIER: The normal life of this type of plant is forty years. It could be longer than that, or shorter, but that's a business assessment of the plant. Normally forty years.

MR. BLACKBURN: That's only a business assessment; it's life doesn't end in forty years because of the type of work that's done there?

MR. CROW: No.

MR. BLACKBURN: Thank you.

MR. CROW: Thank you.

Susan Brannon?

STATEMENT OF
SUSAN BRANNON

MS. BRANNON: My name is Susan Brannon. I am from Montgomery. I was wondering, will there be any by-products released into the air, either radioactive or nonradioactive?

What kind of precautions will there be against that?

MR. CROW: Both radioactive contaminants and non-radioactive contaminants that are released into the air from this facility are very strictly controlled by regulation, and these will be addressed in the Environment Impact Statement.

MS. BRANNON: What type of products are those?

MR. CROW: The radioactive components will be mainly low-enriched uranium. The nonradioactive chemicals could be

1 some quantity of fluorides. That's the only one that comes to
2 mind that's significant. But it will be controlled also.

3 MS. BRANNON: Thank you.

4 MR. CROW: Thank you.

5 Randy Aronov?

6
7 STATEMENT OF
8 RANDY ARONOV

9 MR. ARONOV: Could you get this microphone turned up?
10 I don't think the people in the back can hear it. It's very
11 low.

12 (A brief pause.)

13 MR. ARONOV: If plutonium --

14 MR. CROW: Would you state your name, please?

15 MR. ARONOV: Rand Warren Aronov.

16 At the Columbia plant, is plutonium being used at
17 all?

18 MR. CROW: No.

19 MR. ARONOV: Why is the plant only commissioned to
20 be used for forty years?

21 MR. CROW: That's just a rule of thumb for most
22 industrial plants.

23 MR. ARONOV: What happens at the end of forty years?
24 Why would it need to be shut down?

25 MR. CROW: It wouldn't need to be shut down.

MR. ARONOV: That's just the normal course of action

1 for any industrial plants?

2 MR. CROW: That's what they normally amortize a plant.

3 MR. ARONOV: A nuclear plant?

4 MR. CROW: Any plant.

5 MR. ARONOV: Okay.

6 MR. CROW: Thank you.

7 MR. ARONOV: Thank you.

8 MR. CROW: Ms. Charles Butler?

9

10 STATEMENT OF
11 MARILYN BUTLER

12 MS. BUTLER: Marilyn Butler, the Methodist Church.

13 I am asking how they plant to dispose of the waste material?

14 There is no safe way to dispose of this waste.

15 It can leak from its tanks; it can cause all of the
16 genetic defects, the cancer, the leukemia, the birth defects
17 for years to come. How can they dispose of this waste, and
18 where.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. CROW: Any waste from this facility will be
21 disposed of to a licensed burial ground.

22 MS. BUTLER: Where are the licensed burial grounds?
23 South Carolina? Washington?

24 MR. CROW: There are two of them. There is one in
25 Nevada.

1 MS. BUTLER: But they are getting full. There is no
2 place left.

3 They don't want it anymore. The people there don't
4 want it. It's too dangerous for us to have it here.

5 They can leak. Those burial containers leak, and
6 they cause the radiation effects and there is no prevention.

7 MR. CROW: The handling of waste will be addressed
8 in the Environmental Impact Statement. The effects on the
9 environment will be discussed in the Environmental Impact
10 Statement.

11 MS. BUTLER: The leading and prominent cancer
12 specialists say the only prevention of cancer is to control
13 this nuclear output and we've got to make every effort to
14 stop it as soon as possible.

15 MR. CROW: Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. CROW: George B. Allison?
18

19 STATEMENT OF
20 GEORGE B. ALLISON

21 MR. ALLISON: Sir, I'm George Allison from Prattville.

22 I am stating what is probably already been taken
23 care of in the impact statement somewhere, and that is some
24 type of accident. I'm talking primarily about an industrial
25 accident.

1 I know also that it will surely address natural
2 disasters. But one in particular I'm anxious for the statement
3 to be sure it addresses would take into the consideration the
4 fact that we are in a high-incident tornado area. And I
5 also notice that the location of the plant happens to be
6 approximately downwind of the normal trajectory of a tornado.

7 From the two major arteries of traffic that lead
8 out of the Montgomery Metropolitan Area, I would only suggest
9 that adequate consideration be made as to what happens if a
10 tornado takes up part of those pellets and scatters them over
11 a broad area of the southern part of Autauga County, the
12 northern part of Montgomery County. What happens then to
13 the transportation system? How long would it stay shut down?
14 What means would be made of shutting it off, et cetera?

15 In other words, how long would the transportation
16 throughout the Greater Montgomery Area be tied up until all of
17 those pellets were accounted for?

18 MR. CROW: Thank you, Mr. Allison.

19 Mr. Jim Zeigler? I think it's Zeigler.

20
21 STATEMENT OF
22 JIM ZEIGLER

23 MR. ZEIGLER: My name is Jim Zeigler. I am an
24 attorney at 2580 Main Street, Millbrook, Alabama and 833
25 Jefferson Street, Montgomery, Alabama.

1 First of all, do we know when the Environmental
2 Impact Statement will be circulated?

3 MR. CROW: The drafted Environmental Impact Statement
4 is now scheduled to be circulated around the first of next
5 year.

6 MR. ZEIGLER: The first of 1981?

7 MR. CROW: Yes. Or before.

8 MR. ZEIGLER: Did I get a misimpression from the
9 film that the Environmental Impact Statement was already
10 produced and available?

11 MR. CROW: No, sir. It's just being prepared.

12 The Environmental Report has been produced, and it
13 will be available -- if I may digress a minute. Someone asked
14 me earlier about the availability of these documents. We are
15 setting up a local public document room in Prattville. There
16 will be a notice published in the newspaper shortly when
17 documents will be available for people to go to the public
18 document room and read.

19 MR. ZEIGLER: Can you tell us when the time frame
20 for comments on the Environmental Impact Statement will begin
21 and end?

22 MR. CROW: There is normally a 45-day comment period.

23 MR. ZEIGLER: Is it correct to state that in these
24 proceedings issues as to the generic standards will be limited
25 to whether the proposed facility meets already established

1 generic standards?

2 MR. CROW: That's correct.

3 MR. ZEIGLER: No questioning can be made in these
4 proceedings of those standards?

5 MR. CROW: That's correct.

6 MR. ZEIGLER: Is the possibility of a decline in
7 demand in permitting nuclear plants going to be a legitimate
8 issue in these proceedings?

9 MR. CROW: Will the decline in the demand of
10 nuclear fuel?

11 MR. ZEIGLER: Will the possibility of a decline in
12 demand in permitting of nuclear plants be a proper issue in
13 these proceedings?

14 MR. CROW: It will impact on the need for the
15 facility, and that will be an issue in the Environmental Impact
16 Study.

17 MR. ZEIGLER: May it be raised by a party in these
18 proceedings?

19 MR. CROW: It can be raised, I'm certain, but I'm
20 not sure that it will be addressed.

21 MR. ZEIGLER: One last question. Have the
22 transportation routes for the nuclear pellets, both the incoming
23 and outgoing routes, been formulated?

24 MR. CROW: Not to my knowledge.

25 MR. ZEIGLER: When will that be known?

1 MR. CROW: I don't know if the routes will be always
2 the same. I think it will vary depending upon --

3 UF-6, or uranium hexafluoride, coming in, that route
4 probably will be a fairly fixed route because it's only coming
5 from places like Oakridge, Tennessee or Paducah, Kentucky. So,
6 you would expect they would use the best route all the time.

7 Now, the fuel leaving here could go anyplace in the
8 United States. It could go anyplace in the world, probably.
9 So, I don't know what the route would be there.

10 MR. ZEIGLER: Thank you.

11 MR. CROW: Thank you.

12 Robert Campbell?

13

14 STATEMENT OF
15 ROBERT CAMPBELL

16 MR. CAMPBELL: My name is Robert Campbell. I live
17 in Montgomery, Alabama. I'm an independent insurance agent and
18 financial planner.

19 I just represent the common working man the future
20 generations.

21 My first question is directed to Mr. Williams.
22 Mr. Williams, what amount --

23 MR. CROW: Would you direct it to me, please?

24 MR. CAMPBELL: I'm sorry. I would like for Mr.
25 Williams to answer the question, if that would be possible.

1 What amount of radioactivity, and what radioactive
2 materials, will be released into the environment?

3 We've heard from Mr. Williams that the level will
4 be as low as is reasonably achievable. Exactly what amount
5 is as low as is reasonably achievable?

6 MR. CROW: This is controlled by an EPA regulation
7 that just became effective in December of 1979, where it
8 specifies that the dose to the nearest resident of any fuel
9 facility, either a light water reactor or a fabrication
10 facility producing fuel for a light water reactor, that the
11 dose must be below 25 millirem for any 12-month period.

12 We work from there to keep them as low as is
13 reasonably achievable.

14 For most --

15 MR. CAMPBELL: Do you know what it would be for just
16 the average population?

17 MR. CROW: This is for the nearest resident.

18 MR. CAMPBELL: What about for the workers involved in
19 the plant, what would the permissible dosage be for them?

20 MR. CROW: This is controlled also by the NRC --
21 well, it's controlled by Westinghouse, but it's regulated by
22 the NRC -- and it is specified in Title X, Code of Federal
23 Regulations, Part 20.

24 MR. CAMPBELL: What amount would that be?

25 MR. CROW: For most workers in this type of facility,

1 it's normally less than 25 percent of what's allowed in the
2 regulations.

3 MR. CAMPBELL: In comparison to the 25 millirems
4 for the closest resident -- is that correct? -- what amount
5 would that be for the worker? Would that not be greatly
6 increased from the closest resident? Wouldn't it be much
7 greater?

8 MR. CROW: Yes, it will be greater for the worker.

9 MR. CAMPBELL: Would it be a hundred times greater?

10 MR. CROW: No.

11 MR. CAMPBELL: Fifty?

12 MR. CROW: The number sticks in my mind -- what Ed?

13 MR. SCHUM: If you want the concentration as far as
14 uranium is concerned, in Part XX we have two columns, one is
15 soluble uranium and one is insoluble. Each one has a
16 concentration we called the MPC, the maximum permissible
17 concentration. You can refer to that.

18 The number, I can only quote you approximately,
19 and for insoluble uranium is about like one times ten to the
20 minus ten microcurie per mil.

21 MR. CROW: You are asking for a dose. In the
22 regulations we specify -- we don't specify dose, we specify
23 concentration the employee can be exposed to. By regulation
24 they have to keep below 25 percent of the maximum permissible
25 concentration specified, or else take action to reduce it

1 below 25 percent.

2 MR. CAMPBELL: But the average worker can be exposed
3 to a much greater level than the closest resident, and then
4 there again, if an accident were to happen and the radiation
5 levels were to be increased inside the plant, then Westinghouse
6 could bring in special people for a short period of time and
7 they could receive the maximum yearly dose within, say, a few
8 given hours, is that not correct?

9 MR. CROW: That would only be correct in the case
10 of a nuclear excursion, which is --

11 MR. CAMPBELL: (Interrupting) Well, any type of
12 accident.

13 MR. CROW: No, not any type of accident.

14 You are thinking reactors --

15 MR. CAMPBELL: No, I'm speaking of fabricator plants.

16 MR. CROW: This is not a problem in a fuel fabrication
17 plant, and it's not allowed by NRC.

18 MR. CAMPBELL: I have a question for the NRC
19 representatives. Does it seem possible that individuals who
20 are hand-picked by Westinghouse to prepare environmental
21 reports would be able to totally, in an unbiased way, totally
22 unbiased, issue reports, when, in essence, if they issued
23 negative reports it would cost Westinghouse millions and
24 millions of dollars?

25 MR. CROW: That's the reason the law requires that

1 the NRC do an independent assessment of the environmental
2 effects in our Environmental Impact Statement.

3 MR. CAMPBELL: I have another question for Mr. Cellier
4 of Westinghouse.

5 Ralph Nadar's Critical Mass Group reports that since
6 1974, Mr. Cellier, there have been 328 nuclear transportation
7 accidents, 118 of which have spilled radioactive materials
8 into the environment. Eighty-seven percent of these spills
9 dumped radioactive materials on America's highways.

10 Now, we heard that these materials are going to
11 be shipped in specially constructed containers. Are not these
12 the same containers that have been used since 1974? Or, are
13 these going to be different containers?

14 MR. CROW: These containers are containers that are
15 reviewed and approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and,
16 if necessary, an Environmental Impact Statement is prepared
17 for the container.

18 MR. CAMPBELL: Are these the same containers that
19 have been in use since 1974?

20 MR. CROW: These containers have been in use, yes,
21 since 1974.

22 MR. CAMPBELL: So, in essence it's the same container
23 that there have been 328 nuclear transportation accidents with?

24 MR. CROW: No, sir. I don't know what nuclear
25 accidents you are referring to that Nadar published. I know of

1 no accident involving a shipment of UF-6 where it was released
2 in the past, since 1974 or even prior to that.

3 MR. CAMPBELL: That's all I have.

4 MR. CROW: Thank you.

5 Jack Naftell.

6
7 STATEMENT OF
8 JACK NAFTELL

9 MR. NAFTELL: Jack Naftell, Montgomery, Alabama.

10 First of all, I would like to express my opposition
11 to this plant. The radioactive materials, nitrates, nickel,
12 and lead that will be routinely released into the environment
13 pose a hazard to the health of plant workers, to the general
14 public, and to the wildlife in the area.

15 I would also like to request public hearings
16 concerning the Environmental Impact Statement and the issuance
17 of a license.

18 I have a few questions.

19 MR. CROW: There are procedures if you want to
20 petition to intervene in this action. There are methods that
21 you can follow, and I will be happy to give you that infor-
22 mation at the end of the hearing.

23 MR. NAFTELL: Right. I was under the understanding
24 that would be presented here.

25 Will there be enough radioactive material at the

1 plant at any one time to allow for a critical mass to be
2 reached?

3 MR. CROW: Yes.

4 MR. NAFTELL: So, there could be a melt-down?

5 MR. CROW: No.

6 MR. NAFTELL: There could be an uncontrolled release
7 of radiation.

8 MR. CROW: Not in this type of facility.

9 MR. NAFTELL: You are saying critical mass could be
10 reached?

11 MR. CROW: You asked the question, is there enough
12 material here to reach a critical mass, the answer to that
13 is, yes, there is. There are mitigating designs in the
14 facility to prevent a nuclear excursion. This is one of the
15 reviews that NRC does, or will do, on this facility.

16 MR. NAFTELL: Like they did at Three Mile Island.

17 MR. CROW: No, now, that's an altogether different
18 thing.

19 MR. NAFTELL: Well, any --

20 MR. CROW: Excuse me. There has never been a
21 nuclear excursion in a fuel facility of this type.

22 MR. NAFTELL: Yet.

23 Will any waste or radioactive materials be buried
24 at the plant site or anywhere in the Montgomery-Prattville area?

25 MR. CROW: The regulations do allow the burial of

1 waste on the Westinghouse property. How long this regulation
2 will be in place, I can't say. But it's an extremely small
3 amount.

4 MR. NAFTELL: And how long will these products
5 remain radioactive?

6 MR. CROW: I don't, offhand, know the half-life.

7 MR. NAFTELL: Thousands of years?

8 MR. CROW: Yes.

9 MR. NAFTELL: And how long are the containers
10 designed to last?

11 MR. CROW: Any material that's buried will be fixed
12 so that it is in an insoluble state.

13 MR. NAFTELL: For how long?

14 MR. CROW: It's not the container; it's the way the
15 material is --

16 MR. NAFTELL: (Interrupting) How will they be done?
17 Put in concrete?

18 MR. CROW: Will be solidified.

19 MR. NAFTELL: And placed in what?

20 MR. CROW: Probably in drums or boxes.

21 MR. NAFTELL: And how long do you suppose those will
22 last? Thousands of years?

23 MR. CROW: I don't think so.

24 MR. NAFTELL: I don't either.

25 Thank you.

1 MR. CROW: Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3
4 STATEMENT OF
5 DARRYL SMITH

6 MR. SMITH: My name is Darryl Smith and I'm a resident
7 of Deatsville, Alabama.

8 I would like to know -- the question was asked before
9 about the radiation exposure of workers at the site. Now, one
10 of your colleagues was speaking about concentration, which is
11 a body-burden limit, it's not an actual radiation limiting
12 dose, such as a rem rad or roentgen. You say you do not know
13 exactly what the dose that the workers will receive at this
14 particular place is?

15 MR. CROW: I think the regulations allow like five
16 rem a year.

17 MR. SMITH: I don't believe 10 CFR 20 states that.
18 I believe they state it as 15 and the industry standard in most
19 places is five rems a year, three per quarter.

20 I would like, if there would be some way to find
21 out after the meeting, if there is some way we can find out
22 approximately what Westinghouse is going to limit their
23 employees to.

24 I am a previous radiation worker, licensed operator,
25 health-physic technician and instrument technician at a nuclear

1 station. I am concerned that our residents may receive an
2 overdosage, and I would like, if there was some way for the
3 public to know, that the Westinghouse Corporation and the NRC
4 will oversee and make sure that our residents are protected.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. CROW: Thank you.

7 Mr. R. J. Popwell?

8 MR. POPWELL: I don't have any comments at this time.

9 MR. CROW: Thank you.

10 Mr. E. S. Fried.

11
12 STATEMENT OF
13 E. S. FRIED

14 MR. FRIED: My name is Eugene Fried. I'd like to
15 know if Westinghouse intends to be responsible for any
16 accidents concerning fuel shipments outside the plant, and if
17 they don't intend to be responsible, who will be responsible?

18 MR. CROW: That's really out of the scope of this
19 meeting, but I think normally the carrier is responsible for
20 any shipments.

21 MR. FRIED: I would also like to know if Westinghouse
22 consulted any residents who live downstream from this plant as
23 to how they feel about Westinghouse dumping radioactive materials,
24 nitrates, nickel, and lead into the river?

25 MR. CROW: The effluence from this facility, both

1 gaseous and liquid, will be dealt with in the Environmental
2 Impact Statement.

3 MR. FRIED: My question was, I wanted to know if
4 Westinghouse consulted any residents who live downstream as
5 to how they feel about this?

6 MR. CROW: They are not required to, but I don't know
7 if they did.

8 MR. FRIED: I doubt it. Thank you.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. CROW: Mr. Popwell?

11 MR. POPWELL: I stated that I didn't want to comment.

12 MR. CROW: There are two Popwells on here.

13 MS. POPWELL: That's me.

14

15 STATEMENT OF
16 DONNA POPWELL

17 MS. POPWELL: My name is Donna Popwell. I am from
18 Auburn.

19 I had a question about something that I noticed in
20 the preparatory statements, and that was the use of the word
21 "reasonable."

22 Several times we've mentioned "every reasonable
23 effort will be taken," and "radiation will be kept as low as
24 is reasonably achievable." First, I'd like to know if the
25 definition of "reasonably" will be spelled out, and whether

1 if unforeseeable circumstances should occur at the plant -- I
2 know this is the case at reactors -- whether the definition
3 of "reasonably" changes?

4 In other words, can standards be dropped for un-
5 foreseeable accidents or some circumstances beyond control?

6 MR. CROW: The term "as low as reasonably
7 achievable" is taken directly from our regulations. What the
8 NRC has done is they have set limits on effluence, they have
9 set limits on exposures for personnel. That does not mean
10 that a licensee can operate all the way up to those limits.
11 So, we put in a phrase, "We wish you to operate as low as
12 reasonably achievable." That doesn't mean you can operate
13 above the limits; this means you must operate as low below those
14 limits as is reasonably achievable.

15 The regulations also specify, again, as I mentioned,
16 for inplant air concentrations, they should be below 25 percent
17 of what it says in the regulations.

18 MS. POPWELL: But are they required to be, or should
19 they be?

20 MR. CROW: They are required to either be below 25
21 percent or be doing an engineering survey to justify why they
22 are above 25 percent.

23 MS. POPWELL: And my second question about the special
24 circumstance at the plant, do the standards hold there?

25 MR. CROW: The standards are written in the regulations

1 and it takes a rule change to change that standard.

2 MS. POPWELL: Is that not the case at reactors at
3 this point though?

4 MR. CROW: I think that's still the same situation,
5 that's correct.

6 MS. POPWELL: In other words, there is a limit and
7 they cannot breach it?

8 MR. CROW: That's correct.

9 MS. POPWELL: All right.

10 MR. CROW: T. J. Knight?

11 (No response.)

12 MR. CROW: Is there a T. J. Knight here?

13 (No response.)

14 MR. CROW: Ms. Doris Beckley?

15

16 STATEMENT OF
17 DORIS BECKLEY

18 MS. BECKLEY: My name is Doris Beckley and I am a
19 wife, mother, and grandmother. Currently I'm living at Maxwell
20 Air Force Base and in July will be living in Montgomery
21 permanently.

22 My permanent address until last July was 1 Conway
23 Drive, Middletown, Pennsylvania.

24 I am aware that when trucks shift into, I believe it's
25 the third gear, it makes a lot of noise, and so noise pollution

1 on the transportation is one thing I think should be considered
2 because I know of three families who could not sell their homes
3 because of that up there.

4 I am also wondering about the way that you would
5 measure the amounts of the chemicals that you would be putting
6 into the river. I am also wondering about the accumulation for
7 the fishing river, like that happened up near Norfolk when those
8 chemicals accumulated and ruined the oyster beds.

9 I am also aware that you have detection devices to
10 detect the radiation but it's possible that there can be a
11 crack in the plastic protective clothing or perhaps a detection
12 device is not working and a worker could go home and carry
13 some of it. It's possible. It's not probable, but it is
14 possible.

15 I would like to say thank you for the chance to
16 go on record as being more for conversation of energy and the
17 development of solar energy than nuclear, although I do realize
18 we do need it.

19 I cannot help but wonder, with Pennsylvania being
20 considered a state that is somewhat depressed, losing its
21 population, and trying to get industry, such as Volkswagen
22 and Addidis from other countries, and with Alabama gaining
23 population -- I realize it's nice down here; we like it, too --
24 but I can't help but wonder why you didn't build the plant in
25 Pennsylvania?

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. CROW: Thank you, Ms. Beckley. The siting of the
3 plant will be discussed in the Environmental Impact Statement,
4 as Dr. Kelly mentioned. The need for the plant will be also
5 discussed.

6 As far as the effluence, they are under extremely
7 tight controls, both by the NRC and by the EPA and the State of
8 Alabama.

9 MS. BECKLEY: And you will consider the tornado
10 aspect?

11 MR. CROW: Yes, ma'am.

12 MS. BECKLEY: Thank you.

13 MR. CROW: Debra Gordon-Hellman?

14
15 STATEMENT OF
16 DEBRA GRODON-HELLMAN

17 MS. GORDON-HELLMAN: Debra Gordon-Hellman from
18 Birmingham, and I'd like to make a couple of comments and
19 ask a couple of questions.

20 One being that in the NRC news release that I
21 received in the mail it said that the ending date for the
22 opportunity for citizens to intervene in the licensing of this
23 plant was April 7th. I am concerned about this because that
24 is not enough time for us -- the NRC themselves do not have the
25 application yet, much less the public -- to go over this and

1 compile our information and make an intelligent judgment about
2 the plant.

3 I request that we postpone this date, and I would
4 like to go on record as saying that, as well as postponing
5 another scoping hearing, such as tonight, after the public
6 has had a chance to go over the information that Westinghouse
7 has compiled.

8 MR. CROW: You will have an opportunity for a hearing
9 even after the draft Environmental Impact Statement is
10 published.

11 MS. GORDON-HELLMAN: But in order to intervene in the
12 licensing of the plant, it said that the ending date was April
13 7th in order to petition for intervention.

14 I have the news release here, or I did. I guess it's
15 at my seat. But it's the March 11th news release that was
16 sent out by the NRC. I can get it, if you would like.

17 MR. CROW: The Federal Register notice I would have
18 to pull. It is more accurate than the news release. I haven't
19 read the news release.

20 MS. GORDON-HELLMAN: Do you have a copy? Why don't
21 I get it?

22 (Document handed to Ms. Gordon-Hellman by someone
23 from the audience.)

24 MS. GORDON-HELLMAN: This is from the United States
25 Nuclear Regulatory Commission and it says that "Any petitions

1 will be acted upon by the Commission or an Atomic Safety and
2 Licensing Board to determine whether or not a hearing should
3 be held. In the event that a hearing is held, any person
4 permitted to intervene becomes a full party to the proceeding.
5 Petitions should be filed by April 7, 1980."

6 I don't feel we can leave here tonight with that date in
7 mind and know that we can't do anything after that date unless
8 we know that's not so.

9 MR. CROW: That date is wrong. I am sure that you
10 can petition to intervene up until right before we take the
11 licensing action.

12 MS. GORDON-HELLMAN: Can someone from the NRC verify
13 that?

14 MR. CROW: I will verify it.

15 MS. GORDON-HELLMAN: Also, no new nuclear plants are
16 being authorized to be built now, except for the ones that are
17 already licensed or under construction. That being the case,
18 why do we need this fuel fabrication plant if no new plants
19 are being built, and to subject the people of Prattville and
20 Montgomery to the unnecessary dangers?

21 MR. CROW: The need for this facility is one of the
22 major issues that will be addressed in the Environmental
23 Impact Statement.

24 MS. GORDON-HELLMAN: I'd like to make a correction
25 in that in this environmental analysis of the uranium fuel cycle

1 prepared by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency it said
2 that the life of a fuel fabrication plant is 30 years, not
3 40 years, and does not say that it can be extended after that.

4 And in terms of the control of substances leaving
5 a plant, you can say -- I mean, you can hope that that can be
6 controlled, but in the case of the Jonesboro Fuel Fabrication
7 Plant in Tennessee, since that plant was built there has been
8 a sharp increase in cancer since 1973, and the rate is still
9 rising.

10 And not only that, in 1977 250 to 500 pounds of
11 enriched uranium was reportedly released into the Nalachuckee
12 River by routine plant operation.

13 MR. CROW: The Irwin facility that you are referring
14 to is really not an issue to be discussed here, but since you've
15 mentioned it I will have to say the Atlanta office of the
16 National Institute of Health evaluated the allegations that
17 the cancer rate around that facility was greater than normal
18 and found that that is not true.

19 They have a report on it; I don't have a copy of it.
20 But you can get it from the Atlanta office.

21 MS. GORDON-HELLMAN: Okay. Also, I don't believe
22 that the carrier, in the case of a transportation accident,
23 with carrying the uranium fuel rods, I don't believe the
24 carrier is responsible for that. It must be the NRC or
25 Westinghouse.

1 You had said that the carrier, the person driving the
2 truck, the company, would be responsible, but I don't believe
3 they are responsible for cleaning up such an accident.

4 Or paying for it either.

5 MR. CROW: That is under discussion right now at the
6 NRC, about spelling out who will clean it up. I think -- well,
7 I really shouldn't get into it because I'm not that familiar
8 with the firm details of who will be responsible.

9 In the past, the NRC jumps in and takes over and
10 evaluates what's going on and makes sure that somebody is there
11 taking the responsibility of cleaning it up.

12 MS. GORDON-HELLMAN: As I understand it then, the
13 things that everyone is talking about tonight are the things
14 that will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement
15 so that such as this issue of transportation would be addressed
16 there and we would know who is responsible?

17 MR. CROW: That's correct.

18 MS. GORDON-HELLMAN: Thank you.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. CROW: Thank you.

21 I can't make out the first name, but the last name
22 is Wainwright.

23 Mr. Wainwright?

24 MR. WAINRIGHT: Yes, sir. The name is Mack
25 Wainwright.

1 STATEMENT OF
2 MACK WAINWRIGHT

3 MR. WAINWRIGHT: I'm Mack Wainwright from Autaugaville,
4 Alabama. We are downstream, more or less.

5 I would like to say that I'm not pro or con on this
6 issue yet; I only have questions. Is there an address or a
7 name of a person, or persons, that we could write or address
8 future questions to for short-term answers?

9 MR. CROW: Yes.

10 MR. WAINWRIGHT: May I have that, sir?

11 MR. CROW: Address them to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory
12 Commission, Attention Dr. E. Y. Shum -- S-h-u-m -- Washington,
13 D. C. 20555.

14 MR. WAINWRIGHT: Thank you.

15 MR. CROW: Aaron Aronov?

16 MR. ARONOV: I have no further questions.

17 MR. CROW: Judy -- and I cannot read the name, but
18 from the Auburn Safe Energy Alliance?

19
20 STATEMENT OF
21 JUDY COMBY

22 MS. COMBY: I'm Judy Comby from Tuskegee.

23 I have a real concern about the jobs, which are being
24 played up as an important aspect of the economy here in
25 Prattville. It said 400 jobs. How many of those would be for

1 local people?

2 MR. CROW: I can't really answer that, but I understand
3 Westinghouse will try to fill as many of those jobs with local
4 people as they can.

5 MR. CELLIER: That's correct. Approximately 350.
6 In that neighborhood.

7 We are bringing in some experienced people in
8 management and engineering.

9 MS. COMBY: All these people then have training
10 then here before the plant is opened and they begin their work?
11 These 350 unskilled people?

12 MR. CELLIER: That's generally what you do, is bring
13 in trained personnel to train people.

14 MS. COMBY: If you have an accident and the workers
15 have already gotten the maximum dosage of radiation that they
16 can get, what do you do? Who do you bring in?

17 Do you get unskilled people off the street, or do
18 you have people from other plants?

19 MR. CROW: That sort of thing never happens in this
20 type of facility. Now, as I mentioned earlier, a nuclear
21 excursion would be the only thing that I could see where an
22 operator would get an excessive dose of radiation.

23 Normally, the problem in this type of facility is
24 not external radiation or ionizing radiation; it's normally
25 from inhalation due to the uranium in the air.

1 MS. COMBY: And so there is no way to detect that?

2 MR. CROW: Yes, there is. You detect it with what
3 we call a bioassay program which is required by the license.
4 And this bioassay program includes urinalysis on a routine
5 basis and whole-body counting where you can count how much
6 material is in the person's lungs.

7 MS. COMBY: My understanding is once it's in the
8 urine it's in other parts of the body and it could already
9 be causing cancer, is that not right?

10 MR. CROW: I don't know what it would cause, but
11 if it's in the urine it's a soluble exposure and it's being
12 excreted.

13 MS. COMBY: One thing that I'm really concerned about
14 is that with this the jobs are highlighted and I think about
15 the General Electric workers who resigned in 1976 as nuclear
16 engineers because of the terrible danger. And it seems to
17 me that at hearings like this we need to share these concerns
18 because I don't know how the people of Prattville are knowing
19 that other nuclear engineers are saying these things can
20 involve the life of the planet itself.

21 And they are saying that they had to resign from the
22 job because they could not be involved in a system which was
23 going to be producing increasing cancer, genetic defects for
24 our children, for our grandchildren.

25 There are radioactive materials in the earth, which

1 itself is "holy" earth, and the contains won't last the thousands
2 of years the material is radioactive.

3 How can we best get this word out so people can know
4 the dangers that are involved for right here in Prattville
5 and everywhere? Because this is the fuel that will go to
6 reactors, as you said, all over the world, so it's part of the
7 whole process.

8 It seems to me that we've really got to lift this
9 issue up, and like Einstein said, he said the people have got
10 to decide in public meetings what we're going to do and whether
11 we're going to have it, and I don't think the issue is being
12 raised as much as it must be. What do we do?

13 MR. CROW: Well, I think meetings like this may
14 raise some issues. But I think you're discussing a problem
15 that doesn't exist in a facility of the type that we're talking
16 about being built here in Prattville.

17 MS. COMBY: But there is radioactive effluence in
18 the air and in the water.

19 MR. CROW: Very small amounts.

20 MS. COMBY: That can cause cancer and genetic
21 mutations.

22 MR. CROW: There are people that will argue about
23 that.

24 MS. COMBY: Thank you.

25 (Applause.)

1 MR. CROW: David Arrett?

2
3 STATEMENT OF
4 DAVID ARRETT

5 MR. ARRETT: My name is David Arrett. I live in
6 Montgomery.

7 The first question I would like to ask you is if
8 the Environmental Impact Statement is going to address the
9 relationship between Union Carbide and Westinghouse?

10 MR. CROW: I'm not sure there is a relationship.

11 MR. ARRETT: Let me ask you this, then. Will Union
12 Carbide be furnishing the ore or the low-level uranium that
13 will be fabricated in the fuel plant?

14 MR. CROW: Union Carbide operates uranium milling
15 processes and supplies ore to utilities.

16 MR. ARRETT: Will it also be providing ore to be
17 milled or be made into the fuel at this plant that's proposed
18 for Prattville?

19 MR. CROW: I can't answer that.

20 MR. ARRETT: Well, the material has got to come from
21 Oakridge, is that correct?

22 MR. CROW: The enriched uranium comes from either the
23 Oakridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant or the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion
24 Plant.

25 MR. ARRETT: Is that a Union Carbide facility?

1 MR. CROW: No, that's a U. S. Government facility
2 that's operated by Union Carbide.

3 MR. ARRETT: And Union Carbide is also going to
4 do the Environmental Impact Statement, is that correct?

5 MR. CROW: Oakridge National Laboratory is going to
6 do it, which is operated by Union Carbide, that's correct.

7 MR. ARRETT: And your statement is that the
8 Environmental Impact Statement will not address the relationship
9 between Union Carbide and Westinghouse?

10 MR. CROW: That's correct.

11 MR. ARRETT: Well, let me go on record as requesting
12 that it do address that relationship, both the financial
13 and the economic relationship.

14 Let me also ask, the people you introduced as being
15 the persons who will make the Environmental Impact Statement,
16 could you tell us how many Environmental Impact Statements they
17 have prepared for fuel fabrication plants in the past, please,
18 sir?

19 MR. CROW: This is the first Environmental Impact
20 Statement that I'm aware of, because it's the first application
21 we have had for a fuel fab plant since NEPA has been in -- no,
22 that's not true. There was one prepared for the Exxon facility
23 in Richland, Washington. That was performed by Argon National
24 Laboratory.

25 The Oakridge team, we have contracted with them to

1 perform environmental impact assessments for five facilities
2 of this type just recently. It was not a complete Environmental
3 Impact Statement because it was associated not with a new
4 plant but with a renewal of a license.

5 MR. ARRETT: Would it be accurate to state that the
6 persons who are going to be preparing this Environmental Impact
7 Statement at this fuel fabrication plant have never prepared
8 an Environmental Impact Statement for a fuel fabrication plant
9 before?

10 MR. CROW: I think that's correct.

11 MR. ARRETT: Now, can you tell us who chose the
12 postulated accidents that were in Westinghouse's environmental
13 statement?

14 MR. CROW: No, I can't.

15 MR. ARRETT: Well, would it be accurate to state that
16 Westinghouse chose those postulated accidents?

17 MR. CROW: I would imagine.

18 MR. ARRETT: Will postulated accidents be addressed in
19 the Environmental Impact Statement?

20 MR. CROW: Yes, they will.

21 MR. ARRETT: And who will chose those postulated
22 accidents?

23 MR. CROW: NRC will.

24 MR. ARRETT: Now, Mr. Cellier mentioned in his
25 presentation that there were associated facilities with the plant

1 itself. Can you tell us what the associated facilities are?

2 MR. CROW: No, I can't, but Frank, would you?

3 MR. CELLIER: These are the mechanical operations
4 that don't involve nuclear materials.

5 MR. ARRETT: Like what?

6 MR. CELLIER: Like making grids and hardware items
7 that go into the fuel assembly itself. And the office building.

8 MR. ARRETT: Those are facilities that are located
9 in Prattville or in Alabama?

10 MR. CELLIER: They are located on the same site.

11 MR. ARRETT: Will the Environmental Impact Statement
12 address the environmental impact of those facilities?

13 MR. CROW: Yes.

14 MR. ARRETT: Will the Environmental Impact Statement
15 address the tax consequences to the Autauga County and to
16 Prattville and to the State of Alabama?

17 MR. CROW: Minton?

18 DR. KELLY: Yes.

19 MR. ARRETT: Could you tell us whether or not there
20 are going to be any tax advantages to Westinghouse to locate
21 the fuel fabrication plant here in Prattville?

22 DR. KELLY: Not at this time.

23 MR. ARRETT: You can't tell us?

24 DR. KELLY: At this time, we can't.

25 MR. ARRETT: Are you saying you have no information

1 from the City of Prattville or the County of Autauga or the
2 State of Alabama as to any particular tax advantages for
3 locating here?

4 DR. KELLY: Sam, what did you find out about that
5 today, if anything?

6 MR. MARTIN: We're just starting on it.

7 DR. KELLY: My socioeconomic impact man has not
8 finished making a tour yet.

9 MR. ARRETT: But it will address those considerations?

10 DR. KELLY: Yes.

11 MR. ARRETT: Can you tell us who will pay for the
12 training and who will train the technicians who are going to
13 be responsible for safety monitoring and for discharge of
14 effluent monitoring?

15 MR. CROW: Westinghouse.

16 MR. ARRETT: Westinghouse will train the people that's
17 going to be monitoring Westinghouse?

18 MR. CROW: Well, I'm talking about their employees.

19 MR. ARRETT: That's who I'm talking about, too.

20 MR. CROW: They will train their own employees, that's
21 right.

22 MR. ARRETT: And their own employees will regulate
23 and monitor -- not regulate, but monitor the discharges and
24 the safety of the facilities there?

25 MR. CROW: Yes. And NRC will audit this.

1 MR. ARRETT: All right.

2 MR. CROW: NRC will audit this to make sure it is
3 done properly.

4 MR. ARRETT: How would that be done by NRC?

5 MR. CROW: That will be done by routine inspections
6 from our Office of Inspection and Enforcement, Region II
7 Office, in Atlanta.

8 MR. ARRETT: Those are the issues that I would like
9 to see addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. CROW: Thank you, Mr. Arrett.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. CROW: By the way, you mentioned Union Carbide
14 doing the spadework for the Environmental Impact Statement,
15 and that is true. But NRC is preparing the Environmental
16 Impact Statement. We have contracted Oakridge National
17 Laboratory as a consultant to aid us in this.

18 MR. ARRETT: Can you describe to us exactly what
19 the Union Carbide responsibilities will be and what NRC's
20 responsibilities will be?

21 MR. CROW: NRC's responsibility is for the
22 Environmental Impact Statement.

23 MR. ARRETT: Does NRC intend to have federal employees
24 conducting or working in the Environmental Impact Statement --
25 working on it?

1 MR. CROW: Yes.

2 MR. ARRETT: In what capacity?

3 MR. CROW: Overseeing the Environmental Impact
4 Statement.

5 MR. ARRETT: Will there be NRC employees, federal
6 employees, here working in the Prattville area on a daily
7 basis?

8 MR. CROW: No.

9 MR. ARRETT: Will it be on a weekly basis?

10 MR. CROW: No.

11 MR. ARRETT: Will it be on a monthly basis?

12 MR. CROW: No.

13 MR. ARRETT: Can you tell us how frequently there
14 will be a government agent down here to see that Union Carbide
15 is doing the EIS correctly?

16 MR. CROW: Union Carbide, they won't be spending
17 that much time here either. We will be spending it overseeing
18 the work that Union Carbide will be doing.

19 We will make site visits here with them periodically,
20 but there is no routine period that is set up for this.

21 MR. ARRETT: Will there be a publication of the
22 NRC's findings with respect to the accomplishments being made
23 on the EIS from time to time?

24 MR. CROW: Not really. Not until the draft statement
25 is published.

1 MR. ARRETT: Is there any way that we could keep
2 up with the EIS as it is being made, or that we could keep up
3 with the Government keeping up with the EIS as it is being
4 made?

5 MR. CROW: Any issues that come to mind, you may
6 write to Dr. Shum, as I indicated, and we'll make sure they
7 are addressed in the EIS, or else tell you why they won't be.

8 MR. ARRETT: Thank you.

9 MR. CROW: Mr. Leon Thompson.

10
11 STATEMENT OF
12 LEON THOMPSON

13 MR. THOMPSON: I am Leon Thompson, president of
14 Carter Lumber Company, down the road here a little piece.
15 I'll be about a mile from Westinghouse, or a little bit less,
16 probably, and based upon the information that I have already
17 received from the pictures of the plant in Columbia, South
18 Carolina and the safety standards and so forth that they have
19 explained to us, I'm one hundred percent for this plant. And
20 I think we are very fortunate that Westinghouse has chosen
21 this vicinity.

22 I expect no business dealings with Westinghouse, no
23 monetary advantage. In fact, they might get a few of my
24 employees. But yet, I believe in my city, in my county, and
25 this vicinity -- Montgomery -- the whole state, and I just

1 welcome Westinghouse wholeheartedly.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. CROW: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

4 Those were all the people that indicated that they
5 wanted to make some comments. Again, I want to thank all of
6 you people for coming here tonight.

7 I appreciate the ones that came up and made the
8 comments. I recognize that it is not easy at times to get
9 up here and face that microphone.

10 Now, although our notice in the newspaper specified
11 that we will accept written comments from the public up until
12 April 3, 1980, we will address comments received after that
13 date, if time permits.

14 Again, these comments should be addressed to the
15 U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Attention Dr. E. Y. Shum,
16 Washington, D. C. 20555.

17 Thank you very much.

18 (Whereupon, at 9:00 o'clock, p.m., the public
19 hearing in the above-entitled matter was closed.)
20
21
22
23
24
25

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the
UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

in the matter of: LICENSE APPLICATION WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION
SCOPING HEARING

Date of Proceeding: MARCH 27, 1980

Docket Number: _____

Place of Proceeding: PRATTVILLE, ALABAMA

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript
thereof for the file of the Commission.

KENNETH W. PRICE

Official Reporter (Typed)

Kenneth W. Price

Official Reporter (Signature)