

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

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

DATE: February 4, 2016

7:04 p.m.

North Augusta Community Center

495 Brookside Avenue

North Augusta, SC 29841

Holmes Brown, Facilitator

Maxcine Maxted, Department of Energy, EA Document Manager

REPORTED BY: Claire R. Netzler, CCR

ATKINSON-BAKER, INC.

COURT REPORTERS (800) 288-3376

www.depo.com

1	FORMAL COMMENT SESSION	
2	INDEX	
3	Page Number	
4	Introduction by Mr. Holmes Brown	4
5	Mr. Terry Speirs	6
6	Ms. Maxcine Maxted	6
7	Mr. Holmes Brown	7
8	Mr. Tom Clements	9
9	Ms. Suzanne Rhodes	12
10	Ms. Pamela Greenlaw	15
11	Ms. Elaine Cooper	16
12	Ms. Dawn Gillas	17
13	Mr. Donald Bridges	18
14	Mr. Chuck Goergen	20
15	Mr. Daniel Kaminsky	22
16	Dr. Rose Hayes	24
17	Mr. Ken Kehr	27
18	Mr. Ernest Chaput	29
19	Ms. Laura Lance	30
20	Mr. Rick McLeod	33
21	Ms. Susan Parr	36
22	Ms. Brenda Bancroft	39
23	Mr. Chris Hall	40
24	Mr. Bill Lawless	43
25	Mr. David Matos	45

1	FORMAL COMMENT SESSION	
2	INDEX - continued	
3	Page Number	
4	Mr. Sandy Haskell	47
5	Mr. Charles Utley	48
6	Ms. Glenn Carroll	50
7	Ms. Gloria Tatum	52
8	Ms. Betsy Rivard	54
9	Ms. Susan Corbett	55
10	Mr. Wayne Rickman	58
11	Ms. Leslie Miner	60
12	Mr. Robert Guld	62
13	Rev. Brendolyn Jenkins Boseman	64
14	Closing Remarks by Mr. Brown	66
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 FORMAL COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC HEARING ON FEBRUARY 4, 2016

2 (In session at 7:04 p.m.)

3 MR. BROWN: Good evening. Welcome to this meeting
4 to discuss the Department of Energy's Draft Environmental
5 Assessment on a proposed project to accept used nuclear
6 fuel from the Federal Republic of Germany at the Savannah
7 River Site. I hope you had an opportunity to browse the
8 displays in the back of the room and talk with project
9 staff during the just-completed open house. My name is
10 Holmes Brown. I will serve as the Facilitator for
11 tonight's meeting. My job is to make sure the meeting
12 runs on time and that everybody has an opportunity to
13 speak. I'm not an advocate of any party or particular
14 position.

15 I will now like to explain the format and ground
16 rules to assure timely participation by everyone. The
17 slide presentation that you'll see this evening will be
18 available on the DOE Savannah River Office website at
19 sro.srs.gov and then go to the German HEU Project
20 portion, and there are a number of documents, including
21 the slideshow, available at that point. There are three
22 parts to the meeting this evening: The just-concluded
23 open house, the DOE slide presentation, and the formal
24 comment period. Both the slide presentation and the
25 formal comment period are being Webcast to a wider

1 audience. Those who wish to submit comments but prefer
2 not to speak at this meeting or appear on the Webcast can
3 do so in a number of ways, which are listed on the hand-
4 out that you received at the registration desk, and,
5 again, a reminder that all comments count equally in
6 whatever format they're submitted.

7 The public information period began with the just-
8 concluded open house and continues with a presentation by
9 the EA Document Manager, Maxcine Maxted. She also serves
10 as the Spent Nuclear Fuel Program Manager for the
11 Savannah River Site. Ms. Maxted will discuss the origins
12 and composition of the used fuel, potential
13 transportation modes and casks, alternatives for the
14 processing and disposition of the HEU and comparisons of
15 the impacts of the alternatives. She will also explain
16 the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, that
17 governs the Environmental Assessment process, and please
18 refrain from questions during the slide presentation.
19 The speakers additionally may not defer or yield their
20 assigned minutes to other speakers.

21 We will now resume the information period. I would
22 like to introduce Terry Speirs, Deputy Manager of DOE for
23 the Savannah River Site. He will offer welcoming remarks
24 and will introduce Maxcine Maxted, EA Document Manager.
25 Terry?

1 MR. SPEIRS: Thank you. As Holmes said, I am Terry
2 Speirs. I am the Deputy Manager for the Department of
3 Energy Savannah River Operations Office. I'm here this
4 evening to welcome you on behalf of the Department and
5 our contractor, Savannah River Nuclear Solutions, to our
6 public meeting on the spent nuclear fuel from Germany.
7 Welcome to all those in the public who are here with us
8 in the lovely North Augusta Community Center as well as
9 those who have joined us on our Webcast. Just to
10 reiterate what Holmes said, Maxcine Maxted will follow
11 with a presentation on the Draft EA and on its content
12 and some of the background regarding the spent nuclear
13 fuel from Germany, and then we look forward -- and really
14 the meat of this is your comments. We're here to receive
15 your comments as members of the public. We're very
16 interested in those, so we'll welcome them and we'll
17 receive them tonight either in verbal or in written form
18 as Holmes had suggested. We'll certainly be considering
19 your comments with the Final Environmental Assessment
20 when it's issued by the Department, and with that, again,
21 welcome and, Holmes, I'll turn it back over to you.

22 MR. BROWN: Okay. Maxcine Maxted will now present
23 the slide presentation.

24 MS. MAXTED: Thank you, Holmes. Thank you, Terry.
25 Welcome everyone. So I want to give you a presentation

1 on the Draft Spent Nuclear Fuel from Germany EA --
2 Environmental Assessment.

3 (Slide presentation was given from 7:10 to 7:43
4 p.m.)

5 MR. BROWN: Thank you, Ms. Maxted. This concludes
6 the information portion of the meeting. We will take a
7 five minute break while I review the sign-up sheets for
8 the people making public presentation, and we will begin
9 the public comment period at that point. Thanks very
10 much.

11 (Brief break from 7:44 to 7:53 p.m.)

12 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thanks very much. It's now time
13 to begin the formal comment period. This is your
14 opportunity to provide DOE with comments on the Draft
15 Environment Assessment. Our court reporter for tonight,
16 who was here last time, is Claire Rodriguez, who will
17 transcribe all of your statements.

18 Let me review a few ground rules for formal
19 comments. Please step up to the microphone over there
20 when your name is called, introduce yourself providing
21 your organizational affiliation where appropriate, and
22 please speak directly into the microphone. The
23 technicians say get within about three inches or so, and
24 they are adjustable, so -- since speakers come in all
25 sizes. Again, so the court reporter can get all of your

1 comments and, again, because we're Webcasting tonight to
2 make sure that the Webcast is picking up all of your
3 comments. If you have a written version of your
4 statement, please provide a copy to the court reporter
5 after you've completed your statement, and you can leave
6 them on her desk over there. I will call two names at a
7 time. The first of the speaker to come to the microphone
8 and the second person who will follow. That way we can
9 save time in transition. In view of the number of people
10 who have indicated an interest in speaking tonight, I am
11 going to ask the people to confine their statement to
12 three minutes.

13 Now, normally, we figure that there will be an hour-
14 and-a-half for speakers. We've ran a little overtime on
15 the slide presentation and so on, so what I want to do is
16 start the 90 minute period now. We've got about 30
17 speakers, so that will work out to about three minutes
18 per person. I will let the speakers know when they have
19 a minute left, so at that point if you can conclude your
20 comment. Again, if you have a statement longer than the
21 three minutes, please summarize your key points in the
22 allotted time. As we've stated before, all comments
23 count equally, so whether they're submitted as a speaker
24 or later in written form given to the court reporter,
25 they will all count equally.

1 Maxcine Maxted of DOE will be serving as the Hearing
2 Officer during this formal comment period. We ask that
3 people not ask questions or make comments. The DOE will
4 just be observing. Your questions and comments will be
5 addressed during the preparation of the Final
6 Environmental Assessment. So with that by way of
7 introduction, let's get started on those folks who have
8 signed up to speak, and our first speaker is Tom
9 Clements, and if you can -- thanks.

10 MR. CLEMENTS: Good evening, everyone. My name is
11 Tom Clements, and I am the Director of Savannah River
12 Site Watch, a public interest organization that tracks a
13 lot of the issues out at the Site. And before I begin
14 just reading some comments, I wanna say that I was the
15 one who informed the public that this project was afoot.
16 I'm still baffled as to why they left it up to me to
17 inform the public before a Citizens Advisory Board
18 Meeting, but I had heard about it from a German Bundestag
19 and people in Germany before DOE would even inform people
20 about it. And I also wanna add, I have visited the
21 Jülich facility where the casks are stored. I've met
22 with German government officials on two occasions, and
23 I've actually touched one of the casks and gone into the
24 reactor building where the AVR reactor is located. I'm
25 gonna submit some written comments and I'm also gonna

1 submit a statement from a local group, Don't Waste Aiken,
2 for the record.

3 Savannah River Site Watch is alarmed that
4 unnecessary plans are continuing to import spent fuel
5 from Germany for reprocessing at the Savannah River Site.
6 These 900,000 graphite balls are from two long-closed
7 commercial nuclear power reactors, and we feel that this
8 action must be terminated. The import and the
9 technologies you've seen presented are highly speculative
10 and will result in negative environmental impacts, and
11 actually could damage U.S. Nuclear Non-Proliferation
12 Policy. I'm just gonna read a number of bullet points
13 that are further explained in my long notes, which I
14 would be glad to email to anybody. The Europe -- under
15 European Union and German laws and regulations, export of
16 nuclear waste, except for proliferation relevant waste
17 for research reactors, is not allowed. Likewise,
18 reprocessing of commercial fuel elements is prohibited by
19 law in Germany as both the AVR and THTR were not research
20 reactors. These were experimental power reactors
21 connected to the grid. The export of spent fuel from
22 them is not permitted. A legal process has already begun
23 before the EU to block the export, and once an export
24 license application is applied for, there will be more
25 legal proceedings to begin in Germany. This is gonna be

1 hung up for many years. Next, there's been no need
2 established to do this. We've heard the presentation,
3 but the Environmental Draft and Environmental Assessment
4 does not really say why this needs to be done. While DOE
5 rhetorically claims in a few sentences that there is a
6 need, there's really no explanation of why we need to
7 import this material. In the document, DOE has rejected
8 the option of direct disposal of the graphite balls, but
9 this is the option that Germany has been planning to
10 pursue for decades. It was only in 2012 that this
11 reprocessing option came up, and if DOE wants to help
12 Germany with direct disposal, that's totally fine.
13 Despite the claims in the draft document that the project
14 is being pursued for nuclear non-proliferation reasons,
15 the DOE's National Nuclear Security Administration has
16 established there is no nuclear non-proliferation
17 concern, and I've given this memo to several of you.

18 MR. BROWN: You've got a minute left.

19 MR. CLEMENTS: Okay. We assessed this material is
20 low attractiveness, which only requires category four
21 security protection. We also assessed the material is
22 not attractive to sub-state terrorist entities in its
23 current state. Since the material is stored in a secured
24 environment in a politically stable country, it is not a
25 proliferation concern. I challenge anyone in here and

1 DOE to counter what NNSA has said about the proliferation
2 concern and why this project is being pursued if there's
3 a claim of nuclear non-proliferation. And just in
4 closing, I want to say two things: that the biggest thing
5 of concern to me is that this is part of the tip of the
6 spear to import more nuclear materials to Savannah River
7 Site. With the waste burden already at the Site, we
8 don't need that. The development of the reprocessing
9 techniques, to me, is the biggest proliferation threat
10 here, but DOE has refused to do a nuclear non-
11 proliferation impact assessment on development of those
12 reprocessing options.

13 MR. BROWN: Okay.

14 MR. CLEMENTS: Finally, the Environmental Assessment
15 should be cancelled and the whole proposal should be
16 terminated. Thank you very much.

17 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Suzanne Rhodes is next and
18 Pamela Greenlaw will follow her.

19 MS. RHODES: Okay. Thank you very much. I
20 appreciate the opportunity to speak. I represent the
21 League of Women Voters of South Carolina. The League's
22 been concerned about SRS for about fourteen years, longer
23 than I've been involved in it. I'm gonna give some
24 written comments to be added to my spoken comments here.
25 Our concern is why so much interest around the world is

1 coming -- waste are coming to SRS. Euratom, E-u-r-a-t-o-
2 m, the European Atomic Group and the World Nuclear
3 Association, among others, have clear laws and policies
4 that the country that originates waste takes care of it.
5 Germany, UK, France, and Japan all have their eyes on
6 SRS, and they're all potential leaders in their regions
7 for taking care of the country's waste there. There's no
8 good reason for these countries to dump at SRS. Now,
9 there are jobs at SRS associated with this, but let's
10 think about the big picture. I want you to use this part
11 of your brain and not your technical thing, please,
12 because we're interested in public policy issues and the
13 implications of what's going on. According to a recent
14 NRC document that I have footnoted in my report, research
15 and test reactors by definition do not produce
16 electricity. The U.S. has about 31 research and test
17 reactors for a variety of purposes. There are a bunch
18 more that went around the country for as a part of Atoms
19 for Peace back in the Eisenhower day. One of those
20 shipments was just received back at SRS. And I want --
21 it's somewhere in Southern Africa on -- I wanna say
22 Rhodesia, but I can't remember. Anyhow, those research
23 reactors that went out for study and weren't developed
24 further, legitimately came back and The League of Women
25 Voters says that's non-proliferation, and we need to get

1 those scattered waste back here taken care of. There are
2 99 operating commercial reactors in this country. We
3 have a bunch more, maybe half that many that have also
4 been licensed, operated briefly or not at all. We have a
5 pebble reactor. Although the industry's learned from
6 these reactors, we don't call them research reactors and
7 neither should Germany. The German reactors produced
8 about 31 million -- megawatts of electricity over almost
9 a 20 year period. By definition they did -- they
10 produced electricity, so they're not research reactors,
11 and this is where the fine line is.

12 MR. BROWN: You have one minute left.

13 MS. RHODES: Okay. Are we talking about U.S. origin
14 fuel? Oh my God, Westinghouse has provided reactors for
15 half the reactors in the world. It's not where the fuel
16 or the mining was, it's the country of origin. The
17 League of Women Voters is wondering what's really going
18 on. DOE headquarters is pushing this German shipment.
19 NRC headquarters was involved in a secret shipment of
20 Exelon commercial waste from Illinois to here. Japanese
21 plutonium that came largely from the UK is destined to
22 come here. These leaders need to be pushing Congress to
23 get serious about permanent repository. Thank you very
24 much.

25 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay. Pamela Greenlaw.

1 Elaine Cooper will be next.

2 MS. GREENLAW: My name is Pamela Greenlaw. I'm
3 coming as an individual concerned citizen. My comments
4 are -- some of them are actually questions, which I have
5 to ask in a different venue, but it doesn't seem to me to
6 make a lot of sense to say we have a new HTGR fuel
7 digestion process and there's no prototype, which means
8 there's no data. If you have no data, you can't analyze
9 it. If you can't analyze it, you cannot predict the
10 environmental impact. That's a no go. That's just --
11 I'm sorry. I'm an elementary school teacher. My kids
12 wouldn't have let me get away with that kind of thinking
13 at all. My second comment, and I may have misheard it.
14 I heard in the presentation that this is a 95 percent
15 reduction of fuel volume. It's not. It's a reduction of
16 the volume, but it's not a reduction of fuel. The carbon
17 sleeve is not fuel. So they're trying to do a razzle-
18 dazzle, sock-em quick, ta-ta-ta-ta-ta magic show. Don't
19 buy it. They're gonna have to really be real with us.
20 Please be real with us. You have been in many of your
21 displays. Let's continue that scientific aspect. I have
22 a question about your air quality slide that there would
23 be minor changes in the criteria that air pollutants may
24 require modification of the Clean Air Act permit. We
25 need a detailed explanation of what you mean by the

1 criteria. We also need to know what this modification of
2 the air -- Clean Air Act Permit is. We need details. We
3 can't --

4 MR. BROWN: One minute.

5 MS. GREENLAW: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, I'm
6 finishing up. The no-action alternative of keeping it in
7 Germany does not -- I don't -- and I may have misheard
8 again, but does it really preclude us from giving them
9 assistance to keep the fuel where it is in Germany?
10 Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Elaine Cooper. Dawn Gillas
12 will be next.

13 MS. COOPER: Hello. I'm Elaine Cooper from
14 Columbia, South Carolina. I have lived in South Carolina
15 for about 37, 38 years. I am live streaming this event
16 on Periscope for more of the public to participate. We
17 have several viewers here tonight who have been writing
18 in their reviews. Because we don't have much of the
19 public here tonight, we don't really have the first
20 population here that represents South Carolina. Hey, can
21 we have a show of hands of people who are here who have
22 no financial interest, that they don't have a job at
23 Savannah River Site or they weren't employed? Can we
24 have a show of hands? So you can see there's almost
25 really not many representatives of the public, so I hope

1 you do have more meetings tonight. And so it simply
2 said, I am a member of the Sierra Club, and I am frankly
3 shocked that we would even consider waste coming in from
4 Germany or any other out-of-country, out-of-state into
5 South Carolina. We have enough waste here. Thank you
6 for my children, and my grandchildren, and your
7 grandchildren, and all the community who is not
8 represented here tonight.

9 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thanks very much. Dawn Gillas
10 and Donald Bridges will be next.

11 MS. GILLAS: I'm Dawn Gillas, a member of the
12 public. The first thing I wanna say is it's the U.S.
13 origin materials from the Atoms for Peace Program, not
14 Westinghouse sending fuel over to a reactor. And through
15 that program, it does imply that the Department of Energy
16 has some responsibilities for the final disposition of
17 this material given the -- where it sits now meets
18 particular requirements, which is what this EA is talking
19 about -- all the different requirements and nothing is
20 going to be done until these requirements are met. And
21 the point that it's an experimental reactor just because
22 it put some power to the grid -- a little bit of power to
23 the grid, EBR2, which is Experimental Breeder Reactor Two
24 out in Idaho, put a little bit of power to the grid. It
25 was an experiment reactor. It was a research reactor.

1 The whole point is can this fuel do that? Can it
2 actually produce fuel to go to the grid? So it's still
3 an experimental research reactor. As far as it coming
4 here, I think it should come here. I think that the SRS
5 has the facilities, has the expertise to deal with this
6 material, which is not very common in the world, and I
7 think we should use that expertise to deal with this
8 material. And we already have here at Savannah River
9 Site a wide variety of materials that have -- each one
10 has to be dealt with and, yes, this is another one to be
11 dealt with, but we've got the expertise to do it, so I
12 think that we should do this here. And as far as the
13 transportation is concerned, it's the requirements that
14 transportation casks go through are just absolutely
15 amazing, so there's -- the shipping of it, I don't see
16 any problems with at all. So, okay, and then I have a
17 question that I'll submit later. Thank you.

18 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thanks a lot. Okay. Donald
19 Bridges, and Chuck, I think it's Goergen, is next. I
20 know he spoke last time, I should have remembered how to
21 pronounce it correctly, so let me know if I -- how I did.

22 MR. BRIDGES: My name is Donald Bridges, and I live
23 in North Augusta. I am the Chair of the Citizens for
24 Nuclear Technology Awareness Organization. We're a non-
25 profit located in Aiken, and I would like to make these

1 comments on behalf of what we refer to as CNTA. CNTA
2 would like to speak in support of receiving, processing,
3 and later preparing this nuclear material for
4 disposition. CNTA strongly supports these actions for
5 the following reasons: 1) receipt and processing of the
6 Highly Enriched Uranium serves a national interest in the
7 policy by reducing and eliminating the HEU from civil
8 commerce. In short, it serves the national interest by
9 making the world safer by removing such material from
10 potential misuse. Secondly, receipt and processing of
11 this HEU should be done in this area, because SRS is the
12 only site in the free world that could process this
13 material with the facilities, the technical expertise,
14 and the infrastructure. Third, this action provides jobs
15 for SRS in this area. It's consistent with the
16 traditional and historical role of the Site for over
17 sixty years. It's been successful both for the Site,
18 surrounding communities. The proposed work will be
19 carried out safely by well-trained operators who
20 routinely work with nuclear materials in safe, well-
21 controlled conditions. The environmental impact will be
22 negligible as determined by a very thoroughly exhaustive
23 study. Further, the entire work-scope will be funded by
24 the Germans offering a significant economic boom to the
25 area with a program that will cost as much as several

1 hundred million dollars over a four to six year period.
2 It's much needed. It would help the Site who has
3 experienced some layoffs in recent years.

4 MR. BROWN: About one minute left.

5 MR. BRIDGES: Okay. Processing this material will
6 necessarily involve some R&D but it will enhance the
7 technical expertise of the Site. Overall, this Site will
8 be a positive -- it will be a positive move for the Site.
9 It's in the best local interest. It will also serve the
10 community of both the nuclear community nationally and
11 internationally. There are a lot of reasons why the site
12 is qualified to do it. They've had excellence in safety
13 records and done this thing commonly in the past. It's
14 just well-matched to the Site capabilities, and with that
15 I close.

16 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN: Daniel Kaminsky will follow Chuck.

18 MR. GOERGEN: My name is Chuck Goergen. I am
19 retired from the Savannah River Site. I've got over 40
20 years experience in the nuclear field, and I run a
21 company called Nuclear Vision Consulting. So I am in
22 favor of the HEU material being brought from Germany to
23 the Savannah River Site for the interim storage
24 processing and disposition. I see this as an
25 international and U.S. security issue. The United States

1 has a policy objective to reduce and eventually eliminate
2 HEU from civil commerce. We were the supplier of this
3 HEU and bear some responsibility. The nuclear -- over
4 fifty heads of state support the elimination of the
5 commercial HEU, and HEU is anything that has an isotopic
6 U235 content greater than twenty-percent and this started
7 out at 90-something percent, and it's not that deep of a
8 burn, so most of that is still there. HEU can be
9 relatively easily converted into an improvised nuclear
10 device that's called an atom bomb, a radiological device,
11 or other radiological exposure device. It can be
12 shielded and most easily smuggled across borders than
13 plutonium. The unclassified amount for U235 to make a
14 nuclear weapon is 25 kilograms, so the 900 kilograms in
15 this HEU material represents many, many Hiroshima-type
16 bomb equivalents. In this case, I think SRNL has proved
17 their moniker, we put science to work, and so they have -
18 - the researchers have discovered and developed an
19 innovative flow sheet to process material that has had
20 over thirty years of research in trying to treat that
21 material and find a solution.

22 MR. BROWN: One minute left.

23 MR. GOERGEN: Okay. The receipt of this material
24 will eliminate the origin -- U.S. origin HEU and
25 processing will isotopically dilute the HEU to LEU making

1 it no longer a threat to nuclear weapons and that's
2 something that we can all benefit from. So SRS has the
3 security to protect the material until processing to the
4 waste form. SRS has the capability and experience to
5 design the equipment that protects the nuclear
6 criticality safety, the chemical processing safety, and
7 the environment, so I am in favor. I will submit these
8 comments and any other ones in writing, also.

9 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Daniel Kaminsky and
10 Rose Hayes will be next.

11 MR. KAMINSKY: Hi. I'm Dan Kaminsky speaking as a
12 member of the public this evening. I have been on the
13 Citizens Advisory Board for the past year. I also have a
14 family, a growing family, here in the CSRA. We live in
15 Beech Island, which we literally see the glow of the
16 lights and hopefully that's all that's glowing. First of
17 all, thank you for the many members of the public. I
18 invite you to attend the next Citizens Advisory Board.
19 They are published. I know it's usually populated in the
20 paper and it's also on the DOE website, so please attend.
21 It's my understanding speaking with my German colleagues
22 that these research reactors, though they were connected
23 to the grid, the actual output I believe someone stated
24 was thirty megawatts. I'd like some perspective to that.
25 We're installing a one megawatt solar panel grid at our

1 manufacturing site in Graniteville and thirty megawatts
2 over that many years is a dismal amount of energy, so
3 keep that in perspective. Comments as a public member
4 for sure if Germany can safely dispose of this on their
5 own, I welcome them to do that. If they can, do it.
6 Someone offered the advice of SRS to do that without the
7 transportation and things. I am not a nuclear expert by
8 any stretch of the imagination, but if it can be done
9 where it sits, it's probably the safest place to do it.
10 But if it has to come to SRS, which I have a strong
11 inkling that it does, sufficient funding must be
12 earmarked for this project for the short-term and the
13 long-term, and right now, Germany is signed up to provide
14 that funding. We just have to make sure that it
15 continues to flow until that product is dispositioned out
16 of South Carolina. Most importantly, the final
17 disposition of this material has to be formalized. We
18 have to have somewhere for it to go. As a citizen, I am
19 appalled that we would continue to stockpile things, add
20 to the high-level waste tanks. That's, in my opinion,
21 unacceptable. The tanks are aged. We're in the process
22 of cleaning them up so they can be systematically closed.
23 Continually adding more and more to those waste tanks is
24 not in our best interest.

25 MR. BROWN: One minute.

1 MR. KAMINSKY: Thank you. And once we do find a
2 final disposition site, let's take some of the rest of
3 the waste with it. SRS should be using some of this as
4 leverage to negotiate to get some of the things that
5 we've been promised to get off of our land for many, many
6 years to have it go with it. We have a large backlog of
7 things to clean up at the Site. We certainly don't
8 necessarily need more. This is a viable opportunity for
9 the Site to continue its operations. I do believe
10 everything that I've been told with the tours and such,
11 SRS has done everything in our best interest in a very
12 safe manner. They uphold that above everything else and
13 I have been more than pleasantly pleased at what I've
14 learned in the last year visiting the Site, so thank you.

15 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay. Rose Hayes and
16 Marilyn Parsons will follow.

17 DR. HAYES: Thank you. Aside from the safety issues
18 that have been the focus of much of the discussion this
19 evening, I'd like to address the issue of disposition.
20 It's used often in the document, the EA, and it's often
21 used in other official documents. We hear it all the
22 time. It's the end point of the plans that we are
23 constantly given. When I say, we, I served six years on
24 the Department of Energy's Site Specific Advisory Board
25 for SRS and finished my term in 2015. The term is

1 misleading to the public. There is no disposition site.
2 There is no federal repository. There is no viable plan
3 for a federal repository. It's like saying we're going
4 to build buildings without toilets. You simply can't
5 offer the public a plan for something as serious as
6 nuclear waste storage and indicate that somehow or
7 another that it eventually will be disposed of when you
8 have no plan whatsoever even on the table for this
9 mythical disposal site. Secondly, the statistics that
10 are provided here tonight are very impressive statistics
11 with high probabilities for safety. Unfortunately,
12 they're computer modeled. You can't test them. You
13 can't verify them. They're simply garbage in, garbage
14 out. That's what we used to say in the government.
15 Thirdly, even if none of this were true, SRS has never
16 been studied, tested, or licensed to be a federal
17 repository. Therefore, it's probably not even legal to
18 be sending all this stuff, whether it's domestic receipt
19 or foreign receipt, to SRS. Fourthly, H-Canyon at one
20 point was going to be taken down to min-safe or
21 shuttered. Congress was going to shut off funds. We on
22 the CAB argued against that point and some people who
23 knew a great deal about that on the CAB, the Citizens
24 Advisory Board, pointed out that first of all, if you
25 took it down to the min-safe, it was so old, we could

1 probably never bring it back to code.

2 MR. BROWN: One minute left.

3 DR. HAYES: Thank you. And secondly, that if it
4 simply was aging and then it has, you know, some years
5 left, I guess, but not all that many. And now, today,
6 maybe five or six years later, every time we're gonna
7 have a receipt at SRS, H-Canyon suddenly becomes the
8 solution. H-Canyon is old. It's aging, and its first
9 failure rate or lifespan is probably limited at this
10 point. And fifthly and finally, about the tanks, so many
11 of the process procedures that were discussed here
12 tonight talk about it ends up in the tanks. Well, the
13 tanks are behind schedule. They're leaking. They're
14 ancient. They're underground. One or more is leaking.
15 They're actually under threat of a lawsuit by the
16 Governor of South Carolina and, I believe, the Attorney
17 General. To say that we're gonna put more stuff in the
18 tanks, which are a problem into themselves right now, is
19 highly inadvisable, so I recommend that alternative that
20 says, no-action at all at least by the United States.
21 Thank you.

22 MARILYN PARSON: I'd just like to pass.

23 MR. BROWN: Oh, okay. Marilyn Parson?

24 Okay. Ken, is it Kellum?

25 MR. KEHR: Kehr.

1 MR. BROWN: If you're Ken, then you're probably the
2 right guy.

3 MR. KEHR: Actually, Ken Kehr was my father. I am
4 Ken Kehr, Jr.

5 MR. BROWN: Oh, okay.

6 MR. KEHR: And I am on the Board of the North
7 Augusta Chamber of Commerce. Tara Carroll was going to
8 deliver this letter to Ms. Tracy Williams, an EPA
9 Compliance Officer with the U.S. Department of Energy,
10 and she is unable to attend tonight, so she asked me if I
11 would read it on her behalf. Dear Ms. Williams: On
12 behalf of the Board of Directors, staff, and members of
13 the North Augusta Chamber of Commerce, thank you for the
14 opportunity to express our support of the proposal to
15 accept Highly Enriched Uranium from Germany for
16 processing. The Savannah River Site has safely managed
17 nuclear materials for sixty years. We feel it is in the
18 best interest of our national security for SRS to
19 continue leading the charge as demonstrated through
20 technology development by Savannah River National
21 Laboratory. The industry experts at SRNL have and
22 continue to provide high tech innovation that helps to
23 ensure SRS is the safest place to secure and process
24 nuclear materials. As our friends and neighbors, these
25 experts have been vital in creating a culture of

1 understanding, acceptance of the missions of the Savannah
2 River Site, and we trust them to keep us safe. Again,
3 thank you for the opportunity to express our support.
4 Sincerely, Tara Carroll, President and CEO of the North
5 Augusta Chamber of Commerce. On a personal note, what
6 I'd like to say as well, I'm a lifelong resident of North
7 Augusta. My dad was in reactor technology for 30-plus
8 years. I grew up concerned about radiation. He assured
9 me over and over again and I saw it through the parents
10 of other children that the dedication and the commitment
11 to excellence. He believed that it was the safest place
12 you could possibly be, and he believed that the mission
13 at that point in time was very, very important. I agree.
14 I think there's much more mission that SRS is going to be
15 able to provide for our community and, indeed, our world.
16 Thank you very much.

17 MR. BROWN: Thank you. So I need to call the next
18 speaker; it's Ernie Chaput. And Ernie usually needs
19 little warning to be able to speak; right? So you're
20 ready. Okay. Then Laura Lance is next.

21 MR. CHAPUT: Yes. My name is Ernest Chaput, and I'm
22 a member of the public. I'm here to make about five
23 points about the Draft EIS -- or EA. Excuse me. Number
24 one, we should always remember what the purpose of this
25 program is: it's to reduce the worldwide inventory of

1 potentially vulnerable materials, which are capable of
2 being used in nuclear weapons. Highly Enriched Uranium
3 is one of those materials. It's a long standing U.S.
4 policy to consolidate and dispose of that material and
5 that's a good policy. This supports that policy, and I
6 support that policy. Secondly, SRS has the people and
7 the infrastructure to dispose of this material and
8 perform this program safely. Thirdly, I support the
9 additional development activities, which I understand
10 would be the next step, to validate and refine the
11 alternatives and the flow sheets and the impacts and the
12 costs. That's a necessary step that needs to be done and
13 it should be done, so when the final decisions are made,
14 they are made in the light of the best available
15 information. And lastly, I support two additional tasks
16 for the Department to consider. First, I think you need
17 to develop the financial lockbox so that when money does
18 flow, we know it flows to the right places and it stays
19 in here in Savannah River. It's not skimmed off in
20 Washington and elsewhere and secondly, I think there
21 needs to be a look at alternative waste forms, which can
22 increase the options for off-site disposal using existing
23 facilities that might exist, to at least provide some
24 relief to the -- of having to wait for a national
25 repository or deep repository. There should be some more

1 options that we can use that currently exist. Thank you
2 very much.

3 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Ms. Laura Lance. Rick
4 McLeod will follow.

5 MS. LANCE: My name is Laura Lance, and I'm here as
6 a citizen not very well versed in speaking. I apologize.
7 Aiken seems to have become the epicenter for the nuclear
8 waste industry, a lucrative high-dollar gain for those
9 who work in shipping, import, and process of radioactive
10 waste, and a win-win for the many countries around the
11 world seeking to dispose of their own deadly or nuclear
12 waste. There's a reason why countries like Germany
13 aren't fighting as some of you are to have waste shipped
14 into their country. They're fighting to get rid of it.
15 Countries like Canada and Japan and the UK, which are as
16 we speak, shipping their waste to Aiken, there's a reason
17 why they're not hoarding this waste and trying to make a
18 business model of it. Over the past decade or more, our
19 town has been courted by the nuclear waste industry.
20 These corporations -- I'm having to stand on my tiptoes,
21 can you hear me if I don't?

22 MR. BROWN: You can bend -- it bends down.

23 MS. LANCE: Okay. Does that work?

24 MR. BROWN: That's fine.

25 MS. LANCE: Okay. I don't want to like yell. Our

1 town has been courted over the past, I don't know, ten or
2 fifteen years by the nuclear waste industry. They give
3 big money to charitable efforts and to schools and
4 athletics, and to the professional and campaign coffers
5 of local businesses and politicians, they put out
6 millions in ads and PR to romance the community into
7 accepting this radioactive waste. But this is all about
8 money, and for the most part, the people who embrace this
9 waste, do have moneyed interest in doing so. Going back
10 to the legacy of the existing waste that we have, there
11 was a lot of pay dirt generated in the 30 years of bomb
12 making out at the plant, but not so much money or
13 interest was invested in the necessary technologies for
14 storing and safely storing this waste. Today we're
15 flirting with relearning that lesson. It's being floated
16 under the guise of the nuclear non-proliferation despite
17 that the National Nuclear Security Administration has
18 established that there is no proliferation concern if
19 this material remains in Germany.

20 MR. BROWN: Ms. Lance, you have one minute.

21 MS. LANCE: Okay. I think if our heads weren't so
22 easily turned by the money, the people of the community
23 our jobs depend on it and that sort of thing, maybe we
24 really would be asking more questions about the wisdom of
25 trucking this radioactive -- highly radioactive waste

1 across the ocean with numerous risks that can't be
2 calculated, and also, being trucking and barged inland by
3 -- on rail bed, whatever, where at any point along the
4 way, it is a potential target of sabotage or accident,
5 and ditto once it, you know, safely arrives at the plant.
6 That's an ongoing risk which has yet to be properly
7 calculated. The ongoing nuclear waste shipments to SRS
8 -- and they have been ongoing for years now -- they
9 remind me of the life in the old roach motel ad: they
10 check in, but they don't check out. It's the height of
11 human folly to expect that this waste is going to be
12 brought to Aiken and then be taken to this mythological
13 repository that doesn't yet exist, and as it stands right
14 now, all of the waste that is brought here is ours to
15 keep forever, and there is no amount of money that can
16 make that right.

17 MR. BROWN: Okay. Rick McLeod.

18 MR. McLEOD: I hope the time doesn't start until I
19 get up there.

20 MR. BROWN: No, it doesn't. And Susan Parr will be
21 following Rick.

22 MR. McLEOD: My name is Rick McLeod. I'm the
23 Executive Director of the SRS Community Reuse
24 Organization, and I plan on reading a letter that I'll
25 leave with the court reporter. Our organization, the

1 Savannah River Site Community Reuse Organization, or
2 SRSCRO, is the U.S. Department of Energy's designated
3 community reuse organization for the Savannah River Site.
4 It is governed by a twenty-two member Board of Directors
5 composed of business, government, and academic leaders
6 from Georgia and South Carolina. The SRSCRO is a
7 501(c)(3) private non-profit organization charged with
8 developing and implementing a comprehensive strategy to
9 diversify the economy of a designated five county region
10 of Georgia and South Carolina. SRSCRO counties include
11 Aiken, Allendale, and Barnwell in South Carolina and
12 Augusta -- and Richmond-Augusta and also Columbia
13 counties in Georgia. The SRSCRO is focused on the
14 missions at SRS and ensuring the Site maintains its role
15 as part of this nation's natural security structure. It
16 is our understanding that following this public comment
17 period, DOE will either issue a NEPA determination called
18 a FONSI, or Finding of No Significant Impact, or announce
19 its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.
20 However, even if these actions are taken, they do not
21 constitute a decision by DOE to accept the German
22 material, but will be used to help formulate that
23 decision. We'd like to receive confirmation of this
24 understanding. We believe DOE should strongly consider
25 preparing an EIS due to the duration, complexity, and

1 other uncertainties about the project. As stated during
2 the public scoping meeting, we believe that Savannah
3 River Site has the capability to safely handle and
4 process the German HEU. We further support the
5 involvement of the Savannah River National Laboratory and
6 its research efforts related to this program.
7 Furthermore, we understand additional activities must be
8 completed before DOE can make a decision on the
9 acceptance of the German material. These include: 1)
10 irradiated sample testing to confirm anticipated fission
11 products pathways; 2) development of a pilot scale system
12 including the remote handling of the CASTOR casks; 3) a
13 Technology Readiness Assessment to confirm the
14 Engineering Scale of the system has been achieved; and 4)
15 fourth, establishment of a full cost recovery contract
16 with the appropriate government entities. We support
17 waiting on these results before these activities --
18 results from these activities before a final decision is
19 made. We do believe this project has the potential of
20 rendering the U.S. origin HEU in a form no longer usable
21 for an improvised nuclear device, a radiological
22 dispersal device, or other radiological exposure devices.
23 Before any decision is made to accept transport, process,
24 and disposition the HEU compliance with all applicable
25 requirements of U.S. laws and DOE requirements, including

1 NEPA, must be met and resolution of any technical,
2 financial, and legal issues resolved. If a decision is
3 made to accept this material, it must be under a full
4 cost recovery scenario as mentioned previously.

5 MR. BROWN: Sorry, but is your letter just about
6 over?

7 MR. McLEOD: It is.

8 MR. BROWN: Okay. I didn't wanna interrupt, but
9 your time --

10 MR. McLEOD: This includes the appropriate legal
11 framework or agreements to implement the project. We
12 request such an agreement include a Community Commitment
13 Plan from the German government. Such a plan is part of
14 several existing DOE contracts and is included in the
15 Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation section
16 970.5226-3 and also in 48CFR970.2673. This project will
17 benefit greatly from its location in South Carolina and
18 from the work force and other resources provided by the
19 region. In recognition of these benefits, the German
20 government should take meaningful action to implement its
21 community commitment as described in those regulations.
22 While we fully support DOE's objective in --

23 MR. BROWN: Excuse me. Is this your last paragraph?

24 MR. McLEOD: -- pursuing this project, a major
25 concern for our region and state is that the proposed

1 nuclear material and other nuclear material currently
2 here or coming to South Carolina -- to SRS will
3 ultimately have a disposition path out of SRS. We
4 appreciate the opportunity for comments. Thank you.

5 MR. BROWN: Okay. Again, if your statement's gonna
6 run a little longer than three minutes, try and summarize
7 your key points and the court reporter can fill things
8 out. Okay. Susan Parr is our current speaker and Brenda
9 Newman Bancroft will follow.

10 MS. PARR: Good evening. My name is Sue Parr as in
11 Jack, not Carr. I am the President of the Augusta Metro
12 Chamber of Commerce. Our organization serves as a
13 platform for over a thousand businesses in the CSRA
14 region who wish to voice their opinions on matters of
15 public policy at the local, state, and federal levels.
16 So we appreciate the opportunity to provide some thoughts
17 and comments this evening. For over 60 years, the
18 Savannah River Site has provided outstanding leadership
19 in its missions to manage nuclear materials. Its
20 facilities, human capital, and expertise represent the
21 best in the industry and in many respects, the world.
22 The scientists, researchers, and workers at SRS are our
23 neighbors and friends. We trust them to keep our
24 community safe as they carry out the missions that have
25 been entrusted to them by our nation. In the world of

1 international nuclear material management, the United
2 States must, without a doubt, assume and maintain a
3 leadership role, especially at a time when we have the
4 capabilities to offer innovation in an increasingly
5 complex environment. As challenges and opportunities
6 mold an ever-evolving industry, we have a responsibility
7 long-term to discover and implement the technologies that
8 will lead to an even safer and stabilized future for
9 nuclear materials. U.S. superiority in developing and
10 implementing technologies that minimize HEU and pioneer
11 the safest and securest disposition of proliferant
12 materials is already being demonstrated at the Site. The
13 HTGR project exemplifies the capabilities of SRS as a
14 preeminent resource our nation and the world can depend
15 on. As the surrounding community, we are very proud of
16 this distinction. We are here this evening to let you
17 know that our community overwhelmingly embraces our role
18 as a region vital to the future of solving some of the
19 world's most difficult problems. Our region has worked
20 very hard to cultivate an environment and culture that
21 supports and understands the importance of Savannah River
22 Site. We believe the relationship between the Site and
23 the community serves as a model for our nation, and for
24 what could be accomplished through education and
25 awareness where value and appreciation for the missions

1 of the Site grow every day.

2 MR. BROWN: Okay. You have one minute left.

3 MS. PARR: Savannah River Site represents a
4 compelling solution for the future of national and
5 international technical leadership in the nuclear
6 industry and is worthy of the opportunity to implement
7 its plan for HTGR. Its unique assets should be valued
8 for the state of our capabilities that they are in
9 maximized for the betterment of our country and our
10 world. Thank you very much.

11 MR. BROWN: Okay. Brenda Bancroft and Chris Hall
12 will be next.

13 MS. BANCROFT: First, I'd like to thank DOE for your
14 presentation, and I am an outsider. I'd like to thank
15 the CAB, the Citizens Advisory Board for sending me their
16 material for the past twenty years. I'd like to go back
17 to something that you said. You mentioned President
18 Eisenhower. Show me the document or tell me where I can
19 find the document where President Eisenhower said that we
20 would be responsible for the material, the spent
21 material. If there's a document out there, a treaty,
22 this is not about non-proliferation. It is not. And if
23 there is a document out there, a treaty that says that we
24 have to accept this material, I would like to see it. If
25 not, because I think the United States should honor their

1 treaties, they should do what they say they're going to
2 do. If President Eisenhower said we would be responsible
3 for it, I think we should be responsible for it, but I
4 don't think that document exists. I think that Germany
5 should be responsible for this, and I thought about it
6 before I came here tonight. I am an outsider, but I am a
7 citizen. I'm a grandmother. I've lived in the area for
8 a very long time. I know it means jobs and I'm sorry for
9 that. We are losing jobs in the United States of
10 America. We certainly are, but when it comes to
11 accepting this material, which is not attractive to
12 terrorists, I think that we should go back and look at
13 what the DOE has given us to clean up what we already
14 have at the Savannah River Site. I'm sorry, but that
15 history is not an easy one to look at. We were
16 promised --

17 MR. BROWN: One minute left.

18 MS. BANCROFT: One minute. So I'm not for bringing
19 it here. I don't think we should bring it here, and I --
20 like I said, I'm sorry that we're going to lose jobs, but
21 like we are losing jobs. And it's frightening to come
22 here before you, because I don't know everything that you
23 know, but I do know that when money -- when DOE puts
24 money out there, which you just recently excluded the
25 Savannah River Site when you decided to give money to the

1 different sites to record the history. Why were we
2 excluded? I don't understand that. I know a lot about
3 history and I know that the people in New Ellington, I
4 hear that history all the time, and it's going to be lost
5 because you excluded the Savannah River Site.

6 MR. BROWN: If you could wrap it up, please.

7 MS. BANCROFT: I'm finished and I appreciate your
8 time.

9 MR. BROWN: Okay. Chris Hall and then Bill Lawless.

10 MR. HALL: Good evening. My name's Chris Hall, and
11 I'm a resident of Aiken and I'm also the new Chapter
12 Chair for the South Carolina Sierra Club, and my comments
13 reflect both. The Sierra Club in South Carolina is an
14 organization that represents 20,000 members and
15 supporters, and I've come here to express our disapproval
16 for this project. I've got some notes here that I want
17 to read off, but first I want to make a comment on the
18 fact that I've heard several times this evening that we
19 know how to handle it. The only thing I can say to that
20 is tell that to the people of Barnwell. For the last ten
21 years, we've been gauging legal measures against Chem
22 Nuclear as well as South Carolina Department of Health
23 Environmental Control because of a weak area in Barnwell.
24 While we appreciate the long history of the Savannah
25 River Site and its role in the Cold War and defending our

1 country, we're also aware of the terrible toxic legacy
2 left behind from that mission. As a community and as a
3 state, we know the importance of clean-up and remediation
4 for all the radioactive and other deadly contaminants
5 created or brought here, and this should be the main
6 focus of our work and of the DOE budget. It is with that
7 in mind that we must voice our opposition to any more
8 waste being brought here. SRS was not built or intended
9 to be a dumping site for the radioactive waste. Already
10 we've received radioactive garbage that we are having
11 trouble getting rid of. Exit strategies are often
12 dependent on available budgets, cooperative partners,
13 legislative and administrative changes, and new
14 regulatory policies. The uncertainty of what to do with
15 all the world's radioactive waste weighs heavily on all
16 citizens with sites like SRS in their backyards. We know
17 the level of expertise and the operative facilities must
18 make it an attractive location to many around the world
19 who simply think it's easier to send their waste to us
20 than to deal with it themselves. But the people of South
21 Carolina are not interested in continuing to be a dumping
22 location in the long chain of nuclear possibilities.
23 Other countries who want nuclear power, nuclear research,
24 or nuclear medical facilities must bear the risk, cost,
25 and burden of the radioactive waste created in these

1 processes.

2 MR. BROWN: One minute.

3 MR. HALL: These highly industrialized countries are
4 perfectly capable of handling this waste, and by allowing
5 them to shirk their responsibilities, we risk the likely
6 scenario of the U.S. becoming the world's nuclear waste
7 dump. Bringing 900,000 highly radioactive granite spent
8 fuel balls for processing at SRS will only add to the
9 burden of waste at the Site. The people of South
10 Carolina and citizens of Aiken want clean-up, not more
11 waste. Let the people of Germany and all the other
12 countries deal with their own nuclear waste and not look
13 to the U.S. and, specifically, South Carolina and our
14 area here in Aiken as their permanent solution to an
15 unsolvable problem. Thank you.

16 MR. BROWN: Thanks. Okay. Bill Lawless and David
17 Matos is next.

18 MR. LAWLESS: Hi, my name is Bill Lawless. I teach
19 at Paine College. I live in Augusta, Georgia. I
20 recommend that we take the German's spent nuclear fuel
21 for several reasons. First off, the Savannah River Site
22 is technically qualified. You've got enhanced jobs at
23 the Savannah River Site. It would keep H-Canyon, if
24 that's the option chosen, active. H-Canyon is one of the
25 nation's top assets in this area and it's something that

1 we should keep active. SRS has the top safety record.
2 SRS has the top environmental record. I've heard some
3 scare stories tonight about the terrible releases that
4 would come if we took this. As a comparison, if you look
5 at just the human body, from health physics society are
6 our bodies naturally radioactive? Yes. So if you sleep
7 with someone in North Augusta, you're gonna be getting
8 more radiation than you will get from the Savannah River
9 Site. It will reduce proliferation. Once processed,
10 this would lead to vitrification. If it's vitrified, it
11 could be disposed at will. It allows the United States
12 to keep its commitment. Some years ago when I was on the
13 Citizens Advisory Board, we worked out a deal with DHEC,
14 that's the Department of Health and Environmental
15 Control, and the Savannah River Site where the -- this
16 was a really nice deal. We would take in one drum of
17 transuranic waste from Mound and other sites and we would
18 send two drums of transuranic waste to WIPP. It was an
19 extraordinary deal and it cleaned up the transuranic
20 waste at the Savannah River Site. We've got rid of --

21 MR. BROWN: One minute left.

22 MR. HALL: We got rid of all the waste of -- that
23 was a legacy transuranic waste. So here's the deal I
24 propose. We make a deal on this German spent nuclear
25 fuel. We take it for the right to ship Savannah River

1 Site vitrify -- it's vitrified high level waste to WIPP,
2 especially it's vitrified high level waste that can be
3 relabeled as transuranic waste, and that's something that
4 the Citizens Advisory Board should take up as a motion.
5 I even heard tonight another scare statement was that
6 there are leaking tanks. That tells me, and I heard this
7 from a former Citizens Advisory Board member -- that
8 tells me that you can be on the Citizens Advisory Board
9 for six years and not learn anything. That's all I've
10 got to say.

11 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you. David Matos. Sandy
12 Haskell will be after David.

13 MR. MATOS: Good evening. My name is David Matos.
14 I'm a twenty year resident of Aiken County, and I'm also
15 the President of the Carolina Peace Resource Center.
16 It's a non-profit that focuses on peace, justice, and
17 environmental issues. We've been coming to hearings on
18 various DOE projects for many, many years and heard some
19 bad ideas that didn't get through and, unfortunately, I
20 think as it stands, this one is a bad idea. I don't
21 think you can live in Aiken or the area and not
22 understand that once nuclear waste lands somewhere, it is
23 very hard to move it somewhere else, and that seems to be
24 the big problem with this proposal to accept German
25 shipments of Highly Enriched Uranium waste for processing

1 at the Savannah River Site. Well, we already have -- you
2 know, they thought by now we would figure out the
3 commercial waste problem. Yucca Mountain has failed. I
4 know people say it's about politics; no, it's because it
5 will leak. WIPP has had a fire. We have problems with
6 WIPP and it was not designed to take the high -- the
7 plutonium legacy wastes that are planned to be sent
8 there. So we still have not figured out this problem and
9 we probably won't figure out that problem any time soon
10 with this new German HEU waste. So we have to honestly
11 consider the possibility that it will be long-term or
12 permanently held at the Savannah River Site and what is
13 the economic liability of that? We heard, you know, it
14 would be the height of irresponsibility for the Germans
15 to ship it to us without us having established how we're
16 gonna deal with the long-term disposal. We need to have
17 a deep geologic isolation of these waste materials and we
18 don't have a means to do it. We have it lined up so this
19 is more waste. We need to clean up and not pile up. I
20 am very concerned with what I heard about them using the
21 tank farms for this, and my understanding of the tank
22 farms issue is that it has been kited so far out to us to
23 finally clean up this and we're having a race against the
24 clock, because we are concerned that the tanks could
25 leak. We are concerned that material could get out, and

1 now we have German nuclear waste that's gonna be cut into
2 somehow this process and we're juggling these balls
3 already with all these tanks, and now we wanna add a
4 million more balls to that juggling act.

5 MR. BROWN: One minute.

6 MR. MATOS: Okay. So, you know, there's a lot been
7 said about whether there's a proliferation risk with this
8 waste and stuff like that. I do think the best idea is
9 to keep it where it is at, especially since we don't have
10 an idea of what we're gonna do with it long-term. You
11 know, if there's a proliferation risk, then shipping it
12 by rail via port facilities that are easily surveilled is
13 a risk, and the economic consequences of that being
14 attacked and disbursed in the environment needs to be
15 honestly considered, Charleston's tourism industry and
16 the port industry. Let's look into that. Is it a non-
17 proliferation risk? If it's a non-proliferation risk
18 then it's a risk of being attacked and the materials
19 being released into the environment. It's called shape-
20 charge, not blunt-force, people. That's not the problem
21 there. So thank you very much. We have to consider
22 South Carolina. We have to consider our environment, and
23 we have to consider future generations. We should not
24 accept that waste into our country and into South
25 Carolina without a plan to actually deal with it

1 permanently and put it somewhere. Thank you.

2 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thanks. Sandy Haskell and
3 Charles Utley will follow.

4 MR. HASKELL: Good evening. I'm Sandy Haskell. I'm
5 a native of Aiken County, and I would like to voice my
6 support in bringing the nuclear material to SRS. SRS has
7 demonstrated for over sixty years that they have the
8 ability and the capabilities to safely and efficiently
9 process nuclear material. The Savannah River National
10 Lab is world renowned in their abilities to create
11 technologies and the means to properly and safely also
12 handle nuclear materials. By bringing this material back
13 to the U.S. where it originated, it would hopefully keep
14 the material out of the hands of people that might want
15 to use it for nefarious activities. And the fourth point
16 is the Germans have accepted responsibility economically,
17 which will hopefully minimize the impact to the U.S. tax
18 payer. And with all this, I would voice my support in
19 bringing the material back. Thank you very much.

20 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Charles Utley and Glenn
21 Carroll will be next.

22 MR. UTLEY: Good afternoon. I'm Charles Utley with
23 the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League and with the
24 Highland Park Improvement Committee. And I stand here
25 before you this afternoon and I'm kinda puzzled for one

1 thing, because I thought we have had this conversation
2 before where we renownly said that we didn't want any
3 foreign waste, and that it went before the CAB and the
4 CAB said it's -- I just don't know how many times we have
5 to keep bringing it before us, but, however, it's before
6 us again tonight. And I wanna thank Tom Clements if he's
7 still here because I had written a piece, because I
8 thought I was not going to have an opportunity to respond
9 to this request. But, however, it is and I've heard your
10 requests and I noticed you said things that -- you said,
11 a little. There was little effect on the economic, the
12 air, the environmental justice, those who live in
13 proximity. They were little. And I like to look at a
14 little, because for a moment you said, 25,000 tons, a
15 little, that's gonna travel across a big ocean. That's a
16 large impact. If everything was equal, you know what we
17 would be doing tonight? We would be discussing the
18 little impact it has on Bamberg that closed a little
19 hospital that no one seemed to care about. That would be
20 an impact. That's one of the things that I would say if
21 we were really interested in the impact, little has a
22 great deal when you're talking to whomever you're
23 speaking to, and the word little may have a different
24 meaning. It could mean huge. It has a huge impact on
25 those who are with children, those who are looking for

1 children, those who desire to have good jobs, and by the
2 way, it's not about jobs. It's not about jobs. It's
3 about the almighty dollar. If we got away with the
4 dollar then we okay with the job. You just said it had
5 very little economic impact. A little, which means it
6 has no impact on the poor man or the one who needs the
7 job, because those who will have the job, are gonna keep
8 the job and that's a huge thing. So it depends on how
9 you use little. So we have to be careful in how we use
10 little because it does have an impact and the one thing
11 we have a little of is a plan. You don't have a plan.

12 MR. BROWN: You have about one minute left. Sorry.

13 MR. UTLEY: You have little to no plan, and without
14 a plan, you can't do anything. So I'm gonna say, get a
15 plan, clean it up, and don't come with something little,
16 but come with something huge that is gonna be something
17 that's gonna stay where it is. If you make the mess, my
18 mom say you clean it up. So go clean up your own German
19 waste. I think they are able, I think they are capable,
20 and God knows we don't need it. And good evening.

21 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Glenn will be followed by
22 Gloria Tatum.

23 MS. CARROLL: I'm very appreciative of the
24 thoughtful comments I've heard tonight. My name is Glenn
25 Carroll. I'm Coordinator of Nuclear Watch South. We're

1 based in Georgia, and we've come over tonight because
2 Savannah River Site affects Georgian's, too. We have
3 more than a thousand members in our Grassroots Group in
4 Georgia and South Carolina. We say, no nuclear waste
5 imports to Savannah River Site. The Germans are already
6 dealing with these pebbles very effectively in robust
7 casks as waste. What we have seen tonight from the
8 Environment Assessment is sketchy plans to transport and
9 process the spent German fuel to make it into waste.
10 Now, the NNSA says it's not a terrorist threat. We've
11 described very hard and iffy maybe processes to get those
12 grains out of some waste that is protecting it right now.
13 We don't know that our government -- unless we get phase
14 two going and those millions more dollars, we don't know
15 if we can get those grains out, why do we think
16 terrorists can get those little itty-bitty grains out and
17 mount them up and hurt us? It's illegal in Germany to
18 export the waste. A little respect for international
19 law. Now, I have been following this and I really didn't
20 think we were gonna have to come out again tonight for
21 this loser idea, but here we are. And I have a
22 credibility issue with DOE. You're calling these
23 reactors research reactors and they are not and this is a
24 legal term and it matters. They're experimental
25 reactors. That's why it's illegal in Germany to export

1 the waste to the U.S., and the Julich reactor had an
2 accident, so it's all crapped up and that wasn't
3 mentioned and that's a big deal. So I feel like this is
4 very much being misrepresented to the public, but I would
5 like to give a little credit to DOE's marketing plan.
6 We're gonna digest the radioactive waste. Yum, yum. And
7 I'm hungry, we need to get out of here, but I love this
8 one --

9 MR. BROWN: Okay. You need to wrap it up. You've
10 got a minute.

11 MS. CARROLL: Vaping is all the rage. What? Bite
12 the radioactive waste. Come on! So I do like the idea
13 of assisting Germany. Do I have time left?

14 MR. BROWN: Yes, one minute.

15 MS. CARROLL: Well, let's get this done and eat.
16 Thank you for not bringing the German waste here. We
17 need to get on with it. There's work to be done.
18 Germany is sophisticated. Technically, they are doing a
19 really good job containing the waste now. The no-action
20 alternative is the one. Thank you very much.

21 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Gloria Tatum and Betsy
22 Rivard will follow Gloria.

23 MS. TATUM: Good evening. My name's Gloria Tatum.
24 I'm an individual citizen, and the Savannah River Site
25 must not become an international nuclear waste dump.

1 This is a wet, rainy area where groundwater in some
2 places is only a few feet below the ground. This is not
3 a good area for an international nuclear waste dump site.
4 For over seventy years, scientists have not been able to
5 come up with a solution for a safe long-term -- and by
6 long-term, I mean hundreds of thousands of years, because
7 that's how long it will take to keep some of these
8 elements that are dangerous out of the environment.
9 There's no solution for this nuclear waste. We have some
10 interim solutions, but no long-term solution, and a wet
11 area like Savannah River Site is not a good option.
12 Germany is quite capable of taking care of their own
13 commercial spent fuel. Savannah River doesn't even know
14 how to do that, so why are they bringing it over here?
15 We have -- this would just add more radiation --
16 radioactive nuclear waste to the already overburdened
17 radioactive waste at Savannah River Site. I mean, maybe
18 they should put the nuclear waste and let people in North
19 Augusta sleep with it, because it seems that sleeping
20 with each other is more dangerous than sleeping with the
21 nuclear waste, so maybe they could put it there in
22 everybody's bed. This misguided and dangerous plan to
23 bring more radioactive commercial spent fuel from Germany
24 is not about non-proliferation, it's about money. Money,
25 M-O-N-E-Y. This is what this is about.

1 MR. BROWN: You have one minute.

2 MS. TATUM: Money for everyone along the line from
3 the ships to the transporting it over land to the
4 majority of the people in this room who will make profits
5 off of that to the Savannah National Lab. This is a
6 shameful way to make money by endangering the health of
7 citizens, future generations, and the environment.
8 Anyone who tells you there is little risk of increased
9 cancer from more nuclear waste, they are lying to you.
10 Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN: Okay. Betsy Rivard and Susan Corbett.

12 MS. RIVARD: Hi. I'm Betsy Rivard and I'm from
13 Atlanta. There have been some great comments. I don't
14 know if I can add anything to the wonderful comments that
15 have been made, but I am for the no-action alternative.
16 I think that the German waste should stay in Germany. We
17 don't need more waste in South Carolina. I live in
18 Georgia across the river, I don't really want more waste
19 in South Carolina. I think that there's plenty of work
20 in dealing with the waste that's already at Savannah
21 River Site, and I'm sure there's jobs in that -- cleaning
22 up that waste. I believe that this is against the German
23 law, and I do think that it should be considered
24 commercial nuclear waste and that is something that is
25 illegal in Germany and in the European Union. I think

1 that there will be a lot of waste created in this taking
2 apart of the graphite balls. I appreciated the
3 illustration about the -- or saying that the very
4 radioactive part would be reduced to the size of a milk
5 carton in, you know, one of these CASTOR casks, but I
6 think that that -- all that graphite is contaminated, so
7 that's gonna take a lot more volume. I wish the
8 slideshow would actually show how much waste is generated
9 in the different options. I think, you know, it's kind
10 of disingenuous to say that, you know, it's only a milk
11 carton full. It's not really quite accurate, I think.
12 And I wonder about these comments what -- I know it's
13 part of NEPA and that the public is allowed to make
14 comments, but what impact do they actually have on the
15 final decision? I would love to know that. That's never
16 been explained to me.

17 MR. BROWN: Just one minute left.

18 MS. RIVARD: Pardon me?

19 MR. BROWN: One minute.

20 MS. RIVARD: Okay. Well, I'm pretty much finished.
21 I do think that I probably will feel funny eating black
22 sesame seeds from here on out.

23 MR. BROWN: Okay. Susan Corbett and Wayne Rickman
24 is next.

25 MS. CORBETT: Good evening. My name is Susan

1 Corbett. I live over in Lexington, South Carolina, and I
2 am also on the Board of the Sierra Club Chapter -- South
3 Carolina Chapter. I'll try to get through this. I have
4 four pages, but I will try to speak quickly. I was doing
5 some research today on two international health
6 environmental health groups -- New York-based Blacksmith
7 Institute, Green Cross Switzerland -- indentifying the
8 top toxic pollutants in the world that are putting
9 hundreds of millions of people at risk and they are in no
10 particular order: lead, mercury, arsenic, chromium,
11 pesticides, and radionuclides. Radioactive materials are
12 dangerous. They're carcinogenic, they're toxic. There's
13 no safe level of exposure, and I don't care what bogus
14 comparisons you make about sleeping with someone, it's
15 not the same as ingesting cesium, plutonium, strontium,
16 tritium, or all those other things. The world has a
17 problem with nuclear waste. Nuclear activities have
18 created some of the most dangerous contaminated sites in
19 the world. Places like Cellfield, England, Washington --
20 Hanford, Washington, Mayak, Russia. The world has also
21 managed to stockpile hundreds of thousands of tons of
22 radioactive spent fuel from commercial reactors, and to
23 date there's really no permanent solution anywhere. If
24 you could go down a list of proposed permanent sites
25 around the world, they're all in discussion, still

1 locating, talking about it. Onkalo, Finland is probably
2 the only one that's actually being built, so it's easy to
3 understand why a functioning facility like SRS would
4 suddenly become a very attractive target. But I'm here
5 to say that the one solution that we should not be
6 allowed -- that should not be allowed is for the U.S. and
7 specifically for Savannah River is that we are gonna be
8 the end game in this global problem. And I don't think
9 that the Department of Energy should be in the business
10 of targeting our country as the world's nuclear waste
11 repository, nor South Carolina and SRS as the dumping
12 ground for more radioactive garbage. Under various
13 guises such as a country of origin, a nuclear security,
14 the DOE is trying to bring waste in from all over the
15 world, and we have to ask why. In this particular case,
16 the information says that there's no proliferation risk,
17 Germany is a highly sophisticated company and -- country,
18 and even the directive from the NNSA says that we should,
19 quote, help Germany develop and implement an appropriate
20 disposition pathway for this material.

21 MR. BROWN: Okay. If you can hit your key points
22 within the next minute.

23 MS. CORBETT: Yes, one more minute.

24 MR. BROWN: Okay.

25 MS. CORBETT: We don't think that's a -- that South

1 Carolina is an appropriate solution. Let me just say
2 this: Savannah River Site is already one of the most -- I
3 don't know where the people who advocate for bringing
4 this here think it's gonna go. The Yucca Mountain is not
5 gonna open; okay? It has too many problems. WIPP has
6 already exploded in our faces. We can't even keep one
7 site open for fifty years. Where do they think this is
8 gonna go? Savannah River Site is already awash in some
9 of the most contaminated materials, carcogenic, volatile
10 organic compounds, radioactive materials. To allow DOE
11 to dump yet another generation of deadly waste in our
12 state in the hopes that some day we will find another
13 state to be our exit strategy is irresponsible on the
14 part of the DOE. The elected officials and public
15 officials who sanction it and not in keeping with the
16 wishes of the majority of South Carolinians, we say, stop
17 opening the door for nuclear waste, make other countries
18 be responsible for their waste, and we call for the no-
19 action alternative. Thank you,

20 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay. Wayne Rickman and
21 Leslie Miner.

22 MR. RICKMAN: Hi. I'm Wayne Rickman, and I'm a
23 resident of Aiken, a retired submarine officer, and a
24 member of the Board of CNTA. The Savannah River Site
25 from inception has been in the forefront of national

1 security among other national defense related roles,
2 their capabilities, their professionalism, and the
3 dedication of the SRS employees is clearly demonstrated
4 in the Vital National Security Program of Non-
5 Proliferation and Nuclear Threat Reduction. With the
6 dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, the control and
7 reduction of nuclear materials has been and continues to
8 be of the highest priority. In this case, the U.S.
9 objective, the minimization of Highly Enriched Uranium is
10 met by returning this fuel to the United States for safe
11 storage and stabilization. The stabilization will result
12 in HEU being place in a form no longer usable for
13 improvised nuclear device or radiological dispersion
14 device or other radiological exposure devices. Savannah
15 River Site contains two national assets: the Savannah
16 River National Laboratory and H-Canyon. The Savannah
17 River National Laboratory has and continues to perform at
18 the highest level, securing, packaging, and shipping
19 nuclear materials worldwide. H-Canyon is the only large
20 hardened nuclear material processing facility in the
21 United States capable of disposing of HEU so that it's
22 not usable in any terrorist nuclear device. Given the
23 proven capabilities of Savannah River National Laboratory
24 to design a safe process and a proven credible nuclear
25 operational safety record of the H-Canyon personnel,

1 these two observations confirms and reinforces the
2 proposal that this important and vital necessary
3 operation should be conducted at SRS. The safety record
4 of the employees at SRS is excellent, and having
5 personally reviewed other DOE sites management safety
6 process, my assessment is that DOE could not have picked
7 a better, safer, more capable site for this necessary
8 non-proliferation mission of securing and stabilization
9 of the nuclear materials, than SRS.

10 MR. BROWN: Okay. One more minute.

11 MR. RICKMAN: This proposal allows the confluence of
12 these two national priorities and principles to combine
13 with the two identical -- two identified national assets
14 here at SRS to reduce the threat margin for the citizens
15 of the United States and allow the world to be a safer
16 place. Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay. It's Leslie, you're
18 next, and Robert Guld will follow.

19 MS. MINERD: Hi. I'm Leslie MinerD. I live in
20 Columbia, South Carolina, and I'm here to agree with the
21 option of do nothing. The reason is when I hear the
22 expression of German engineering I get this idea of this
23 country that knows what to do with technology and cars,
24 aside from that Jetta TDI I had. Do not buy a Volkswagen
25 TDI. I'm telling you. But other than that, I don't see

1 why we're having to take their waste. I think it's
2 setting a very bad precedent. If it was Afghanistan or
3 the Democratic Republic of Congo, I would say, you know,
4 maybe, but opening the doors to a country such as Germany
5 for their waste, it's sending a bad signal -- we're easy,
6 which brings us back to what Bill Lawless said. I am
7 renouncing my flesh after what he told me. Anyway, since
8 the failure of that -- okay, back to us being easy.
9 Since of the failure of Yucca, there was the suggestion
10 by I guess it's Argonne National Labs that basically what
11 it boiled down to from my analysis of it was they were
12 suggesting that South Carolina become the new Yucca
13 Mountain, and that's really what we fear. Not only are
14 we going to become the national repository, but this is
15 sending the message that, hey, the heck with that, let's
16 just be the international repository for nuclear waste.
17 And the south -- I know some of you might not agree with
18 this, but I hope y'all are scientifically minded. The
19 planet is warming up, and the prediction is that the
20 Southeast is going to be getting a lot more rain. I just
21 found out the other day in Columbia, South Carolina last
22 year, we received eighty-four inches of rain. My
23 business, which isn't even near a river or a creek, but
24 it's downhill. I'm in this building that's sixteen-feet
25 underground, it flooded for ten days. We are living in a

1 wet climate and it's gonna get wetter. This is not a
2 good place to be setting yourself up to be the
3 international repository for nuclear waste.

4 MR. BROWN: Okay. You got about one minute left.

5 MS. MINERD: Okay. Yeah, I'm pretty much done. I
6 was just gonna say, yeah, this guy, I think he knows a
7 lot more about any of this than most of us here, Mr.
8 Jackson Crocker, and he said says this is not a
9 proliferation threat, so let's go with that. Thanks.

10 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you. Next, Robert Guld,
11 and Reverend Brendolyn Jenkins Boseman will follow
12 Robert.

13 MR. GULD: My name is Bob Guld. I practice
14 Environmental Law in Columbia, South Carolina, and I
15 volunteer with the Sierra Club. I wanna speak against
16 this proposal and urge that the DOE reject this notion of
17 bringing German nuclear waste to Savannah River Site. I
18 want to endorse the comments I heard from many others. I
19 won't attempt to repeat them. Those opposed in this
20 idea. The point I want to make is this represents in my
21 view a fundamental breach of faith by the Department of
22 Energy with the people of South Carolina. They promised
23 us that there was an exit strategy for the high level
24 nuclear waste accumulating in these corroding, leaking
25 steel tanks, and when they agreed to take more of this at

1 a point where they are behind schedule and where they
2 refuse to meet their existing commitments to safely
3 manage the high level waste accumulated already at the
4 Site, that represents a fundamental breach of faith. And
5 although I don't agree with our Governor on much, I must
6 say that the notion of suing the Department of Energy to
7 make them honor their legal commitments to the people of
8 South Carolina is very attractive to me. I think the
9 Environmental Assessment is flawed in many respects. I
10 heard someone say that risk assessments that are based on
11 no actual historic experience and can't be field verified
12 are not of any value, and I think the more than a
13 thousand former Department of Energy Savannah River Site
14 workers who died waiting for compensation for the
15 injuries caused by exposure to radioactive materials and
16 other toxins while working at this facility, ought to
17 count for something in your risk calculation instead of
18 the near zero value that you have put by worker and
19 public health risks. That they may put the lie to this
20 Environmental Assessment and you need to reconsider it.
21 In Sierra Club's experience, this represents yet another
22 trail of a series of failed technologies, the leaking
23 tanks, the leaking Chem Nuclear low level waste burial
24 ground that's already contaminating surface streams,
25 having left a plume of tritium over a half mile outside

1 of the burial trenches.

2 MR. BROWN: You have one minute left.

3 MR. GULD: The failure to demonstrate a need for
4 this proposal where the Germans are managing it just fine
5 in secured casks, you want to convert this material
6 that's now safe and secure in solid form into a liquid in
7 the H-Canyon? That is insane. There is no proliferation
8 risk. There's a flawed cost analysis. This represents
9 SRS mission creep in the most extreme. And we heard the
10 honest answer from somebody with the boosters here:
11 hundreds of millions of dollars over several years to
12 manage this stuff. That's what's really this is about.
13 This is about trying to create a mission when you should
14 be cleaning up the mess you already have, and then all
15 you bright folks who work out there, turn your talents to
16 researching clean energy, clean technology. Let's do
17 something good at Savannah River Site instead of
18 proliferating nuclear waste. Thank you.

19 MR. BROWN: Okay. The Reverend Brendolyn Jenkins
20 Boseman.

21 REV. BOSEMAN: Good evening. I am Reverend
22 Brendolyn Jenkins Boseman. I'm a local pastor in
23 Augusta, Georgia, and I serve as the Executive Director
24 of the Immani Group, a community based non-profit where
25 one of our programmatic areas is environmental justice.

1 I serve as a community partner on environmental justice
2 issues at Savannah River Site for the EPA, and I'm a
3 former Co-Chair of the Savannah River Site Citizen's
4 Advisory Board, and to my brother and my colleague, I did
5 learn something. I thank you for the opportunity to
6 stand tonight to voice my adamant opposition on the
7 reception and storage of additional spent nuclear fuel
8 from Germany. My reasoning is as follows: We have no
9 place for permanent storage of materials currently at
10 Savannah River Site, much less an inception and the
11 acceptance of one million units, balls, units for -- of
12 spent nuclear fuel from another country. Secondly, SRS,
13 my backyard, South Carolina should not be the dumping
14 ground for these materials even as I understand the
15 capacity and competence of the tremendous workforce at
16 Savannah River Site. They are world class employees and
17 we applaud that. Thirdly, we have no clear path for it
18 for geological repository, no path for it for one in the
19 near future. The reception of the spent nuclear fuel
20 rods present a potential environmental hazard beyond epic
21 proportions. Fifthly, the transport of these materials
22 from our port through communities that do not have shared
23 nor common communicated emergency preparedness plans.
24 Six, public health -- the public health impact that is
25 not acceptable even for a minimal increase in

1 radiological emissions. The slide said, one in fifty or
2 one in one-hundred. That sounds minimal unless you are
3 the one. Seventh, although SRS may have capacity to
4 store this material, this technology has not been proven
5 successful. My recommendation is provide all the
6 assistance to Germany and allow them to keep the
7 materials there. Finally, the executive order on
8 environmental justice means meaningful involvement of
9 communities, minority and low-income communities, so I
10 stand to invite this body from the Department of Energy
11 to join us as at our next environmental justice community
12 meeting and meaningfully share this information with
13 those impacted communities. Thank you.

14 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. That concludes the
15 list of folks who had signed up to speak tonight. We've
16 run a bit over time. I appreciate your patience, and
17 mainly I appreciate people taking the time to come and
18 listen to the -- show and offer your comments. So with
19 that, we are adjourned. Thanks.

20 (Meeting adjourned at 9:26 p.m.)

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25

1 CERTIFICATE

2 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

3 AIKEN COUNTY

4 I hereby certify that the foregoing meeting
5 transcript, consisting of pages 4 through 66 was taken
6 down by me and transcribed by me and that the same is a
7 true, correct and complete transcript of said meeting.

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

11 This the 16th day of February, 2016.

12

13

14

15

Claire R. Netzler, CCR

16

Certified Court Reporter and

17

Notary Public

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25