

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
26

PUBLIC HEARING
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE
DISPOSAL OF GREATER-THAN-CLASS C (GCC)
LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE AND GCC-LIKE WASTE

- - - - -

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PUBLIC HEARING

Before Laurie M. Hannon-Stair, Certified Court Reporter

At the North Augusta Community Center

495 Brookside Avenue, North Augusta, South Carolina

On April 19, 2011, Commencing at 6:30 p.m.

- - - - -

APPEARANCES

Hosting Public Hearing For the Department of Energy:

Facilitator: Mr. Holmes Brown

- - - - -

INDEX TO PUBLIC HEARING

Page

INTRODUCTION BY MR. BROWN 3

PUBLIC COMMENTS 5

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER 31

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
26

1 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PUBLIC HEARING
2 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE
3 DISPOSAL OF GREATER-THAN-CLASS C (GCC) LOW-LEVEL
4 RADIOACTIVE WASTE AND GCC-LIKE WASTE

5 (Pursuant to O.C.G.A. 9-11-28(d), Augusta West
6 Reporting has no contract with any of the parties or
7 their counsel. The court reporter's charges are the
8 usual and customary charges for services within the
9 industry and are available upon request by either
10 party, with no financial or services discount being
11 given to any party.)

12 - - - - -

13 INTRODUCTION

14 MR. BROWN: It is now time to receive your
15 comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
16 This is your opportunity to provide to DOE with oral
17 comments on the Draft EIS, including what you would
18 like to see as a preferred alternative and/or what path
19 DOE should consider in developing a preferred
20 alternative for inclusion in the final EIS. The court
21 reporter will transcribe your comments for the
22 administrative record. Our court reporter for tonight
23 is Laurie Hannon-Stair. DOE has stated how critical
24 your input is to the development of the EIS. This
25 evening's format is designed to ensure that all
26 interested parties have equal opportunity to provide

1 input. In terms of proceeding I'll ask those who
2 signed up to please come up to the microphone over
3 there when your name is called, introduce yourself,
4 providing an organizational affiliation where
5 appropriate. If you have a written version of your
6 statement please provide a copy to the court reporter
7 after you've concluded your remarks. Also please give
8 the reporter any additional attachments to your
9 statement that you would like entered into the
10 transcript. Each will be labeled and submitted for
11 inclusion in the formal record. I will call two names
12 at a time, first of the speaker and second of the
13 person who will follow. Due to the number of people
14 who have signed up to speak tonight we can actually be
15 fairly liberal in allowing a speaking time. These
16 meetings are scheduled to run through 9:30, the reason
17 being that there are ten meetings--I believe nine
18 meetings scheduled, the number which we expect to have
19 a lot of our people speaking so we have through 9:30.
20 What I am going to suggest is that for variety sake to
21 give the public a bit of a break to confine your
22 initial remarks to 5 minutes. At the 5-minute mark I
23 will hold up this beautifully handcrafted sign to
24 indicate that if you want to draw at least your initial
25 remarks to a close at 5 minutes and then we can go on
26 to the next speaker. If time remains, as I think there

1 will through the 9:30, if folks then want to come back
2 and complete their remarks they can do so. So with
3 that I--way of introduction, Arnie Edelman will be
4 serving as the hearing officer for the Department of
5 Energy during this formal comment period. He will not
6 be responding to any questions or comments during this
7 comment period. And with that let me call our first
8 speaker, Suzanne Rhodes, and she will be followed by
9 Louis Zeller.

10 - - - - -

11 PUBLIC COMMENTS

12 MS. SUZANNE RHODES: Thank you very much, Holmes
13 and Mr. Edelman. Whoever picked this location gets an
14 A-plus. It is the most beautiful public meeting I've
15 been to. It's a nice place to even walk around. I am
16 Suzanne Rhodes. I am here today representing the
17 League of Women Voters in South Carolina. The League
18 has a long history of leadership and citizen action and
19 education on nuclear issues in South Carolina.
20 Currently we are concerned regarding proposals to bring
21 even more of the nation's greater-than-class C waste to
22 Savannah River. The SR team already has extensive
23 health and safety responsibilities for much of the
24 nation's legacy curies and there are no exit strategies
25 really. The site is large but the soil could allow
26 rapid contamination and movement of groundwater in

1 event of accidents, and that was obviously recognized
2 in EIS. More than 30 years ago South Carolinians stood
3 almost alone in urging federal attention for the
4 permanent management of defense waste accumulated at
5 Savannah River Site and elsewhere. Actually several of
6 the governments got together and tried to apply some
7 leverage in connection with another project. The
8 League was part of the concerned community in South
9 Carolina and today the League strongly opposes
10 proposals that suggest we become a storage site for
11 even more defense waste as well as commercial nuclear
12 waste which so far we pretty well kept off the SRS
13 site. We wish to credit the managers of the site as
14 they have made important progresses from the legacy
15 waste at SRS and also the movement of plutonium and
16 other weapons materials from other nations to the SRS
17 for safekeeping. We did not oppose that by any means
18 and it has serious challenges. The League applauds the
19 ingenious strategy that was taken to expedite waste
20 management by taking advantage of funds from the
21 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the stimulus
22 monies. Using those monies SRS trained local workers,
23 some previously unemployed, to repack the transuranic
24 waste among other activities. Much of this TRU waste
25 has been or will be shipped to the only permanent
26 nuclear waste geologic storage site in the world. I

1 hope I haven't picked my words too carefully but U.S.
2 really does have the only permanent site, and that of
3 course is New Mexico in Carlsbad. Well, that's great but many
4 other TRU wastes are at SRS and they're not ship-able
5 and will remain there indefinitely. The League
6 definitely supports proper management of existing waste
7 for on-site storage at SRS. We anticipate that those
8 greater-than-class C waste already at SRS will remain
9 there in a safe manner and that's reasonable. We think
10 it's reasonable. But we think transporting more waste
11 to SRS is neither fair nor reasonable and I'm really
12 glad that Mr. Edelman mentioned the Nuclear Waste
13 Policy Act limitation. But I think a combination of a
14 no-action alternative and some sort of HOSS
15 consideration should be considered for these
16 greater-than-class C waste. Nothing in the act is
17 sacred. We've already broken several of the pieces for
18 very good reasons and this would be another one that
19 deserves some serious consideration. Because although
20 not part of the original plan the current practice of
21 default nuclear waste storage at existing defense and
22 commercial sites has been our goal for the most part.
23 Professionals at these sites are knowledgeable and
24 respectful of their responsibilities. Transporting
25 waste generates more wastes. It creates citizen
26 concern and it's expensive. Unless there is a site

1 specific safety issue all nuclear waste should remain
2 where they are until we have a permanent plan and it's
3 been demonstrated and South Carolina should surely not
4 receive any more of the nation's nuclear waste. Thank
5 you very much.

6 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Louis Zeller is next and
7 Steve Geddes will follow Louis.

8 MR. LOUIS ZELLER: Thank you. I appreciate this
9 opportunity. My name is Louis Zeller and I'm the
10 science director with the Blue Ridge Environmental
11 Defense League. The Blue Ridge Environmental Defense
12 League opposes the Department of Energy's plan to
13 dispose a greater-than-class C waste at Savannah River
14 Site. Central Savannah River area must not become the
15 dumping ground for hundreds of millions of curies of
16 radioactive waste from the nation's nuclear power
17 plants. Further, we oppose transporting this dangerous
18 waste to any other Department of Energy site in New
19 Mexico, Nevada, Idaho or Washington. We have had
20 enough. Today I passed out some flyers here. I'd ask
21 people to show them if you've got one and if you
22 support this position. Now, the presentation earlier
23 was quite correct about the types of waste
24 which--included in greater-than-class C. The one which
25 is the most worrisome is the activated metals which
26 come from nuclear reactors. 98 percent of the

1 radioactivity would come from these power plants. A
2 relatively minuscule part of that is so-called medical
3 waste. Medical waste is not the problem here, nuclear
4 power is the problem. In our news letter which I left
5 over back on the bench back at that--by the doorway
6 coming in I have reproduced a map from the Department
7 of Energy's files from our own files from 1985 which
8 show crystalline repository rock sites, seven in three
9 Southeastern states, and also the Savannah River Site
10 superimposed on this map. These seven sites for
11 high-level nuclear waste were never removed from the
12 Department of Energy's list of suitable sites in 1988
13 when the law changed. What we are looking at, we
14 believe, is the camel's nose under the tent. If we
15 take a little bit of waste this year or next year would
16 we be willing to take a little bit more. We have had
17 enough. We do have a recommendation that is that store
18 greater-than-class C radioactive waste in secure
19 facilities at or near the site of generation. This
20 approach offers many advantages over the methods
21 proposed by the Department of Energy. Also manage
22 greater-than-class C in environmental secure safe,
23 retrievable facilities, keep greater-than-class C
24 facilities, which require little or no energy are
25 resistant to terrorist attack and are not centralized,
26 and abandon plans to bury the waste at Savannah River

1 Site or any other Department of Energy site. Thank you
2 very much.

3 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Steve Geddes, and Peter
4 Evans will be next.

5 MR. STEVE GEDDES: Thank you, Mr. Brown, Mr.
6 Edelman, members of staff, ladies and gentlemen. My
7 name is Steve Geddes. I've just got a short--short
8 comment here. And basically it starts with the initial
9 mission of Savannah River Plant, SRS, which was the
10 production of materials required to build atomic bombs.
11 In fulfilling that mission a certain amount of
12 munition, mostly radiological in nature, was
13 distributed at various locations on the site. The
14 current mission or one of the current missions of the
15 plant is often described as one of environmental
16 remediation to correct those problems. The future use
17 of this 300-plus square miles--square-mile piece of
18 South Carolina property has not been definitively
19 agreed upon by congress. Two possible uses that have
20 been proposed are the creation of either a national
21 energy research park or the creation of a national
22 environmental research park. Either of these
23 possibilities of a combination of the two would seem to
24 be a worthwhile use for this area, certainly a use that
25 would reward the State of South Carolina and its
26 citizens for the sacrifices it made when it allowed the

1 removal of this county-sized area from the general use
2 of the state proper. This being the case I think SRS
3 should be considered a candidate for the location of
4 proposed nuclear waste disposal site only if such
5 location would have no negative impact on the eventual
6 use of the site for either of the two proposed uses
7 previously mentioned. Uses which in addition to the
8 stated purposes of either proposal could also provide
9 considerable access to large areas of the site for
10 recreational use by the general public. A second
11 consideration, should SRS be selected as one of the
12 preferred options for disposal of this waste is that
13 the proposed location of the disposal site is in an
14 area not currently in use for waste management. This
15 would seem to be counterproductive to the end use of
16 the site for either of the two suggested proposals or
17 for the eventual uses of much of the area by the
18 general public. Consideration should be given to using
19 areas currently in use for waste management or areas
20 contiguous to same to eliminate this point of concern
21 in future years. Thank you.

22 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Peter Evans who will be
23 followed by Dr. Rose Hayes.

24 MR. PETER EVANS: Hi. I am Peter Evans, resident
25 of Aiken, no affiliations. I actually want to thank
26 everybody for being here to give the presentation and

1 give us a chance to give our thoughts on this. The SRS
2 is located in a large and growing metropolitan area.
3 When you have the people who are dependent upon the
4 Savannah River for drinking water the people in
5 Savannah, Beaufort and many other people in Hilton Head
6 it is even much larger metropolitan area. When
7 radioactive material is stored at the SRS, whether
8 above the ground or underground, there is always a risk
9 of leakage into the ground. This risk is amplified by
10 the earthquake fault lines that are in the SRS area.
11 We are put at further risk by the fact that the SRS
12 does not continuously monitor the Savannah River for
13 radioactive leaks. Heaven help us if radioactivity
14 gets into our aquifer or into the Savannah River. The
15 group Citizens for Nuclear Technology awareness has
16 lobbied for more nuclear activity to come to Aiken.
17 This group, many represent people either currently or
18 previously involved with the nuclear industry, however
19 they do not speak for the general populous. It is time
20 that the focus be upon some additional jobs or not be a
21 promise of additional jobs of income for the area.
22 This would cease in the event of a substantial nuclear
23 accident. The focus must be on the health and well
24 being of the many people living in the area. The SRS
25 is not the place for storage of any nuclear materials.
26 The materials here must be removed and no nuclear

1 materials should ever be brought here again. Thank
2 you.

3 MR. BROWN: Thank you, David. Dr. Rose Hayes, and
4 Sarah Taylor will be next.

5 DR. ROSE HAYES: Good evening and thank you so
6 much for coming to our community to seek out the
7 public's opinion on your proposed environmental impact
8 statement. I think that a number of people were we to
9 do a public opinion poll in the Aiken-Savannah River
10 area would indicate that they're not comfortable with
11 the idea of Savannah River receiving any more nuclear
12 waste materials. Many people in our area feel that the
13 Savannah River Site is becoming a sort of a nuclear
14 waste dump or Yucca Mountain Plan B and it is not
15 studied or tested for permanent or long-term storage of
16 nuclear waste materials. It is a site that was planned
17 to process certain kinds of legacy materials, both--and
18 research materials that are both foreign and domestic
19 in origin and to disposition those materials offsite.
20 And for a long time, as you all know, Yucca Mountain
21 was the proposed federal repository for receiving that
22 waste. The waste--the inventory at Savannah River now
23 includes but certainly is not limited to
24 greater-than-class C low-level radioactive waste, 37
25 million gallons of liquid radioactive waste in 49 old,
26 underground tanks, tons of non-liquid plutonium and

1 uranium left from the Cold War nuclear weapons
2 production era, that's what we call the legacy waste as
3 opposed to spent nuclear fuel or nuclear fuel from
4 commercial reactors. There is a facility at SRS called
5 El Basin which is 90-percent full, its pool, where
6 spent nuclear fuel rods are stored and their origin is
7 both domestic and foreign reactors, research reactors.
8 I underline research reactors not commercial. When
9 processing operations in the defense waste processing
10 facility are completed there will be estimated three
11 buildings containing 7,000 vitrified logs put in
12 canisters of radioactive waste that is then put in
13 subsurface vaults and secured with very thick walls of
14 grit or cement. All of this is very centrally
15 contained at SRS. You would be amazed at the
16 redundancy and the safety at SRS with this material.
17 But the fact remains that it was never scheduled to
18 remain long term and definitely not permanent at SRS.
19 As a matter of fact, it was always scheduled for
20 disposition one way or another. There have been
21 government commitments for that. In 1982 the Nuclear
22 Waste Policy Act was passed and eventually Yucca
23 Mountain was designated the site to which much of this
24 waste was to be dispositioned. Of course you are all
25 familiar the Yucca Mountain controversy. We all know
26 that it was studied and studied and scientifically

1 verified and billions of dollars were spent to
2 determine that it could in fact adequately perform its
3 mission. President George Bush declared the site ready
4 for its mission and--and paved a way for license
5 application to go forward to NRC. There is a public
6 law, number 107-107 which required the plan be
7 submitted to congress by February 2001 and that plan
8 would designate how and when this waste would be
9 dispositioned from the Savannah River Site and from the
10 state of South Carolina. Of course we know that the
11 application for Yucca Mountain has now been withdrawn
12 and we know that Public Law 107-107, although it is
13 still in effect, has been ignored. The Savannah River
14 Site Citizens Advisory Board, nuclear materials
15 committee, of which I chair, and I am speaking here as
16 a private citizen tonight, not for the Citizens
17 Advisory Board, but I just want you to be aware that
18 this committee, the nuclear materials committee, has
19 put forward a recommendation to DOE which includes the
20 suggestion that no more waste be shipped into the
21 Savannah River Site until some of it starts being
22 dispositioned as the government has committed to do.
23 Given these facts and public opinion, which Thomas
24 Jefferson said was the lord of the universe, I would
25 suggest that the administration develop and fund--life
26 cycle fund a comprehensive national nuclear waste

1 management policy that would include using Yucca
2 Mountain and WIPP as interim, and I underline interim,
3 storage and repositories for all nuclear waste whether
4 it's high level or low level. Additionally, the
5 administration should cancel all plans to permanently
6 store any kind of nuclear waste in geological sites,
7 deep geological sites, near trenches, above-ground dry
8 cast, and I think that's what you refer to here as--as
9 dry storage. Instead the Nuclear--or National Nuclear
10 Waste Management Policy should include a back end of
11 the nuclear production cycle which focuses on promising
12 new technologies, technologies that would burn fuel
13 down to low level with short path lives. That I think
14 should be the end goal of nuclear waste management.
15 And again, I remain an advocate supporter of the use of
16 WIPP at Yucca Mountain but not Savannah River Site.
17 Savannah River Site has not been studied for or
18 declared to be the site which can guarantee public
19 safety and health or security from terrorists or those
20 who would use these materials for ill purposes. Thank
21 you.

22 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Sarah Taylor. And Stewart
23 Fox will be after Sarah.

24 MS. SARAH TAYLOR: Hi. I am a small business
25 person and a small farmer in Aiken County. I am a
26 private citizen. I want to record my opposition to

1 having class-C waste stored in Savannah River Site. I
2 wonder, and probably all of us in the back of our mind
3 are wondering, did the Japanese have these meetings.
4 That's something that's quite chilling that we should
5 really look around and see how many empty seats we see
6 here, how many of us can make a difference to our
7 government in light of what has happened in--in Japan.
8 And we certainly do not need more waste here in South
9 Carolina. As a biologist I also am concerned about the
10 350-plus square miles of the Savannah River Site
11 itself, what will happen to it as it's been a 50-year
12 laboratory which can--has some pristine qualities to it
13 in spite of the fact that plutonium being in--the
14 tonnage of the area. But I do believe that they are
15 managing well but we do not need more waste coming in.
16 We do not need a repeat of Japan's scenario here and we
17 need to abridge our neighbors and our friends to be
18 educated about this problem before it becomes a bigger
19 problem. Thank you.

20 MR. BROWN: Thank you. And Stewart Fox.

21 MR. FOX: Stewart Fox is an error.

22 MR. BROWN: Oh.

23 MR. FOX: I signed up for the wrong place.

24 MR. BROWN: Okay. Well, we'll make sure your name
25 gets on the right list. Thank you. Well, that brings
26 up Glenn Carroll. Sorry I didn't give you much

1 warning. And Glenn will be followed by Debbie Parker.

2 MS. GLENN CARROLL: My name is Glenn Carroll and I
3 am coordinator of Nuclear Watch South. We're based in
4 Atlanta, Georgia. Appreciate of Fukushima being
5 acknowledged tonight. I felt like, you know, that song
6 how can the sun keep on shining, how can the birds keep
7 on flying. You know, it seems like everything has
8 changed except the nuclear industry. And it's
9 interesting to be here tonight. This issue has been
10 really hard to wrap my mind around. It's been really
11 hard to actually identify what greater-than-class C
12 waste is. And I want to comment on--the most positive
13 thing I can think of saying is here we are together
14 making it up as we go so I'm glad I'm here because I
15 trust my thinking, I trust my responses to what I see.
16 One of the things that grieves me and leaves me at a
17 loss for words is that I thought everybody would know
18 the world changed when Fukushima happened, and yet the
19 game has been studiously brought back to the same old,
20 same old. It's relatively safe if you don't count
21 three major meltdowns in 30 years. That's one every
22 ten years when each of our facilities have a point of
23 1.23 probability of a problem. We produced three major
24 can't-happen accidents in 30 years, and this is not
25 counting your less--your less-than-well-known
26 accidents. Of course I'm referring to Three Mile

1 Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima, which isn't even been
2 an issue yet. We've got bazillions of gallons of
3 radioactive water and we hope there isn't an earthquake
4 that shatters the building. And so some of the things
5 that lump out at me tonight and we will enter some more
6 formal comments. By the way, there is a call, but
7 several groups have signed a letter requesting an
8 extension to the comment period as most of the documents
9 in the EIS have not been available until recently so
10 hopefully that--that deadline extension will happen. I
11 want to call foul. You don't put out a Draft EIS for
12 public comment and then reserve your preferred
13 alternative for the final that will receive the public
14 comment. So that just isn't right. The preferred
15 alternatives that Nuclear Watch South promotes is a
16 hardened on-site storage interim approach somewhat like
17 we've crafted principles which are available on our
18 nonukesyall.org website. You can read these principles
19 for storage. And since we're making it up as we go
20 let's not do anything hasty and let's keep this really,
21 really hot stuff that is not that big and is already,
22 according to several speakers tonight, being safely
23 stored at the site for a generation it should remain
24 there. I think the sealed sources do need a different
25 look. They are out all over the place under an
26 agreement state status. That is pretty squirrely.

1 Most of that stuff is nuclear waste that got repackaged
2 and sold as a source and I think that does need a
3 different consideration. Those need to be reigned back
4 in. Now, can anybody think of this, we're having this
5 problem, why do we keep doing it, why do we keep
6 sending this stuff out there that we're scratching our
7 heads now trying to figure out what to do with it. Oh,
8 we might clean up West Valley but we're going to decide
9 and in ten years maybe we won't clean up West Valley.
10 How can you make a decision like this when everything
11 keeps changing. The phrase comes to mind, I'm afraid
12 this will be offensive, you can't argue with a sick
13 mind. Why am I here? That's supposed to get a laugh.
14 So another thing that caught my attention was that most
15 of the activated metals that we're talking about
16 haven't been generated yet. Now, that's good news.
17 Let's not do it. We have got to figure this out.
18 Nuclear power died at Three Mile Island. It's still
19 dead. There is a mission--there is a mission for the
20 bulk of the people in this room that receive their
21 employment in this industry. We do have nuclear waste
22 to take care of. We do need to develop the technology.
23 We don't need to dump it in trenches and we don't need
24 to be moving it around and changing it into--trying to
25 change it into other things and creating new waste
26 streams. There is a future for this industry and it is

1 long. We have radioactive factories. We're talking
2 about them tonight and they need to be dismantled and
3 we don't know how and we don't know where the money is.
4 And we have the high-level spent nuclear fuel and we
5 don't know what to do with it and we're not going to
6 reprocess it and we are wasting time and we need a new
7 mission for the nuclear industry. There is work to be
8 done. We need to get this spent fuel out of the pools
9 and into hardened storage. And so our--we promote the
10 HOSS alternative. We're crying foul that you don't
11 include that now and that you claim that you'll figure
12 out what you want later after you're done hearing from
13 us. And that will do me for tonight. Thank you.

14 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Debbie Parker, and Rick
15 McLeod will be next.

16 MS. DEBBIE PARKER: Thank you for giving me this
17 opportunity to speak. My name is Debbie Parker and I
18 am the legislative director for Conservation Voters of
19 South Carolina. We serve as a non partisan political
20 voice of South Carolina's conservation community and we
21 coordinate with over 40 organizations to promote a
22 healthy, clean future for our state. Our coalition
23 represents over 45,000 citizens in South Carolina. We
24 deeply appreciate the important role that Savannah
25 River Site has played in our nation's defense. Our own
26 organization has developed strong and positive

1 relationships with our state's military community in
2 support of efforts to reduce our country's dependence
3 on foreign oil and promote its national security. As
4 you may know, the conservation community in South
5 Carolina has played a constructive role in discussions
6 about the future of nuclear energy in our state. We
7 know that meeting our country's future energy needs
8 will take a balanced approach and that we need to look
9 openly and objectively at all of our energy options.
10 However our community has also worked hard to establish
11 consensus on nuclear waste as South Carolina has
12 already carried more than its fair share of the
13 national nuclear waste burden. In 2000 our community
14 helped negotiate the Atlantic Compact which closed the
15 Barnwell Nuclear Waste Site to all states but South
16 Carolina and Connecticut and New Jersey. Efforts to
17 undo the Atlantic Compact in 2007 led to a spirited and
18 successful defense of the Compact. In short, South
19 Carolina has spoken firmly and finally on the issue of
20 importing nuclear waste to our state. We therefore
21 strongly oppose any effort to consider SRS as a
22 possible repository of greater-than-class C and
23 GTCC-like waste. First there is the obvious geologic
24 environmental unsuitability of the site. SRS has sandy
25 soils and a wet climate making it highly unsuitable for
26 any kind of nuclear waste disposal near the surface.

1 Two obvious and possible storage options being
2 considered for GCC waste, surface vaults and trenches
3 are especially incompatible for SRS. Second, any
4 proposal to bring GCC waste to SRS actually violates
5 the current stated of mission of the site which is to
6 reduce the concentration and longevity of high-level
7 waste currently onsite. The Department of Energy's own
8 Office of Environmental Management, which is heading
9 the SRS cleanup effort, has stated that footprint
10 reduction is a major goal and our nation's taxpayers
11 have devoted nearly \$1.6 billion in Recovery Act Funds
12 toward that goal. Opening SRS to GCC waste runs
13 exactly counter to this effort. And finally, bringing
14 GCC waste to SRS makes little sense considering how far
15 behind the facility is in meeting its waste reduction
16 mission. In its comments opposing GCC at Savannah
17 River Site back in 2007 our South Carolina Department
18 of Health and Environmental Control observed
19 approximately 36 million gallons of high-level mixed
20 wastes are stored in aging tanks with leak sites while
21 there is no currently no operating treatment facility
22 for the majority of that volume. A substantial volume
23 of transuranic waste remains in storage at SRS awaiting
24 appropriate disposition. Radioactive contamination
25 remains in many areas slated for future cleanup
26 decisions. Disposal of greater-than-class C and

1 GTCC-like waste is in appropriate at SRS given the
2 current cleanup backlog. Thus the conservation voters
3 of South Carolina has two immediate suggestions. As
4 you know, during DOE's group of meetings in 2007 many
5 Americans offered hardened on-site storage as the best
6 storage alternative. All long-term solution is
7 formulated. With hardened on-site storage GCC waste
8 and irradiated spent fuel remains at commercial nuclear
9 power plants in long-term storage so that it can be
10 monitored and detected. While HOSS is not a permanent
11 solution it provides a safe way of storing waste until
12 a scientifically sound solution is found. Second, we
13 recommend that DOE not proceed with the final EIS for
14 greater-than-class C waste but rather develop a new
15 Draft EIS that includes HOSS facilities as the best
16 non-solution for GTCC waste and then seek a permanent
17 geologic disposal site for GTCC waste disposal that
18 reflects our best science, not politics. Thank you.

19 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Rick McLeod, and then
20 Charles Utley will then follow.

21 MR. RICK MCLEOD: I'm Rick McLeod, the executive
22 director of the SRS Community ReUse Organization. I'd
23 like to read a letter into the record and then at the
24 conclusion leave a copy for your files. Dear Mr.
25 Edelman, our organization, Savannah River Site
26 Community ReUse Organization, does not support the

1 selection of Savannah River Site as a potential
2 candidate for the disposal of greater-than-class C or
3 greater-than-class C-like waste under the scope of the
4 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The SRSCRO was
5 the U.S. Department of Energy's designated community
6 re-use organization. We are charged with developing
7 and implementing a comprehensive strategy to diversify
8 the economy of a five-county region in the Central
9 Savannah River area of Georgia and South Carolina. The
10 SRSCRO is governed by a 22-member board of directors
11 composed of business, government, academic leaders from
12 Georgia from South Carolina. Initially its mission was
13 to develop and implement a regional economic
14 development plan utilizing technology-based facilities
15 at Savannah River Site. Today SRSCRO remains focused
16 on the regions of county by supporting new business
17 ventures that create new jobs in our region. The
18 disposal record class-C waste and greater-than-class
19 C-like waste from offsite is not compatible with local
20 and regional manues (phonetic) plans. The SRSCRO
21 believes since disposal of off-site waste as SRS may
22 ultimately affect future industrial recruitment, job
23 creation and overall the common health of the region.
24 Our community has been supporting missions at SRS for
25 over 50 years, a testament to SRS's outstanding record
26 of safety and performance, compliance and contribution

1 to our region and state. While we were confident
2 that--that SRS current handles the disposal of
3 low-level radioactive waste generated onsite and in a
4 technically acceptable and safe manner the disposal of
5 greater-than-class C waste and greater-than-class
6 C-like waste at SRS would violate one of the
7 community's guiding principles, no waste or excess
8 material should be brought into South Carolina unless
9 an approved and funded pathway exists for its
10 processing the shipment to either a customer or an
11 out-of-state waste disposal facility. It appears to
12 the SRSCRO the disposal in the geologic repository like
13 Yucca Mountain and/or the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant,
14 WIPP, is a more appropriate approach for this type of
15 waste stream and provides the additional level of
16 safety, security, reliability to deter and eliminate
17 any terrorist access to radioactive sealed sources and
18 such waste. Thank you for allowing us to voice--our
19 voice to be heard and participate in the Draft EIS
20 meeting.

21 MR. BROWN: All right. Thanks very much. Charles
22 Utley is next.

23 MR. CHARLES UTLEY: Good evening. Thank you for
24 this opportunity to speak with you this afternoon. And
25 I'm kind of perplexed in that the idea that we are on
26 Earth Day discussing what we are discussing. It is

1 disgusting to have to discuss what we are, disgusting,
2 and that we would be considering the idea of moving in
3 greater-than-C waste to an area that has already given
4 to much to this nation. We moved a whole community, we
5 moved churches, we moved families, we moved homes, we
6 moved everything for what we call the great America.
7 How much is enough for one community? The impact is
8 astronomical. So I speak on behalf--tonight on behalf
9 of just humanity itself, the empty chairs, the unborn
10 babies, the ones that are less fortunate. We call them
11 socioeconomically deprived, however you want to label
12 them. Humanity must be considered and we must say
13 enough is enough. And what I meant by it on this
14 particular day in particular, the NRC is having a
15 meeting in Waynesboro because there are ideas of
16 building some more power plants. We call them nuclear
17 plants. And I heard earlier, haven't we learned
18 anything, but yet we want to have a meeting to discuss
19 it but at the same time and at the same moment in
20 Waynesboro they're talking about how great those
21 nuclear plants will be. Haven't we learned from Japan?
22 Or maybe we're just that blessed that we will never
23 have it to happen to us. I stand here tonight to tell
24 you that don't count your hens before your biddies are
25 hatched. And I want to remind you that when you talk
26 about transporting and storing you're talking about

1 going through these EJ communities. They're not
2 bringing those tracks in the upper part of Augusta;
3 they're brining them in the low part where those who
4 would be exposed to it, those that are carrying their
5 unborn babies. Are we thinking or are we just
6 reacting? And I say to each and every one of you, look
7 at the empty chairs and just imagine those empty chairs
8 in your cemeteries because every time we approve
9 something like class-C and thinking it's okay, slap it
10 on your back and bring it on we just put somebody in
11 the grave. And I'm saying that because when I look
12 around and I think about the little children that I
13 work with day in and day out, some of them I have in
14 sixth grade they have tumors. Some of them have skin
15 diseases yet they don't know what caused it. And Earth
16 Day when we're telling them how beautiful this earth is
17 and all the goodness there is and we're talking about
18 bringing some more to dump on them. Ladies and
19 gentlemen, DOE has done a great job and I commend them
20 for it, but enough is enough. Let's not move anything
21 because what you're doing is causing a ripple effect.
22 You approve this, you're not only telling them it's
23 okay to build other plants, you're telling them I'm
24 going to help you because I'll take your waste. And if
25 you can tell me how you can build one and not have
26 waste I'll tell you build it. But one thing we must do

1 and we must do it for humanity, look around you. Would
2 you do it to yourself? I wouldn't. So I say to you
3 and to your great-grands and your great, great,
4 great-grandchildren, it says you should leave a legacy,
5 not detrimental. Any man who refuses to stand for his
6 unborn generation I will say is not a man. And I say
7 that because if we fail to do what is in our faces
8 tonight we'll fail the unborn generation. And I want
9 to tell DOE today don't move it. Leave it where it's
10 at. Don't transport it because it's going through
11 those EJ communities and there's others. And don't
12 think we are unexposable and unexpendable. We never
13 know where the next earthquake may hit. We may be
14 right here sitting on it. Who would have thought North
15 Carolina would be looking like it is today from this
16 weekend. Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. That concludes the
18 list of those who signed up to speak ahead of time. Is
19 there anybody in the audience who hasn't spoken yet who
20 would like to add comments at this point? Okay. We
21 are again scheduled to say available for comments until
22 9:30. What I'd like to do now is to adjourn and if
23 someone decides they'd like to speak please see me.
24 I'll reconvene and the court reporter will remain here.
25 And the folks that here, talk to the staff and look at
26 the posters. So we will adjourn at this point. I'll

1 use the word recess.

2 (Meeting concludes at 8:15 p.m.)

3

4

1 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

2 I hereby certify that the foregoing public meeting
3 was reported as stated in the caption, by the method of
4 Stenomask, and the presentations thereto were reduced to
5 typewriting by me or under my direction; that the foregoing
6 pages numbered 3 through 48 represent a true, correct, and
7 complete transcript of the public hearing held on April 19,
8 2011.

9 I further certify that I am not kin or counsel to
10 the parties involved and I am not in the regular employ of
11 counsel of said parties.

12 I further certify that I have no contract with any
13 of the parties or their counsel. The court reporting
14 charges are the usual and customary charges for services
15 within the industry and are available upon request by either
16 party. No financial or services discount has been or will
17 be given to any party named.

18 This the 22nd day of April, 2011.

19

20

21

LAURIE M. HANNON-STAIR, CCR, CVR

22

CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

23

GEORGIA CERTIFICATE # B-2199

24

25