PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS PUBLIC MEETING

HELD AT THE NORTH AUGUSTA COMMUNITY CENTER

DO NOT REMOVE
FROM READING ROO

NORTH AUGUSTA, SOUTH CAROLINA

ON APRIL 30, 1996

PROPERTY OF
U.S. GOVERNMENT

TETRA TECH, INC.
One Towne Centre
6121 Indian School Road N.E., Suite 205
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87110
(505) 881-3188 Main Number
(505) 881-3283 FAX

14 May 1996

Dear Recipient,

Enclosed are public hearing transcripts associated with the Draft Pantex Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). We will be continuing to send you transcripts from multiple sites as we receive them. Place them in your reading room with your Pantex DEIS.

If for whatever reason you have not received a copy of the DEIS, notify us and we will send you one.

Sincerely,

Rachael E. Pitts

Rachael E. Pitts
Librarian

Pantex Plant
Secured
File
5/8/96
(date)
EIS Site-Wide

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

PUBLIC MEETING

HELD AT THE NORTH AUGUSTA COMMUNITY CENTER

NORTH AUGUSTA, SOUTH CAROLINA

ON APRIL 30, 1996

ACCURATE REPORTING
P.O. Box 2567
Augusta, Georgia 30903-2567
(706) 731-9565

INDEX

MORNING SESSION:

PLENARY SESSION - QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

STORAGE AND DISPOSITION PEIS . . . . .

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP PEIS . . . . . .

PANTEX SITE-WIDE PEIS . . . . . .

DISCUSSION SUMMARIES . . . . . .

EVENING SESSION:

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS .

PANTEX SITE-WIDE PEIS . . . . . .

STORAGE AND DISPOSITION PEIS . . . . . .

MORNING SESSION

PLENARY SESSION

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

- - - - -

MR. LAWSON: Thank you all for your presentations. Let me, because we've had maybe twenty or twenty-five people who have come in since I first spoke, let me just review a little bit of the agenda and how we proceed and some of the options that are available to us this morning.

First of all, my name is Barry Lawson. I'm a neutral facilitator. And we have two other facilitators here who will be helping during the day and the evening. And we have just heard presentations from representatives of the department in those three programs: Stockpile Stewardship and Pantex Site Wide, as well as Material Disposition. In a couple of minutes I'm going to ask for any clarifying questions that you may have about any of the presentations that were made this morning so that you can better understand, make sure that everything was clear. And then I'll have an opportunity -- provide an opportunity for anybody who would like to make a comment, a public comment at this point, they can do that before we take our first break.

Before we do take our break I just want to sort

of warn you or remind you that I will be asking you to give me some notion of where your principle interests lie. We have three options -- well, actually two options that are available to us this morning after we go into our break and come back.

One of those is for the whole group to stay together and for us to sequentially go through each of the three programs and spending whatever time is necessary to cover the issues that are important to you in each of those three programs starting with Stockpile Stewardship and going with Pantex and then going through Storage and Disposition.

The other option is that we have breakout rooms that have been established for more detailed discussions on all three of those programs. If we choose that latter, and you can help me make that choice, if we choose that latter option we'll have basically 40 to 45 minutes that you can spend in each session. And it will be obviously maybe a third or a quarter of the number of people in this room in each of those sessions at one time which could really increase the amount of discussion and dialogue that would take place in each of those issues and then you would be free to stay in that session that you were in or to move to another session on one of the other topics if you choose, let's say, every 40 or 45 minutes.

1 So before we break I'd like to have you give
2 some thought as to which of those two options you would
3 prefer and I'll do a little survey here to help me make
4 my mind. We're really at a point now where we have enou
5 people so I think breakout sessions would work, but then
6 again if your interest lies principally in one or two
7 programs, maybe it would be better sequentially. I'll
8 leave that up to -- to a later discussion.
9 But at this point I'd like to ask are there ar
10 clarifying questions that you would like to ask either o
11 Earl Whiteman or Donna Bergman or Greg Rudy about the
12 presentations they have made?
13 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I have a logistical question
14 MR. LAWSON: Please.
15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: In terms of the small groups
16 will there be resource people that will be able --
17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: -- to answer questions about
19 all three of the drafts?
20 MS. BERGMAN: Not in each room.
21 MR. LAWSON: Not in each room, no. If we do
22 stay together that's one of the advantages, having
23 everybody as a resource for all of them in one room.
24 sir.
25 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I would suggest a fourth op

1 and that would be -- I'm sure there are people here that
2 have general comments and there may be a breakout session
3 with general comments. Not knowing the specifics of each
4 of the three programs, you make a comment on nuclear or
5 not, or environmental effects of nuclear disposition or
6 whatever.
7 **MR. LAWSON:** Right. Well, actually I think most
8 comments can be incorporated either one of two places:
9 one, right after we get through these clarifying
10 questions, if people have comments they'd like to make I
11 will invite them to make those; and if we do -- if we --
12 whether we break or not, assuming by the end of the day if
13 anybody wants to make a statement to that effect they're
14 certainly welcome to do that. I appreciate your
15 suggestion. I'm not so sure we have four rooms set up for
16 doing that kind of thing, but we will make sure that
17 everybody has a chance to say what they would like to say
18 before the day is over no matter which way we go. Yes,
19 sir?
20 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** My question really centers
21 around the Pantex EIS and the storage and disposition of
22 weapons, plutonium.
23 **MR. LAWSON:** Okay.
24 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Are the pits that they're
25 talking about storage in the Pantex EIS surplus materials,

first? Secondly, why was the -- I guess it was 12,000, the number mentioned, pits, why was that done earlier and distinctly different than the Pantex EIS? She mentioned it very quickly but it went over my head.

MR. LAWSON: Okay.

MS. BERGMAN: We looked at the -- is it on? Okay. We looked at -- in EA we actually looked at 20,000 pits. But it was a sensitive issue there. And the state of Texas felt strongly that we should not just have a single focus in looking at those pits, that it was important that we looked at other sites as well for -- to consider the storage. There's currently about 9,000 pits of storage.

And the way it worked is back in 1994 when they -- the number was semi arbitrary, I guess you could say. It was determined at that time it would take about three years to develop an Environment Impact Statement. And at the rate they were currently going or projected on going in disassembling 2,000 weapons a year, they had 6,000 weapons -- pits of storage in '94. They projected it would take three years to do an EIS. 2,000 a year, that was another 6,000 pits.

So that's how they came up with the 12,000 number in the finding of significant impact. But determined that that would be the cutoff point and that no

more would be stored there until we looked at some alternate sites. So it was an agreement that was made between the state of Texas and Secretary O'Leary. Does that answer your questions?

PUBLIC CITIZEN: That's part of it, yeah.

MS. BERGMAN: Okay.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: The other part is are the pits surplus on -- on the other EIS?

MR. RUDY: Right. On that part really interestingly enough from an environmental perspective as well as perhaps from a technical schedule of cost prospective, a pit is a pit.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes --

MR. RUDY: A pit doesn't know if it is a surplus pit or a chief reserve pit. And in fact a surplus -- a chief reserve pit today might become a surplus pit down the road. So what the Department is doing in the document that I described is we're looking at storage, an option storing all pits. So it's really a quantity issue. We happen to know at this time what a breakdown would be of how many of those make up 38 tons that are therefore surplus.

But we're accommodating the footprint, an engineering design, which could address all of the plutonium whether it is surplus today or whether it's

8/95

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2094

1 surplus tomorrow. So we're trying to plan ahead and be
2 irrespective of a designation. The only place that
3 surplus versus nonsurplus really comes to play is in the
4 area of disposition precluding its reuse in nuclear
5 weapons. The materials which would be held for national
6 defense purposes would not go through the disposition
7 pipeline, only the surplus materials would. Is that okay
8 Is that --
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: We would have a blue one that'
10 -- we would have blue one that's surplus and a red one
11 that's not surplus stored contiguously?
12 MR. RUDY: Well, you might -- there's one aspe
13 of this design that's pretty important. And when I talk
14 about -- I may have gone too fast on the storage part, y
15 know, safe, secure, cost-effective and inspectable.
16 Because one of the things that, you know, this nation
17 wants to do that has become the offer with Russia and th
18 world community is international inspection, verificatic
19 of the surplus quantities so that once -- there's surplu
20 in Russia and surplus here, those materials don't find
21 their way back into the weapons pipeline.
22 So there would need to be verification and wi
23 that the facilities would need to be designed to
24 accommodate international atomic energy agency, i.e., E
25 inspection. And in fact, the material forms may need t

1 be changed or some technology applied because we would nc
2 be -- wanting to release weapons design information, the
3 shapes and sizes of these components. It's very sensitiv
4 information.
5 And so what we want is to verify with other
6 nations that, yes, this is surplus and it stays here. We
7 have to work on technologies. We can accommodate that
8 without the release of classified information. So they
9 literally won't necessarily be stored in the same rack or
10 above the other, but certainly contiguous in the same
11 facility.
12 MR. LAWSON: Greg, I think we have a question
13 front here, please.
14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes. The other day last week
15 there was a shipment of uranium that was stopped up the
16 Savannah -- in Savannah by the Port Authority and I was
17 wondering how come this shipment was authorized to come
18 the river without anybody being aware of it? It just
19 happened the Coast Guards stopped the ship because one c
20 the containers seemed like it had been damaged. And now
21 it's sitting at the Port Authority in Savannah.
22 MR. CHAPUT: I'm Ernie Chaput from the
23 Department here. That -- I just know a little bit about
24 that shipment. I believe that was a shipment in
25 commercial commerce, it was not a Department of Energy

1 shipment. I believe it was depleted uranium oxid
2 while I don't know the details on that, it was be
3 shipped to a fuel fabricator or a -- somebody inv
4 the fuel cycle. Jim, do you have any more detail
5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. I'll be h
6 talk with the gentleman off-line. I don't think
7 pertinent to the discussion here.
8 MR. LAWSON: Yes, sir.
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Someone sneaked a litt
10 in there that I wondering if there's more implic
11 there when they mentioned commercial fuel, and p
12 and commercial fuel. Is DOE finally recognizing
13 commercial fuel is going to belong to them?
14 MR. LAWSON: Don't all jump up at once
15 MR. RUDY: You mean would --
16 [Audience members laugh and several pa
17 speak at one time.]
18 MR. RUDY: -- fuel belong to the Unit
19 Government? Right now the U.S. Government is u
20 Nuclear Waste Policy Act outside of the Weapons
21 and outside of the weapons materials talked abo
22 The Nuclear Waste Policy Act mandates a process
23 United States Government has to find and charac
24 geological repository to be able to accept that
25 there's all kinds of debates and lawsuits and

1 I'm not prepared and probably shouldn't be giving my
2 comments on regarding the commercial spent fuel.
3 But, yes, if the reactor option was chosen for
4 the disposition of the weapons material and then there was
5 mixed oxide fuel, plutonium and uranium, that would
6 certainly be part of a decision and negotiate arrangements
7 on responsibility ownership for that spent fuel.
8 Certainly, no matter who owns it on paper, it would need
9 to be safely and securely stored, maintained in a reactor
10 core and then in the storage pool. The arrangement on how
11 long it stays in a pool, where it goes, who owns, who
12 transports, all of those details, yes, it would need to be
13 negotiated and understood.
14 The document we're here to talk about today is
15 at programmatic, a higher level, just -- we term, in the
16 ball park, just in Yellow Stone Park, not Fenway yet.
17 We're just a big park right now called technology option.
18 Then later on after that decision, we walk through that
19 gate, then we have to get into those specific kind of
20 details.
21 MR. LAWSON: There's a question in the back over
22 here, please.
23 PUBLIC CITIZEN: You mentioned the collaboration
24 with the Russians developing the technologies for doing
25 the various options for the disposal of plutonium. Are

1 those only limited to the three in the EIS or do they
2 include [unintelligible]?
3 MR. RUDY: Okay. They principally would fall i
4 those three categories, reactors. But the Russians are
5 also looking at from their perspective different kinds of
6 reactors. They are analyzing fast reactors which we don'
7 use and don't intend to in this country. And they may
8 also be analyzing other reactor types. But principally
9 they would fall in the three basic groups.
10 MR. LAWSON: Are there any other clarifying
11 questions? Yes, please.
12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I've got two quick ones. Wil
13 there be an attempt in order to help regular public
14 citizens understand the language between these three
15 Programmatic EISs? Will there be an attempt to produce
16 simplified document that, in fact, does that, shows the
17 relationship very clearly between these three documents?
18 And then secondly, on your next steps I notice
19 that there is only one allotted period for public commer
20 and that ends May 7th and July 12th. After the Final PE
21 comes out, will there be another opportunity for the
22 public to come back and make public comment on?
23 MR. LAWSON: Good question. Actually two
24 questions. The first being is there any plans for a
25 relatively short or simplified document which would

1 explain the relationship among these three programs and
2 perhaps others? Is that what you said? I'm not sure --
3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes, that's what I said,
4 MR. LAWSON: And the other question is to do
5 with the allotted period for possible public review, has
6 that been extended in any way?
7 MR. WHITEMAN: Let's see. Where was the
8 question? Okay. First of all, I would refer to you, all
9 of the documents, there is a short summary document that
10 is [unintelligible] PEIS. Within that summary document
11 there is a section that describes the relationship among
12 all of these and how the decisions are related. So I
13 think that would answer your question regarding that. We
14 would plan on issuing the Record of Decision in draft form
15 as we issue the final PEIS. And of course, you know, that
16 will be out in 30 days before a final decision.
17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, we'll wait 30 days
18 after the final --
19 MR. WHITEMAN: Right, before issuing the Record
20 of Decision.
21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. We don't issue
22 drafts records --
23 MR. WHITEMAN: Right. Okay. I'm sorry. Yes,
24 that's right.
25 PUBLIC CITIZEN: So 30 days after the final PEIS

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2094

1 will be a time when the public can come back and review
2 that final draft and make its final recommendations or
3 comments --
4 **MR. WHITEMAN:** Yes.
5 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** -- which will then be still
6 integrated into the process of making the final decisions?
7 **MR. WHITEMAN:** Well, I think the way the process
8 is set up it requires us to wait at least 30 days after
9 issuing a final PEIS before making a Record of Decision.
10 It was set up just so that there would be time for people
11 to look at the final PEIS before the final decision was
12 made.
13 **MR. LAWSON:** Does that also answer your second
14 question about the extended period?
15 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** [Indicates affirmatively.]
16 **MR. LAWSON:** A question over here, please.
17 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** This whole exercise is done
18 under the mandate NEPA. I keep hearing how different
19 documents are going to become [unintelligible] comment
20 periods and so forth. NEPA very clearly mandates, among
21 other things that should be addressed in a PEIS are
22 economics and impact on future generations. And I think
23 heard, before I was cut off at last Thursday's forum, th
24 information on these would be forthcoming before a final
25 EIS was published. How does that match with NEPA when y

1 having a public hearing on the PEIS that's inconclusive?
2 MR. LAWSON: Would somebody be willing to
3 explain why the information supposedly on economics and
4 impact on future generations is being developed but it
5 hasn't been included in the documents that we're now in
6 the public review and comment process on?
7 MR. RUDY: Yeah, I think I can take that. And I
8 appreciate -- it was last Thursday's session that comment
9 came up, and I thank you for bringing it back up. We
10 discussed -- you asked at that time should you bring it up
11 then or now, and I said both. That's pretty important
12 because I'm sure many of the people in this room today are
13 not -- did not have the opportunity to join the Citizens
14 Advisory Board session last week, Thursday.
15 Let me real quickly -- and I'll just take less
16 than a minute -- use this as a background and then go into
17 some things specific. The National Environmental Policy
18 Act, for all of the good things it does and all of the
19 tortuous process things it does, helps make sure that from
20 an environmental perspective decisions which would have a
21 significant impact on the environment are thoroughly
22 analyzed. NEPA, the law itself in fact, has a section in
23 it which says you do not want to and you should not have
24 costs and financial issues associated with the costs of
25 some of these options overriding or controlling the

1 decision.

2 For example, you don't want to make a bad

3 environmental choice simply because it's real cheap and

4 very inexpensive compared to some other options.

5 Likewise, you do not want to be over influenced under NEPA

6 and fail to choose a very good or benign environmental

7 option simply because it's just very expensive and we

8 don't want to spend a lot of money.

9 So what NEPA does is it specifically mandates

10 the focus on the environmental issues. And Donna showed

11 that slide, the two columns of all the various things

12 which are analyzed from an environmental perspective

13 including social economic impacts, air and water, et

14 cetera. And in the breakout sessions, or if we decide to

15 stay here as a group, we'll go through some of that. But

16 certainly the Department understands that you don't make

17 decisions on NEPA alone. NEPA is a key ingredient to

18 that, but there are many other things that have to factor

19 into a decision; technical assessments, how well somebody

20 does the job.

21 In the area I'm talking about in plutonium

22 disposition, the Spent Fuel Standard, for example, these

23 various technical options, do they reach it in a better,

24 more sound, more assured way? Technically speaking are

25 any of these options more resilient, more robust? How

1 about the schedule? When we look at some of these
2 options, how fast could you get on with the job, reducing
3 global danger? You may have a technology which works but
4 it might take you 50 years to prove it out to deploy it
5 versus the technology which you may have closer to home in
6 which you could get on with this job and complete the
7 mission in a much shorter period, in 10 or 20 years.
8 That area here of technical scheduled costs and
9 policy considerations -- in fact, let me talk about policy
10 considerations for a quick second. Reactor options, mixed
11 oxide fuel options. There is typically a policy debate
12 where some feel that use of weapons plutonium and mixed
13 oxide fuel, even though you would burn it in a reactor,
14 may not match with this government's policies on
15 reprocessing. Some people draw [unintelligible],
16 understandably you can see it this way, that if you would
17 use this material in reactor fuel you may be down that
18 slippery slope of crossing that line condoning other
19 nation's use of plutonium, the plutonium [unintelligible]
20 and perhaps this government should not step over that
21 line. Now, that's a policy debate, a policy consideration
22 which is not an environmental consideration but it is very
23 important to eventually making a decision on which
24 technology, or technologies, we might deploy.
25 In this area here and, in fact, in the

1 environmental -- just by way of a very quick summary, and
2 this wasn't planned to be part of the formal presentation
3 but I thought it was -- it was a helpful summary a little
4 bit last week. There's a lot of considerations and
5 there's no weights to these but, you know, the purpose and
6 need in storage and disposition is really
7 nonproliferation. If you have to boil it down and say,
8 why am I worried about this? Sure for costs and safety,
9 environment, all of those things. But you don't have to
10 choose one of those over the other. It's really
11 nonproliferation, making sure that these materials from
12 the end of the Cold War don't go back into weapons
13 production. Reciprocity with Russia, the policy
14 considerations like I talked about at the beginning to the
15 plutonium [unintelligible] is it good or bad, does it
16 match, you know, what our nation would like to do in the
17 years ahead? Technical issues, is it viable? Do you have
18 existing capability?
19 One of the things that we look in making that
20 Record of Decision is being practical. If, for example,
21 immobilization was chosen as one of the options or part of
22 it and if we were able to take advantage of the investment
23 that we've already made in Defense Waste Processing
24 Facility and we could use that can in canister concept and
25 get on with it fairly quickly and fairly cheaply, that's a

1 consideration which will be pretty important to us. And
2 likewise, cost and schedule and then environmental safety
3 and health, the NEPA things.
4 So those things are all being taken into
5 account. The Department will under Storage and
6 Disposition by the end of this June/middle of July, by the
7 time they distribute it, be releasing the cost assessments
8 for the various options. We're finalizing the cost
9 assessment of the various MOX versions, the various
10 vitrification versions. And they're rather complex but
11 we're attempting to verify and validate those costs and
12 then summarize them to the public. And we'll make those
13 documents available. Those will be available this summer.
14 A Record of Decision comes at the end of the year.
15 So there are several months' time where these
16 documents are going to be available to the public to
17 understand and review and provide input. NEPA provides a
18 certain mandate, start and stop time for public comments
19 on environmental. There is nothing which precludes -- and
20 in fact one of the things the Secretary of Energy
21 expressed when she came on board -- there is nothing which
22 precludes, and, in fact, she wants public involvement and
23 information, communicate with the Department up to the
24 Record of Decision. And don't just look at communicating
25 under the NEPA schedule, the NEPA clock. That's only part

1 of it. In fact, there's a lot more opportunity to
2 understand and to work with the Department in that
3 decision-making process outside of NEPA.
4 MR. LAWSON: You have got a question? Yeah, go
5 ahead.
6 PUBLIC CITIZEN: First of all, I -- if I
7 suggested it, I didn't mean to, that cost should drive the
8 decision, but I think NEPA itself mandates that they be
9 considered. If you've got two that are close together in
10 environmental protection you better know what they cost
11 and maybe -- you mentioned proliferation, which is the
12 reason for all of this exercise. Timing, timing is not
13 mentioned here. It might directly -- it could have an
14 impact on the decision and the costs.
15 And further you -- I don't think you mentioned
16 in your response anything about the impact on future
17 generations and conservation of nonrenewable resources
18 like fossil fuel which it would bring [unintelligible],
19 nuclear power is what I'm hearing. And certainly one
20 direction that this exercise could end up in would pretty
21 well be the [unintelligible] of nuclear power. If we do
22 that, then France and England and Russia and China and all
23 the rest of them cut back on fossil fuels,
24 [unintelligible] 50 or 100 years from now. And
25 [unintelligible] but [unintelligible] got to talk about

1 future generations is to talk about to some of these
2 alternatives.
3 When I look back at some of the -- the DOE
4 programs, Yucca Mountain, even close to home, DWPF, they
5 don't always follow the schedules. If we have technology
6 that's available today, that might not be [unintelligible]
7 and it's not even addressed here. I'm looking for a
8 complete environmental assessment that's not
9 [unintelligible] and radiation releases and so forth, the
10 total environmental picture including as NEPA mentions
11 repeatedly, impact on future generations and conservation
12 of nonrenewable resources.
13 MR. RUDY: I think the best I can offer you is
14 the assurance that from an environmental perspective which
15 includes impact on future generations current and future,
16 the environmental document analysis being done is intended
17 to address those issues under the various options. And
18 when it comes --
19 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Future generations, I don't see
20 those two words in those four documents. I may have
21 missed it, I don't know.
22 MR. RUDY: Well, we'll take a look at it, but
23 it's certainly inherent as we analyze materials with half-
24 lives of several thousands of years. That's clearly the
25 driver that we have and the understanding that we have

1 going in to that analysis.

2 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Okay. Reprocess spent fuel,

3 [unintelligible] half-life of Plutonium 239, the

4 reprocessing itself removes enough plutonium from that

5 waste you're going to put in the ground somewhere, but the

6 natural decay would take over 150,000 years. Until we

7 [unintelligible] reprocessing [unintelligible] 150,000

8 years if you're looking at long-term.

9 **MR. RUDY:** But what this document was intended

10 to do was take the [unintelligible] up to the form of the

11 spent fuel standard but then not to go beyond that. It

12 doesn't preclude or prejudice future decisions on that

13 spent fuel, but brings it to the spent fuel standard

14 whether in the form of glass, a geologic bore hole, which

15 is it's hard to get at spent fuel several kilometers deep

16 in steel, or the form of spent fuel itself. It brings it

17 up to that point, again, under the purpose and need to

18 preclude the reuse of that material in weapons.

19 If in future generations decisions are made to

20 reprocess or recycle that material, that would be a

21 separate issue way down the road beyond this focus on

22 precluding the reuse of that weapons material --

23 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Mr. Facilitator.

24 **MR. LAWSON:** Yes.

25 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** I think this could go on for

1 some time. Is there something better in the breakout
2 session later on [unintelligible]?
3 **MR. LAWSON:** Well, I would say that we pursue it
4 a little bit later. But I do, I want to thank you for
5 your comment and assure you and other people who have made
6 similar comments that while you may not get the answer
7 that you would like in a situation -- by making a comment
8 not only will you try -- they try to answer it here but
9 they also will try to respond in writing in the comment
10 response document, the points that you've made, so.
11 **MR. RUDY:** And also we'll take that into
12 consideration. I mean, as we move towards these
13 decisions, understanding these public issues and feelings,
14 it's helping us, you know, to be on the ground here
15 listening to people back and forth. So there's a way -- I
16 can't measure that for you, but there's a way that I can
17 assure you we understand and appreciate that input.
18 **MR. LAWSON:** Before we get to specific comments,
19 I want to have time for that --
20 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** This is a procedural question.
21 **MR. LAWSON:** Okay.
22 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Regarding the breakout
23 sessions, as I look around I've seen some of these folks
24 in many other public meetings and I know that they have
25 some things to say. Are the breakout sessions going to be

1 -- are they going to allow enough time for people's
2 comments or is it going to be kind of a classroom school
3 for you-all to tell us about these three projects?
4 MR. LAWSON: Actually --
5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I would recommend the former
6 actually. And I don't know what kind of setup you-all
7 have, but to make sure that we have enough time for people
8 to make comments. And [unintelligible] if we even started
9 right now, because I've been to a lot of these meetings
10 where it gets down to about 10 minutes and then you say,
11 well, submit it in writing, thank you very much for
12 coming.
13 MR. LAWSON: The intent of having the three
14 breakouts is to maybe make a maximum of three times as
15 much opportunity for somebody to speak than they would
16 have if they were just in one group. And so there would
17 be short presentations, hopefully with a minute or two at
18 the beginning of each one so that you would be back into
19 the flow and the understanding of what program you're
20 talking about at that time. But the rest of it's going to
21 be facilitated discussion. The facilitators, all of us,
22 are principally interested in what your comments are, the
23 issues that you want to raise, and that there is a good
24 dialogue or comment period for all of you.
25 I thought I saw a hand back here. Yes, sir.

1 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** I would like to make a comment
2 if I could. My name is Al Lodge [phonetically spelled].
3 I grew up in Savannah, Georgia and lived there for many
4 years. I have lived in several places and as I was
5 relocating to Augusta mostly for my family reasons and for
6 professional reasons I wanted to check out the Savannah
7 River Site more clearly. And I guess my message is to the
8 Department of Energy and that is that I did a considerable
9 amount of homework talking to lots of people and spending
10 some in-depth time with scientists as well as potential
11 neighbors about the Savannah River Site because so much of
12 what I have heard was negative information, negative
13 environmental information, negative about the number of
14 [unintelligible] related to the site.
15 Well, I was given some reassurance. And what I
16 have found to be the case since coming to Augusta seven
17 years ago is that, in fact, much of the negative
18 information heard was without basis and fact. And that
19 friends and now neighbors and many others that have worked
20 at the site for many years, really have a deep abiding
21 interest in making certain that first of all it is safe,
22 secondly it is secure and simultaneously that it is
23 environmentally sound. It looks like the Department of
24 Energy is appropriately wrestling with some major issues
25 regarding the future, not just at the Savannah River Site

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2084

1 but the whole complex.

2 From what I have gathered the most supportive

3 community of any of the areas within the site is in thi

4 one, the Augusta-Aiken region for the site. It looks t

5 me like with your various considerations of

6 environmentally sound and safe disposal options as well

7 those for remanufacturing, the Savannah River Site is t

8 logical place. Logical from -- in every way.

9 Lots of folks not just in this immediate area

10 but in Savannah, Beaufort, Charleston, the greater area

11 are interested in environmentally sound policies and

12 practices and procedures. And it looks to me like fro

13 the safety standpoint and from an environmental

14 consideration, the Savannah River Site is the logical

15 place for the storage and reprocessing of plutonium if

16 we're looking to make certain that things are

17 environmental safe.

18 There's a different issue as well in our are

19 and that is for many years the Savannah River Site has

20 been the largest employer. And largest employer also

21 means that it has employed a wide variety, a true

22 diversity of our work force, of our population in thi

23 community. And with the downsizing that has taken pl

24 there have been some negative residual effects. All

25 folks that have lost their jobs and/or potential jobs

at the site has taken its toll.

So from an economic development and pure job standpoint, I encourage the Department of Energy to look favorably at all of the options to consolidate processes in to the Savannah River Site and use the existing very intellectually capable work force as well as the physical infrastructure that has been built up here over time and take full advantage of that. It's a receptive community. We welcome you. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you for your comment. Yes, ma'am.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: I have a question about the three PEISs in terms of the environmental justice considerations. Could you -- maybe you went over this in your explanation but because we seem to be moving toward breaking down into three separate groups, could the three presenters explain a little bit of what went into that particular analysis? What did you look at when you were looking at this whole question of environmental justice considerations?

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Very good. Who wants to go first?

MR. RUDY: If I can just take it, I guess, from an overview perspective. First and foremost we took a look at the potential environmental impacts associated

1 with normal as well as off-normal for accident scenarios
2 under the various options for storage and disposition.
3 Once that was technically done to be able to determine the
4 quantity disposed, the material types of dispersion, the
5 mediums of dispersion, et cetera, an overlay on that, an
6 understanding of the populations for any given site,
7 Savannah River Site, Pantex Site, Oak Ridge.
8 So consistently across the board, understanding
9 of the demographics of a region, understanding the wind
10 patterns and the applying the potential accident scenarios
11 to that could be able to determine if in fact from any of
12 these options there would a disproportionately high or
13 adverse impacts on certain areas around the site. So
14 that's generically the approach that we took and
15 technically the approach across all of our community
16 sites.
17 **MR. LAWSON:** Does anybody want to add anything?
18 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** No, I -- Stockpile
19 Stewardship demands that, you know, we follow the --
20 essentially the same approach. And in [unintelligible]
21 sites, we had eight sites in the weapons complex, there's
22 a section, it's the 11th section [unintelligible] the
23 environmental resources where we discuss environmental
24 justice and actual disproportionate impacts.
25 Let me just add, the Department has really

1 wrestled with the whole question of environmental justice
2 and it doesn't have a comprehensive guidance yet on how to
3 do it, so there may be some differences between the
4 documents but each one lays out its methodology and how it
5 went about it. But it's essentially what Mr. Rudy said.
6 MR. LAWSON: Ms. Bergman?
7 MS. BERGMAN: Yeah, I -- let me show you real
8 quick. I've got an overhead on it. We've got a section,
9 this -- environmental justice and human health are the two
10 we looked at in depth in the Pantex Site-Wide EIS. And
11 the work that would need to be done in order to store the
12 pits at the Savannah River -- at the assembly area of P
13 Reactor is all internal to that structure. It would all
14 be internal modifications to make it safe for the storage
15 of the pits.
16 And so the conclusion that we reached within the
17 analysis of the environmental justice is that there would
18 not -- we would not be expected to experience any
19 disproportionate higher adverse human health or
20 environmental effects. And that is discussed in detail
21 within that section of the EIS and we can discuss it
22 further as we breakout into our workshops.
23 MR. LAWSON: I just want to do a survey. Are
24 there any other questions before we get involved in other
25 comments? There's a question in the front row, please.

1 Here.

2 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes.

3 MR. LAWSON: Just one second and we'll get a

4 microphone so we can hear you.

5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Plutonium Storage and

6 Disposition PEIS, as far as the MOX fuel is concerned, in

7 converting the plutonium metal to the powder form as a

8 part of that process, what is the criticality and

9 explosive factor of the powder as compared to the metal

10 form of the plutonium?

11 MR. RUDY: The explosive factor, what you're

12 [unintelligible] saying, it isn't an explosion issue of

13 powder and oxide, plutonium oxide. You would -- the

14 concern would be the [unintelligible] exposed air. So

15 what the document analyzes -- and it might help if I just

16 give a very quick overview. There is a technology which

17 warrants Livermore and Los Alamos National Lab

18 [unintelligible] to convert a weapons plutonium pit, a

19 metal sphere, to cut in half a near zero waste band so

20 that there's no metal pieces or shards, and then in the

21 presence of hydrogen in a furnace so you control the

22 quantity of material is very important, so that at any

23 given time there's only a certain amount of the material.

24 And in the presence of hydrogen and with heat, the

25 plutonium would what they call hy-dry, it would flake off.

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 . FORM 2094 8/90

1 It just -- you can actually see it flake almost like snow
2 from the -- the half of a pit and would fall into a
3 crucible, in an oven, which would then be heated and would
4 become a metal hockey puck.
5 Another part of that process is at a later stay
6 you have in a controlled glovebox in earth environment
7 where you control the quantity of material and the
8 environment that it's in to avoid exposure to air and
9 other accident scenarios to convert that to a powder by
10 adding oxygen.
11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: And the powder is an airborne
12 powder with plutonium --
13 MR. RUDY: Oh, no, this would not be airborne.
14 In fact, it would be in a sealed contained glovebox in an
15 earth gas, an environment where it would not be exposed to
16 the air.
17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Is that sometime, the powder,
18 an airborne form of pow- -- plutonium powder?
19 MR. RUDY: It would be through the glovebox
20 system in a can and then when it is mixed it would be
21 mixed in a -- it would not be in the exposed --
22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: No, that's not my question.
23 The question is: At sometime in the process does this
24 powder have the capability of being airborne as opposed to
25 a powder that has a metal that is so heavy that it can't

1 be airborne?

2 MR. RUDY: In an accident scenario --

3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right.

4 MR. RUDY: -- potential dispersion. Andre works

5 on our system for that. If there's anything you want to

6 add in particular --

7 MR. CYGELMAN: Your question is specifically

8 with regard to the size of the plutonium oxide that's

9 formed.

10 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right.

11 MR. CYGELMAN: In general, the material that is

12 of most concern to human population is below 10 microns.

13 And I believe some of the oxide that would be formed

14 within this glovebox could be about 10 microns.

15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: And it's contained --

16 MR. CYGELMAN: It is contained --

17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: -- but in an accident scenario

18 it would dispersed?

19 MR. CYGELMAN: In an accident scenario there is

20 a potential for it to be dispersed, yes. And there would

21 be particles within the 10 micron range.

22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: That's -- okay.

23 MR. LAWSON: And by the way before we go any

24 further, I failed to introduce some of the technical

25 experts who are here. Andre Cygelman who just spoke is

1 with the Storage and Disposition. I'll point to Jay Rows
2 [phonetically spelled] who spoke earlier has been document
3 manager for the Stockpile Stewardship Management Program.
4 And Nanette Founds is also here from Pantex Site Wide.
5 Are there any other questions before I take comments?
6 All right. Are there any folks who would like
7 to make comments before we take our break and then come
8 back a detailed discussion in whatever form? Yes, sir.
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: My name is Sam Gore. I'm only
10 a concerned citizen. I do not work at SRS, nor do I have
11 any financial or any other gain from SRS. My comment or
12 concerns address two issues. First is the preservation of
13 a core of U.S. intellectual and technical competence in
14 nuclear weapons to continue the high level of competence
15 this area, Georgia and South Carolina have in safety and
16 reliability. Since I retired nine years ago I have
17 watched the Army be reduced in size to a point where the
18 American people are beginning to question what happened to
19 the high level of competence we've had in our Army in the
20 past. I am fearful with the continued that -- I am
21 fearful that SRS without a continued needed mission, SRS
22 will begin to lose the high level that currently exists in
23 Georgia and South Carolina and our competence and
24 reliability in this area.
25 My second issue I wish to comment on has to do

1 with all of the sites under consideration. Today at SRS
2 we have a good future use plan. I am concerned that all
3 of the other sites might not have a similar plan. Our SRS
4 future use plan is an effort to -- to maintain the largest
5 national wildlife research area in America. I hope the
6 undeveloped areas of at all of the sites have that same
7 protection for their wildlife. With SRS's future uses
8 plan, all future development is restricted to only areas
9 that have had prior development. No undisturbed areas are
10 to be developed.
11 I wish that DOE would make this a DOE-wide
12 policy. I know how developers prefer to build on
13 undeveloped land and are reluctant to take land previously
14 used and reclaim it for new development. Future
15 development on all DOE sites start the trend in America to
16 build new on old abandoned sites.
17 In closing I hope DOE quickly discards the deep
18 bore hole alternative as discussed in their Storage and
19 Disposition PEIS. Thank you for this opportunity.
20 **MR. LAWSON:** Thank you very much. Is there
21 anyone else who would like to make a comment before we
22 take a vote and then go to a break. Yes, sir.
23 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** My name is Wayne Rogers. I
24 have been a resident of this area for, I guess, 28 years
25 now working on both sides of the river. And I have never

1 had any direct association with SRS before. I'm currently
2 Director of Planning for the Lower Savannah Council of
3 Governments and in that capacity I've had the opportunity
4 to work more directly in recent years with some of the SRS
5 programs.
6 But speaking as a citizen and having been here
7 28 years I think that the facility at some point in time
8 has touched everyone's life whether it's through
9 employment directly or indirectly, and they have been good
10 neighbors. It's been, we feel -- or I feel and I think
11 all my friends do, well-run, very conscientiously managed
12 and we feel that it's even more so at this point in time
13 and this is no reflection on what's come to pass. I think
14 it's just the legislation, the regulations, and so forth
15 that have occurred.
16 But having worked with various federal programs
17 and state programs we -- I feel that the utilization of
18 existing facilities out there, the maintenance of the
19 core, the experience and technologies and the manpower --
20 and womanpower, if you will -- that we have in this
21 community, it's been an integral part of our community.
22 We feel that going forward -- the analyses that have been
23 quickly made, have been made in a very conscientious and
24 straightforward manner. I think that the things that are
25 going on here now and have gone on the last few years in

1 an effort to inform the public, not only locally but
2 nationally, are prime examples of that. And as a local
3 person I think it's very important for us to have a better
4 understanding of what -- what is going on with the
5 facility and what its potential is.
6 And I think that we would like to see the
7 recommendations implemented. We would like to see the SRS
8 facility utilized for the programs are outlined in these
9 three statements. We feel that the facilities are there,
10 the land area is there, the expertise is there and that it
11 is not only in the best interest of the community on the
12 economic side, but nationally. And we appreciate the
13 opportunity of having -- to be able to comment in this
14 regard.
15 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Is there anyone
16 else who like to make a comment? Yes, sir. Right up in
17 the front here, Jim.
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: My name is [unintelligible]
19 Mohammed from Savannah, Georgia. One on my main concerns
20 is that if plutonium can turn into, like, powder or dust
21 form -- it states here in the Storage and Disposition of
22 Weapons-Usable Fissile Material summary is that the
23 African-American community, or you-all consider low income
24 or minority, would be disproportionately affected if there
25 was an outbreak.

1 My concern is that I would not like to see -- I
2 would like to see Savannah River Site close down or
3 consolidated -- the plutonium and highly enriched uranium
4 be consolidated at one site further -- a long way away
5 from Savannah River Site. My concern once again is that
6 if there was an outbreak or any kind of release, the low-
7 income community will be the ones that will be affected.
8 And that's one of my main concerns.
9 MR. LAWSON: Very good. Well, thank you for
10 your comment. That's great. Yes, in the back someone,
11 please.
12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: And so, based on that, I have a
13 comment that I am going to make later, but I think that
14 it's really important particularly under the NEPA
15 regulations and in effort by the Department of Energy to
16 really bring the public more into this discussion that at
17 some point we look at what is the weakness of our outreach
18 strategy that does not allow us to bring more -- a diverse
19 group of people from this area to these kinds of meetings.
20 Because based on what the gentleman just said --
21 and I just saw that in the summary that it does, in fact,
22 state that a disproportionate burden would be borne by
23 minorities as it's defined here and low-income people in
24 this area -- then they should be in greater numbers at
25 this table to, one, learn what is at stake, what are the

1 potential dangers, what are the benefits, et cetera, et
2 cetera, but also to be here to raise their own questions
3 and concerns and then be prepared to help make
4 recommendations that will be factored into the final
5 decision.
6 Because we can point to the successes of the
7 plant, the positive role that it has played in this
8 community, the fact that it is one of the largest
9 employers, but there may be some other things that those
10 regular citizens need to say that may in some way shape
11 the final decision on these particular three EISs that's
12 needed.
13 MR. LAWSON: Good point and thank you. Anyone
14 else with a comment? Yes. Well, actually a couple hands
15 in the back. First, we'll come to you, sir.
16 PUBLIC CITIZEN: One thing, I've been sitting
17 here listening to this, about the Barnwell plant that was
18 closed by President Carter, why can't we reopen that and
19 do what's necessary to process a lot of these fuel rods
20 and radioactive material?
21 MR. LAWSON: Okay. The question is, the
22 Barnwell facility in South Carolina, why can't that be
23 opened?
24 MR. RUDY: I'll -- I'll address that, I guess.
25 Again, the Barnwell facility would be for reprocessing of

1 the spent fuel. And in terms of the Spent Fuel Standard,
2 the issue here is to take it to a spent fuel form.
3 There -- when we're talking about the surplus plutonium it
4 is versus the amount of spent fuel that already exists
5 commercially in this country, let alone the world. This
6 is an extremely small percentage.
7 So this document does not envision reaching out
8 all the way to reprocessing and then eventually recycling
9 material. It takes it to the point where it is changed
10 from a weapons shape and useable form into a spent fuel
11 standard. Future decisions aren't precluded or prejudiced
12 regarding that.
13 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I understand that but we have
14 five reactors over here sitting full of spent fuel, been
15 sitting there for five years. I think it's time we
16 started looking at that, too.
17 MR. RUDY: I can just take that comment, but I
18 understand that. What we're attempting to do is get on
19 with the job of [unintelligible] without stopping work on
20 those areas which have been going on, you're right, for
21 several years, but -- to make progress in this area.
22 MR. LAWSON: Okay. This gentleman -- oh, no,
23 I'm sorry. I called on your first here and then --
24 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I want to respond to that --
25 MR. LAWSON: All right.

1 PUBLIC CITIZEN: My name is Chris Noah. I'm the
2 Land Use Coordinator at SRS for Westinghouse, but I'm here
3 on my own time speaking for myself. And I've got a little
4 presentation but I believe I'll save it for one of the
5 breakout sessions. You don't have enough time right now.
6 However, some of the things that were said require one
7 slide just if I may --
8 MR. LAWSON: Excuse me. Will it brief?
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: It will be very brief, yes.
10 This has to do with the future use of SRS. And what I
11 want to stress is -- and by the way, I just wrote a book
12 on environmental uses of the Savannah River Site, or I'm
13 writing, finishing up. So I've done a little research,
14 it's just not off of the top of the head sort of thing.
15 But what I want you all to keep in mind is that if we look
16 at a primary use which is industrial, the -- it can be
17 nuclear or non-nuclear, you can do a lot of things using
18 the land use concept and multiple use, okay? You've got
19 the primary use right here which would be the project that
20 you all are talking about now. And as you go out from
21 this primary area the protection increases.
22 So at least it's self-explanatory and I can
23 explain it later. But I just want people to get that idea
24 as we talk, that: Imagine 310 square miles and then the
25 center is where most of your activity, your industrial

activity occurs, and then as you go outwards you can do all sorts of things, all sorts of environmental things.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. I would just ask you and anyone else who has visuals or a written statement to leave a copy of it with us so that we can -- it can be included in the record. Yes, sir, you had a question regarding a previous speaker --

PUBLIC CITIZEN: A response, somewhat.

MR. LAWSON: Please, go ahead.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Some 15 years ago I was retired from Allied Signal and prior to that I had been vice-president at the Barnwell plant. I haven't talked to anybody at Allied for ten years about that plant. In the previous [unintelligible]. But when Mr. Carter shut that down, to me that was a prostitution or complete avoidance in the NEPA process. There was a NEPA activity going on, so called [unintelligible] generic environmental [unintelligible] of mixed oxide fuel. It was underway. It had been extended from the [unintelligible] environmental to the question of MOX. He eventually got that off, issued an executive order, and by [unintelligible] NEPA Congress mandated that before any major -- any major action affecting the environment should be subjected to NEPA review. He ignored that, by-passed it. A couple of weeks ago [unintelligible]. But anyway,

1 as far as -- and I'm, as I said, I'm not speaking for
2 Allied Signal, but if I had an investment in any company
3 and they offered at this time to get into the nuclear fuel
4 cycle making MOX fuel, reprocessing spent fuel, I would
5 argue completely against it. Once the federal government
6 can by the signature of one man tear down something like
7 $250 million in private investment and just throw it away,
8 no Record of Decision. They did this before.
9 I was earlier involved in the [unintelligible]
10 process in the mid '60s. A private venture, we put about
11 a million dollars into it. We thought we were doing well,
12 it was an R&D thing, extremely highly classified. It was
13 highly classified and, you know, it was all private. And
14 that was cutoff. And their reason: If we continued to
15 pursue this it might encourage other countries.
16 I talked to Europeans after that and their
17 conclusion was you guys must have had something going or
18 they wouldn't have shut you down. And so they all started
19 work on it and now it's a very popular way of enriching
20 uranium. It's all over the world. To cut off
21 reprocessing in this country to influence other countries,
22 you can see how successful that's been. And it's the only
23 valid reason that I've -- it's the only reason I've really
24 heard put forward to it, is to discourage others by
25 setting a good example. It didn't work before, it's not

1 going to work this way. I don't like [unintelligible]
2 version.
3 And incidentally, don't taken any of my comments
4 as being against the people from DOE. To me they're
5 marching to the beat of a drummer who is the President,
6 they work for the President, they do what he tells them to
7 do.
8 It's amazing -- I've been doing -- working --
9 attending a lot of the Citizens Advisory Board meetings
10 lately, talking to people from the site who have contacted
11 to DOE contractors at various sites. If you get them by
12 themselves out in the hall at some of the meetings, at
13 lunch or something like that, most of them share my
14 positions the only way to get rid of plutonium properly is
15 to burn it and recover what's left and burn it and go on
16 down the road.
17 So I'm not saying this critical of anybody in
18 DOE from the top to the bottom, I'm [unintelligible]. You
19 mentioned Barnwell, and it touches a -- yeah, a nerve.
20 MR. LAWSON: All right. I appreciate your
21 comment and I would encourage people to try to keep your
22 comments focused as much as possible on these documents.
23 We certainly don't want to limit your comments, but --
24 yes, sir, we have another comment here and then I would
25 like to take a survey of how you would like to go --

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2094 8/95

1 continue on with the rest of the day.

2 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Yes. According to your summary

3 report there was a calculation of potential risks of --

4 the citizens of Savannah are within the range of the site

5 for getting cancer over a estimate of 50 years. Was there

6 -- did you-all calculate the -- not only the potential

7 release of radiation coming from the Savannah River Site,

8 but did you-all calculate the other plants that's

9 releasing other types of chemicals and other types of

10 radiation or other forms of radiation in combined with

11 that which is coming from the Savannah River Site?

12 Because if you haven't and you only estimated

13 the potential risk of cancer coming from the Savannah

14 River Site, then there may be a greater risk of low-income

15 people getting the repercussion of what we economically

16 are trying to benefit from the Savannah River Site.

17 **MR. LAWSON:** It's a question of cumulative

18 impacts. Do you -- Andre Cygelman.

19 **MR. CYGELMAN:** I believe that it represents a

20 cumulative impact, what would be projected to be operatin

21 plus what would be --

22 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** I mean, that's not -- that's

23 not clear. You're not exactly sure.

24 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Okay. Then we'll have to make

25 clearer.

1 MR. LAWSON: Now, I would just -- Andre, I think
2 -- you were talking about non -- sources that were non-
3 DOE; is that correct?
4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right. Well -- Yes, sir,
5 combined.
6 MR. LAWSON: Right.
7 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Combined with --
8 MR. CYGELMAN: We would only be looking at what
9 was from Savannah River, not anything outside the Savannah
10 River area --
11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, that's not -- well, my
12 opinion, that is not fair to the citizens of Savannah
13 because now you're only projecting what Savannah River
14 Site, this is supposed to be a total -- this is supposed
15 to be a total sum of -- assessment of what's going to -- a
16 health assessment, what's going to take place.
17 So not only should it be calculated, the
18 radiation that's going to be released from the Savannah
19 River Site, but what is -- what is the total impact
20 because say, for instance, we may have a better chance if
21 the Savannah River Site was closed down, you know, instead
22 of adding what radiation or what contamination would be
23 released from the Savannah River Site, we may have a
24 better chance of having a longer life span if we would
25 close the plant down. So if there was a total calculation

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2094

1 along with all the other plants along with Savannah River
2 Site, then I think there would need to be more input in
3 the study as far as health -- as health is concerned. Do
4 you understand what I'm saying?
5 **MR. CYGELMAN:** I understand your comment. I'll
6 have to take it up with our [unintelligible].
7 **MR. LAWSON:** All right. Thank you. Anyone else
8 with a comment now that can't wait -- yes, ma'am, please.
9 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** I just find it ironic -- I
10 understand under the Stockpile Stewardship and Management
11 PEIS there's discussion about upgrading the pit production
12 at Los Alamos and under the Storage and Disposition of
13 Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials we're worried about what
14 we're going to do with all these pits that we've got. It
15 just seems kind of strange, we're going to make some more
16 and we don't know what to do with these we've got.
17 **MR. LAWSON:** Okay.
18 **MR. RUDY:** I'll just -- I'll try to link here
19 with Earl. What Earl's document is talking about is
20 making the new pits to maintain the stockpile, the
21 nation's national defense nuclear deterrent. A pit is not
22 a pit. There's different types and forms and ways that
23 you would make pits for special types of weapons design.
24 Because the President under a national security policy has
25 stated we will maintain the nation's nuclear deterrent,

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2094

1 we've got to be able to maintain that capability in the
2 event that new weapons might ever be required. So that's
3 a technological issue associated with weapons stockpile of
4 the future. The Storage and -- is that clear?
5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: [Indicating negatively.]
6 MR. RUDY: Okay. It's making -- you know, if
7 the engine breaks or you need to modify something in this
8 six cylinder engine, what would you do to make sure that
9 you continue to have a good operating engine. Now, what
10 we're doing is, these are engines, the surplus pits which
11 are no longer required. You would not need to use them.
12 You would never intend to modify, fix, or remanufacture
13 them. The President, in working with Russia has said we
14 have sufficient plutonium in weapons or in stockpile
15 plutonium materials that will allow this nation to say
16 approximately 50 tons is surplus to defense needs and will
17 never go back. It's because of that that we have to find
18 ways to store and then dispose of that material.
19 And so there is a unique difference. One keeps
20 the weapons and the stockpile safe and secure and
21 reliable, they'll work if they need to work. The other
22 says once you cross the line and you're no longer are
23 going to use it for weapons, what do we do with those pits
24 to make sure that they can't be reused in weapons. Does
25 that help?

1 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes. It's just it doesn't
2 really make sense to me, that's all. If we're on one hand
3 trying to say we're going to eliminate weapons and then at
4 the same time we're making more -- we're maintain --
5 MR. RUDY: Okay. Well, what the President said
6 we're going to do is we're going to maintain nuclear
7 deterrents, we're always going to keep weapons. We aren't
8 going to eliminate all of them and we haven't reached that
9 unfortunately yet around the world that all of the weapons
10 are gone. Because we have them and others have them, as a
11 policy of this nation for national security defense we're
12 going to keep weapons safe, secure, and reliable.
13 But the good news is we're going to keep less of
14 them and the material which comes out of the ones which
15 we're disassembling, we're going to try to work on that
16 material to make sure it doesn't go back into weapons
17 either here in this country or in Russia. So if you will,
18 the glass is half full instead of half empty but we're
19 [unintelligible].
20 MR. LAWSON: We have a comment back here,
21 please.
22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: At no time either at last
23 Thursday's discussion or today have I heard the
24 possibility of using two systems. Like you talked about
25 it's almost like it's either-or. We're already doing

1 vitrification here. I'd like to know with this fifty tons
2 of plutonium we're going to be getting rid of how long, if
3 we just use vitrification only, would it take to get rid
4 of it? If we use MOX -- like over here at Plant Vogtle,
5 if we used a couple of places and started burning it.
6 What if we used vitrification and MOX at the same time,
7 could we not get rid of it faster? It seems like all the
8 discussion I've heard is one or the other. I haven't
9 heard any discussion on using two or more systems at the
10 same time to speed up the process, is the word you used,
11 in scheduling.
12 MR. RUDY: Yes, thank you. I may not have been
13 clear enough, but I really wanted to express that it may
14 be the decision on technology or technologies and, in
15 fact, you may very well pick some combinations thereof.
16 So you are not precluded. It's not an either-or situation
17 among those three.
18 MR. LAWSON: A comment here.
19 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I guess I have two comments.
20 One, I'd like to request to take a break. And, two, I'd
21 like to come back to the procedure issue a little bit and
22 say couldn't we -- when we come back, could we focus on
23 one at a time in general? Let's say, you know, let's talk
24 about Pantex or let's talk about stockpile. We're kind of
25 far beyond the -- I mean, we've just got a broad range of

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07001 · FORM 2094

1 things. I'd like to see us focus a little more --

2 **MR. LAWSON:** That would be the intent, sir.

3 Thank you. Anyone else?

4 Okay. Well, you're going to get your wish for a

5 break in just a couple of minutes. Also before we break,

6 those of you have written statements, I've been reminded

7 that there is a copier machine that is available if you

8 need to make a copy to hand it to the folks here.

9 Now, let me just ask a couple of general

10 questions and then get down to the nitty-gritty here.

11 Let's talk about the three programs for a second. How

12 many people have a principal interest in only one of

13 those, and let's take them one at a time. How about a

14 principal interest in Stockpile Stewardship and

15 Management, anybody have a principal interest in that?

16 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Tell us where you're going.

17 **MR. LAWSON:** Pardon?

18 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Tell us where you're going?

19 **MR. LAWSON:** Where I'm going with this?

20 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** I have a principal interest,

21 but I also have interests in the other two, also.

22 **SPEAKER:** Well, I'm going to ask it for all of

23 those as well. I just want to get a sense of where the

24 major focus is, whether it would be better for us to stay

25 in one group viewing one or two very quickly because

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 - FORM 2084 8/93

there's not a lot of interest and then spend much more time on the one that is of interest, or whether we really need to make sure we will be giving a lot of time for each of the three groups and it's better having the three breakout sessions. But I need a little more information [unintelligible]. Okay. Stockpile Stewardship, I didn't see any -- yes, ma'am.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Not being a scientist --

MR. LAWSON: Yes. Are you speaking about me or you?

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Me. I'm trying to get -- because we are dealing with the three of them together, I'm assuming that there is such an intimate relationship between the three of them that they warrant discussion because, you know, they work together. Is that a correct assumption or can we just deal with them in isolation and still get the broader picture that we need in order to be able to make some kind of substantive recommendation about all three?

MR. LAWSON: Well, if you're asking me, I would say that you could do it -- you could do it both ways. Because I ran a meeting last week at Amarillo where we broke into different groups and I think everyone had a chance to ask what questions they needed in each of the groups and then they came back together again. So there

1 was an opportunity to share or to tell some ideas that you
2 had or to clarify.
3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I guess that's why I asked if
4 there were going to be resource people in each small group
5 that we could refer questions to because if there were,
6 then a small group for us would be better because it would
7 be -- it would give us a chance to have greater
8 interaction. But we would want to be able to ask specific
9 questions about the other two that we were not in.
10 MR. LAWSON: Yes. Well, they were honest before
11 when they said that there won't be experts -- there won't
12 be a specific expert for each program in each of the
13 breakout sessions. We just don't have enough people for
14 that. But they know something about the other programs so
15 they could say something about it. And they could
16 certainly tell you when they know it, when they don't
17 know, when you would have to go to another group to ask.
18 Is that fair?
19 All right. How many people have a specific
20 interest in Stockpile Stewardship and Management as
21 principal?
22 How many have a principal interest in the Pantex
23 Site Wide?
24 How many people have a principal interest in the
25 Storage and Disposition?

1 Okay. Given that information, then, let's just
2 see how you feel about breaking into three groups or
3 staying with one. How many feel that their chance to
4 participate, say what they want to say, ask the questions
5 they want, and have the dialogue that they want to have
6 would be better served by going into three separate
7 groups?
8 That's about seven people. How many feel it
9 would be better to stay in one large group?
10 There's a little more towards the large group.
11 Does anybody that prefers the small group want to state a
12 good case for that? Yes.
13 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, not necessarily the
14 specifics of the subjects, but it was stated back here we
15 might be able to explain more of what -- or have more time
16 to express more views rather than -- how many people are
17 here, seventy-five or a hundred?
18 MR. LAWSON: Yes.
19 PUBLIC CITIZEN: And to give them each five
20 minutes, we'll be here for quite some time. So I just
21 thought that as far as equity of time, there's three
22 groups -- whether they're three groups dealing with the
23 issues -- or all three issues or three groups
24 individually.
25 MR. LAWSON: Because -- well, let's just think

about this for a second. I think my feeling is if there is not a principal interest of anybody in two of the programs except for this one here, I intended to keep us in one room. And I'd really prefer -- as a facilitator I really do prefer the three group area. But I'm also concerned that we will get a lot of people in one group and not very many in the others and we will be back to almost where we are here.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay. We from Savannah, our group, would like to go in a small group on the plutonium disposition and storage because we're at the basic level and there are some questions that my be so elementary that it would just bore the larger groups.

MR. LAWSON: I doubt that.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: So we want to request, if possible, if we could be in a smaller session.

SPEAKER: Okay. Well, let's compromise then. Let's -- why don't we then have -- we'll go into the three breakout sessions and see how that works. We'll leave enough time so we can come back together in case there are some individual questions that are needed.

Now, in terms of the assignments of -- there are rooms, if you go out this door and you turn right, there's a line of offices or rooms over here. And there's one that's called A, B and C. A will be for Pantex, B will be

for Storage and Disposition, and C will be Stockpile Stewardship and Management. I would ask you if you could try to as evenly as possible divide yourselves into those three rooms. And we have probably at the most twenty to twenty-five minutes before the facilitators will say, "if you'd like to move to another room, you may." You certainly can stay in that room if you would like but if you want to move, that would be a good time to do it. And then we'll leave enough time to come back here at 11:30 or a little after that to -- for summaries that are made and also to take any questions that you have. Let's take ten minutes. It's now 10:22. Let's reconvene at 10:30.

STORAGE AND DISPOSITION OF

WEAPONS-USABLE FISSILE MATERIALS PEIS

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

- - - - -

PUBLIC CITIZEN: . . . put a small amount of plutonium in a smaller can?

MR. CYGELMAN: Right, let me -- go ahead.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: And then put the can in a canister?

MR. CYGELMAN: Right. Let me --

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Then you lost me there. Okay. I got the can in the canister.

MR. CYGELMAN: Let me give you the concept and that might help. The concept is one, right now high level waste has a reasonably high radiation level outside the surface. From a nonproliferation viewpoint it's very attractive. It makes it very difficult to steal undetected and you get a substantial radiation exposure. So we said, well, how can we utilize that concept. And one way to utilize that concept was, okay, we will take the plutonium, it will be a slightly different glass, and we'll load it in small cans that are, oh, about this high [indicating] and probably around this diameter [indicating] and we put it in the metal structure that's self-supporting. Then we taken this metal structure and

1 -- have you seen the canisters --

2 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Uh-huh [yes].

3 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Okay. It's cut open, okay. So

4 you take this structure and you load the self-supporting

5 structure with the cans. There's nothing in it except

6 space at this point. All right. Then you weld the top

7 back on. Then you take that and then you bring it into

8 the hot cell line and you pour the high level waste and

9 glass in the canister surrounding these little cans that

10 are in the canister.

11 Now, the advantage of that is, one, you get a

12 substantial radiation barrier. In general, plutonium has

13 radiation but it's not enough to really cause any

14 nonproliferation deterrence.

15 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** What time would be required to

16 build the new facility here?

17 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Okay. We're looking at starting

18 something in the time frame, assuming a Record of

19 Decision, it would probably be about eight years -- six,

20 eight, nine years before we could really get started with

21 serious conversion of plutonium into a form that's really

22 nonuseable. We would be able to convert small quantities

23 before that, as we did our demonstration that we tested

24 things out.

25 But seriously speaking, it does not appear we

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2094

1 would be able to get started with either ceramics or MOX
2 options, reactor options, earlier than at the minimum six,
3 probably more reasonably eight, maybe nine years.
4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Why does it take six years for
5 a MOX? You've got the fabrication plants over in Europe
6 ready to go with access capacity. The utilities have said
7 that there -- at least with Vogtle, the reactor shell is
8 designed to take necessary changes. They said they, what
9 we heard Thursday was it wouldn't take them any six years
10 to do that. So why the six years?
11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes, I was going to make a
12 quick correction about it since I'm from [unintelligible],
13 you know. And if there's a commitment early enough and
14 even though -- really deploy this whole program more
15 rapidly, just in the interest of nonproliferation
16 generally, we can commit capacity now for both the lead
17 test assembly or test demonstration program and then later
18 on for the first third core -- for core loading. But it
19 just has to be done earlier on, otherwise you will book up
20 -- the capacity may be booked up. But so it's just a
21 matter of the commitment can be made, then that space can
22 be made available.
23 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, I recognized, that's why I
24 qualified it. I said we could get started earlier in
25 small quantities, possibly using the European capacity.

1 But by the time we're really ready to start disposition,
2 unless there's a reevaluation in Europe, we would not be
3 able to use what appears to be committed capacity with
4 regard to balancing the European separation of plutonium
5 and burning of plutonium in the time frame that we would
6 be moving large quantities of plutonium.
7 PUBLIC CITIZEN: What, in layman's -- in
8 layperson's terms, what is the greatest negative of using
9 MOX fuel?
10 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, in the United States the
11 position is the greatest negative of using MOX fuel is the
12 fact that it poses a proliferation risk.
13 PUBLIC CITIZEN: And that's because you're
14 talking about sending, possibly sending stuff to Europe to
15 be --
16 MR. CYGELMAN: No. No, it poses a proliferation
17 risk in the sense that you're dealing with plutonium.
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right.
19 MR. CYGELMAN: You're fabricating plutonium. If
20 that plutonium, we have to divert it, it could be met by
21 any terrorist group, any other group, and could be used to
22 form a nuclear weapon.
23 PUBLIC CITIZEN: We better shake down DOE real
24 quick, hadn't we? They're doing it everyday. This hits a
25 sore chord because as you heard I was with the Barnwell

1 plant. We did that to stop proliferation. All of our key
2 technical people had worked for DOE or ADC or
3 [unintelligible] before had the clearances, they were
4 trusted there. All of a sudden industry cannot do this
5 anymore. They went on reprocessing right next door to us,
6 Savannah River Site. They said, no. Commercial industry
7 can't do it. I'd like somebody to tell me why you
8 couldn't trust me as well as you can trust Mario Fiori?
9 MR. CYGELMAN: Let me try to --
10 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I wasn't asking you. I'm
11 merely wondering why when you start talking commercial you
12 say oh, we're going to have trouble with proliferation.
13 MR. CYGELMAN: Okay.
14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, let's put armies around
15 all the DOE sites and shut them down.
16 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, we -- to some extent we
17 have pretty extensive security and safeguards on DOE --
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I think industry does, too,
19 sir.
20 MR. CYGELMAN: Okay. Now, let me answer your
21 question a little differently, which is at the time --
22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Domestic terrorism --
23 MR. CYGELMAN: Huh?
24 PUBLIC CITIZEN: You just signed a domestic
25 terrorism bill which is going to cover such acts like that

1 from any foreign sources. Why is it still a non -- a
2 proliferation problem?
3 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Well, I'll come back -- maybe
4 I'll answer your question a little differently. The
5 proliferation risk may not necessarily be in this country.
6 The proliferation risk could be in other countries.
7 When the position was first posed in this
country it was really -- and you may disagree with it and
9 a lot of people do disagree with it -- but the position
10 was that handling plutonium, okay, is a proliferation
11 risk, period. Okay? All right, that's number one. You
12 want to have nuclear weapons because you feel it enhances,
13 and it sounds odd, but it enhances national security, then
14 do so. But why do you want to expand that use of
15 plutonium? If you have other options to produce nuclear
16 power, why not use uranium? Why do you have to -- I'm not
17 saying, I'm not saying yes or no; I'm just giving you some
18 insight on it.
19 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Okay. Well, you mentioned a
20 possibility. There's a real possibility of sending it to
21 France and let them do it. If letting them make MOX fuel
22 is enhancing the risk of proliferation, and we don't have
23 it here, the U.S. was one of the prime movers in
24 organizing the International Atomic Energy Agency. Their
25 main responsibilities is stopping proliferation. Why

1 doesn't the U.S. insist that the IAEA stop MOX fuel in
2 France? Stop MOX fuel in England. Keep the Russians from
3 going that way. If it's so bad for us, why do we let the
4 rest of the world do it?
5 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Well, if you read the position
6 that the President talked in the Export Control Policy, it
7 said -- it recognizes that other countries have gone a
8 slightly different path in spite of what the United States
9 would have liked. And it says, well, we're not going to
10 encourage it, okay. Again, in an international entity,
11 we're not going to encourage it but we can't tell you flat
12 out to stop it.
13 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** We don't encourage or
14 discourage, I think that's the words that --
15 **MR. CYGELMAN:** We don't encourage to use the
16 plutonium. That's what the words say, okay. Exactly what
17 the words say. So I'm trying to answer your -- plutonium
18 is not the best thing in the world to have around because
19 you can make nuclear weapons. Some of them are
20 sophisticated, some of them are unsophisticated. But the
21 reason we're here today is not so much in the United
22 States, we haven't had any incidents in the United States.
23 But there's a concern outside the United States.
24 There's a concern in what used to be the Soviet Union
25 where the institutions are -- have been deteriorating,

1 where it could pose a threat. Now, if we want another
2 country to start disposing other plutonium, the feeling is
3 no one else is going to do it unless we also do some of
4 it, disposing of plutonium.
5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: France is doing it, England's
6 doing it, China's doing it.
7 MR. CYGELMAN: You mean --
8 PUBLIC CITIZEN: MOX fuel.
9 MR. CYGELMAN: In terms of --
10 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Commercially.
11 MR. CYGELMAN: Yes, they're doing it. And I --
12 they're using it for different reasons than here, but
13 they're doing it, yes.
14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, they're doing it for
15 sound economic and environmental reasons.
16 MR. CYGELMAN: They're doing it for
17 environmental reasons, right.
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Using MOX fuel.
19 MR. CYGELMAN: Yes, that's correct.
20 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes, exactly.
21 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I was just going to point out
22 on that issue, IAEA did a report a few years ago looking
23 at the operations at -- [unintelligible] for other large
24 scale processing plants and also it's MOX production and
25 said there is no proliferation risk. The U.S. was a

1 participant to that study. And as far as all the European
2 countries go, including the U.K. they're very concerned
3 about nonproliferation. They make it one of their highest
4 priorities as well as impact to the environment.
5 And so all these operations have undergone, just
6 for people who don't have any familiarity with your
7 systems --
8 MR. CYGELMAN: I agree with you.
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yeah, that --
10 MR. CYGELMAN: There is an IAEA. In fact, one
11 of the things under the surplus plutonium, we've committed
12 that at some period in time the surplus plutonium will be
13 under IAEA in storage and as it's disposed of. But I want
14 to emphasize the point once again with regard to plutonium
15 which is the country's position, is if you don't have to
16 use plutonium, don't use plutonium, okay. I mean that's
17 the bottom line.
18 MS. WHERLEY: You had a question over here.
19 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes. Using your different
20 types of reactors, it's going to require the use of water.
21 It's going to be your major source of keeping --
22 MR. CYGELMAN: That's correct.
23 PUBLIC CITIZEN: -- most of your reactors cool.
24 Where would your major source of water be coming from?
25 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, first of all -- you mean at

1 Savannah River if there were a new reactor?

2 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes. Yes.

3 MR. CYGELMAN: I would suspect that the first

4 source of water would be Savannah River, but on the new

5 reactor the water would be recycled so you'd be using a

6 makeup on a continual operation --

7 PUBLIC CITIZEN: You could do cooling towers.

8 MR. CYGELMAN: Huh?

9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Why don't you do cooling

10 towers?

11 MR. CYGELMAN: Excuse me?

12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: That's what he means.

13 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Cooling towers.

14 MR. CYGELMAN: Yeah, using cooling towers.

15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: They've got surplus towers --

16 PUBLIC CITIZEN: You could use air.

17 MR. CYGELMAN: Huh?

18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: You could use air.

19 MR. CYGELMAN: But you've got to get water in

20 the first time around.

21 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yeah, the first time around.

22 MR. CYGELMAN: Okay. You've got to fill it with

23 water and as the water evaporates you've got to do makeup.

24 But once you've done the fill, then you still have to make

25 up --

1 PUBLIC CITIZEN: But eventually there'll be a
2 discharge -- they will have to discharge the water that
3 have already been used, the water have to be discharged
4 and recycled again, right?
5 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, let me try to -- what
6 normally happens is once you've filled and you're
7 operating you do provide makeup water and you're right, in
8 order to -- you're going to have to discharge some water.
9 That's correct.
10 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right. Right.
11 MR. CYGELMAN: It depends on, you probably -- I
12 don't remember the number, but 1 percent or something in
13 that order is either made up and discharged, yes.
14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: So there wouldn't be any water
15 coming from the ground? There wouldn't be any use of
16 groundwater? The reactor wouldn't use any groundwater?
17 MR. CYGELMAN: I don't -- well, I don't believe
18 so, but I want to make sure. No.
19 MS. WHERLEY: A question on the back?
20 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I guess my question is about
21 which of these methods creates the most waste? I was -- I
22 didn't understand the comment about MOX being used for
23 environmental purposes because I was under the impression
24 that there was more radioactive waste created by using the
25 -- the plutonium and reactor, rather than just putting it

in --

MR. CYGELMAN: In general, in general the reactor route will create more waste in the area of -- well, not transuraniums, but mixed oxide waste. Well, within MOX fabrication, yes. Transuranium, mixed waste, the MOX route would tend to be a little heavier than the others.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Don't you think there should be a waste standard, also?

MR. CYGELMAN: Waste standard. Let me -- well, we do in a way have a waste standard. I mean, we have regulations that stipulate how much you can release to the environment. We do have those standards. But above and beyond that the Department really has committed itself to what they call is pollution prevention which is you look at your processes right at the beginning and you try to develop -- you develop processes that actually minimize the amount of waste that's generated, so --

PUBLIC CITIZEN: I would think then the reactor idea should be discounted.

MR. CYGELMAN: Well -- all right.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Where can we get more detail on that?

MR. CYGELMAN: On what, sir?

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Because I had that concern,

too. And in Thursday's session I understand there were a lot of questions about waste that were never answered. Now, where can we go for more detail on that?

MR. CYGELMAN: Okay. Well, in the PEIS, and I agree it's a horrendous document, but in the PEIS for each of the disposition alternatives, there are tables that indicate how much waste is generated and the type of waste, not only radiological, but nonradiological waste. Now, if you'd like we can get someone to highlight where it is, if you'll give me right at the end -- and you can then look it up.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay. I'll see you after for that. Yeah, I'm interested.

MS. WHERLEY: I have one question I'd like to interject. The woman along the back wall, would you like us to be sure that we have your -- as a comment that you think the reactor option should be disfavored because of waste generation? I want to make sure the notetakers have that.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes.

MS. WHERLEY: Okay.

[Several participants speak at one time.]

PUBLIC CITIZEN: I think we ought to discuss that a little bit more.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, we want to make sure,

1 too, that we get a comment in there about that MOX fuel
2 since you are talking about getting comments down.
3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right.
4 [Several participants speak at one time.]
5 MS. WHERLEY: Can we let Andre just finish up
6 and then we'll go into a comment --
7 MR. CYGELMAN: I don't have much. Yeah, I'll
8 just wrap it up and then we can deal with more questions.
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Can I ask one following
10 question that's pertinent to this?
11 MR. CYGELMAN: Yes.
12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Does the -- you say that you
13 have these extra wastes that are created. Do you also
14 account for the decrease in the amount of waste caused by
15 decreased mining requirements for uranium --
16 MR. CYGELMAN: Yes. Yes.
17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: -- and decreased enrichment
18 requirements by using the MOX?
19 MR. CYGELMAN: Yes.
20 PUBLIC CITIZEN: That's all accounted for in the
21 evaluation?
22 MR. CYGELMAN: Yes. What we've looked at is the
23 fact that if you went the MOX route, and you have,
24 roughly, nominally, 40 metric tons of plutonium, we've
25 looked at what the equivalent low enriched uranium fuel

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2094

1 would be to generate the same amount of power. And then
2 we walked backwards to see what it -- how much more would
3 be mined and we have taken the impact into account.
4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: That's not in the PEIS, is it?
5 MR. CYGELMAN: It's supposed --
6 PUBLIC CITIZEN: No, it's not. I don't think --
7 MR. CYGELMAN: It --
8 PUBLIC CITIZEN: It's in the body of it. It's
9 in the back section. You don't see it in executive
10 summary.
11 MR. CYGELMAN: Yeah. Right.
12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: In Volume II you just talk
13 about the waste streams, you don't net it against that
14 which is avoided. You talk to it but it's not netted
15 against it.
16 MR. RUDY: That's a comment we have picked up in
17 early meetings as we have gone around the various sites.
18 And we're going to increase that amount of coverage in the
19 final document.
20 MR. CYGELMAN: Yeah. In the final we'll make it
21 much clearer. What happened is at the last minute that
22 got thrown in there. Okay.
23 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Would you go back to what you
24 said about vitrification? You said something about 5
25 percent.

1 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Okay. 5 percent plutonium means
2 we were loading the glass 5 percent by weight, which is if
3 you have a hundred pounds of glass you would have five
4 pounds of plutonium --
5 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Oh, okay. I got it.
6 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** I have a question.
7 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Yes.
8 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Yes. Didn't with the partially
9 completed light water reactors the, I'm not -- the
10 gentleman mentioned that you all would be using cooling
11 towers. But from your report it states that there will be
12 salt drifted -- there will be salt that will be affective
13 to the, not only the wetlands but the aquatic environment
14 due to these light water reactors. And we noticed
15 especially in Savannah that the beaches are corroding
16 because of the saltwater intrusion and stuff like that.
17 And I'm very concerned about that because I called them --
18 I called the State, National Wildlife, and there are quite
19 a few species that are on an endangered list along the
20 Savannah River from here all the way down to Savannah.
21 And along with that, with the effect of thermal impact and
22 other problems that will cause the change of the aquatic
23 life, that is one of the major concerns, also.
24 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Okay. Now, let me make a
25 clarifying comment. With regard to Savannah River, there

are no partially completed reactors, but your point is well made if we were to build new reactors at Savannah River.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right. Right.

MR. CYGELMAN: Yeah. The salt comes from the evaporation.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: That's not salt like in the ocean?

MR. CYGELMAN: No, no, but it's a salt.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: It's a salt.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: It's a different makeup.

MR. CYGELMAN: Yeah.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Now, this only applies to your concern about this salt drift, is that the right way to --

MR. CYGELMAN: Yes, it's the salt drift that --

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Salt drift from either the partially completed or new reactors?

MR. CYGELMAN: In the case of Savannah River it's the new reactor.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: It's only new reactors.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: I'm a little concerned about the comments we've captured one and two. We have very negative comments about reactors being used as a disposition and we've heard very positive things about

1 plutonium fuel cycle, about the Europeans, about the
2 capabilities of people. And I really think that we
3 haven't captured really all the comments that were made
4 here.
5 MS. WHERLEY: No, no. I'm not attempting
6 there's -- nothing here suggests that these are group
7 comments. These are individual comments. We'll also --
8 you'll all have an opportunity to give me your comments.
9 It's just that that was coming up. I didn't want to lose
10 it.
11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, we've been talking about
12 this for --
13 PUBLIC CITIZEN: We've been commenting for a
14 half an hour.
15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: We've been talking about this
16 for a half an hour and none of the comments came until we
17 hear MOX fuel should be discounted because of the waste,
18 yet we heard that the Europeans are using MOX fuel because
19 it's more environmentally fair and better for their
20 environment, so.
21 MS. WHERLEY: Okay. Well, if you -- excuse me.
22 That's -- I was assuming that was kind of a clarifying
23 questions back and forth. If you want a comment reflected
24 that you encourage the use of reactors as an
25 environmentally safe disposition alternative, we'll get

that up here, too.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Please.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Certainly the comment about is the waste issue, the waste being considered in the EIS should be included.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right.

MS. WHERLEY: Yes. We have that.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: I think the fair question is about the waste generation and the consideration of it, but to say discount it, that's just an individual opinion.

MS. WHERLEY: Yeah. Right. But that's what we're capturing here is a whole bunch of individual opinions. I don't think we think we're coming out with a consensus group recommendation.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, you've missed about eighty percent of the comments that have been made.

MS. WHERLEY: Okay, well, we'll catch up. We will catch up.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: You'll catch up. What a memory.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: I'm a little confused.

MS. WHERLEY: Well, the notetakers -- okay.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: May I ask a general question about the three options of immobilization, borehole and reactor use? Immobilization, somehow we're taking this

1 plutonium fuel cycle, about the Europeans, about the
2 capabilities of people. And I really think that we
3 haven't captured really all the comments that were made
4 here.
5 MS. WHERLEY: No, no. I'm not attempting
6 there's -- nothing here suggests that these are group
7 comments. These are individual comments. We'll also --
8 you'll all have an opportunity to give me your comments.
9 It's just that that was coming up. I didn't want to lose
10 it.
11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, we've been talking about
12 this for --
13 PUBLIC CITIZEN: We've been commenting for a
14 half an hour.
15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: We've been talking about this
16 for a half an hour and none of the comments came until we
17 hear MOX fuel should be discounted because of the waste,
18 yet we heard that the Europeans are using MOX fuel because
19 it's more environmentally fair and better for their
20 environment, so.
21 MS. WHERLEY: Okay. Well, if you -- excuse me.
22 That's -- I was assuming that was kind of a clarifying
23 questions back and forth. If you want a comment reflected
24 that you encourage the use of reactors as an
25 environmentally safe disposition alternative, we'll get

1 that up here, too.

2 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Please.

3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Certainly the comment about is

4 the waste issue, the waste being considered in the EIS

5 should be included.

6 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right.

7 MS. WHERLEY: Yes. We have that.

8 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I think the fair question is

9 about the waste generation and the consideration of it,

10 but to say discount it, that's just an individual opinion.

11 MS. WHERLEY: Yeah. Right. But that's what

12 we're capturing here is a whole bunch of individual

13 opinions. I don't think we think we're coming out with a

14 consensus group recommendation.

15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, you've missed about

16 eighty percent of the comments that have been made.

17 MS. WHERLEY: Okay, well, we'll catch up. We

18 will catch up.

19 PUBLIC CITIZEN: You'll catch up. What a

20 memory.

21 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I'm a little confused.

22 MS. WHERLEY: Well, the notetakers -- okay.

23 PUBLIC CITIZEN: May I ask a general question

24 about the three options of immobilization, borehole and

25 reactor use? Immobilization, somehow we're taking this

1 weapons quality plutonium that is excess from the various
2 sites, and we're not talking about residues or anything
3 else.
4 **MR. CYGELMAN:** We're not talking about residues.
5 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Right.
6 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Besides the pits, of course,
7 there's other metals, not in large quantities; and there's
8 oxides.
9 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Right. But we're taking this
10 and in the immobilization we're putting it in some kind of
11 matrix, whether it be a glass or ceramic or whatever, and
12 we're immobilizing it?
13 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Yes.
14 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** It's not very easily dispersed
15 at that point? It's in some kind of solid matrix?
16 **MR. CYGELMAN:** That's right.
17 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Okay. Now, from there what do
18 we do with it afterwards? We can put it in the can in
19 can, which you've mentioned, which gives us the protection
20 of the high radiation?
21 **MR. CYGELMAN:** It provides a high radiation
22 barrier.
23 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** What is the other option to
24 that? Or is the can in can the only alternative to --
25 **MR. CYGELMAN:** No.

1 PUBLIC CITIZEN: -- the disposition?

2 MR. CYGELMAN: No. With regard to the

3 immobilization option there is one, the greenfield where

4 you take the canister the way it's at DWPF, and you fill

5 it up with high level waste and plutonium.

6 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay.

7 MR. CYGELMAN: Okay. There's one option.

8 There's another option which is called the adjoined melter

9 where in the greenfield, of course, we would provide our

10 own cesium, cesium capsules. There's the adjoined melter

11 where we would have to construct a new facility. Again we

12 use the same type of canister but we would pipe high level

13 waste from that -- from the tanks to that facility. So

14 there's several variances. But the basic concept is the

15 one you just indicated which is you have a canister and

16 you load plutonium with high level waste in that canister.

17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay, so we have some kind of

18 processing --

19 MR. CYGELMAN: And glass.

20 PUBLIC CITIZEN: -- that needs to be done --

21 MR. CYGELMAN: Right.

22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: -- whether it be an aqueous or

23 power fork or whatever type processing to get the

24 secondary material in with the plutonium to get mixed so

25 it's nonproliferation.

1 MR. CYGELMAN: In a form, right.

2 PUBLIC CITIZEN: In a deep borehole we're going

3 to do processing of the plutonium into plutonium itself

4 with no other material?

5 MR. CYGELMAN: That's one of the options, that's

6 correct. The other one --

7 PUBLIC CITIZEN: And you're going to drop them

8 down in there?

9 MR. CYGELMAN: Yeah. And the other one of

10 course --

11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: You're going to make a

12 vitrified --

13 MR. CYGELMAN: In the ceramic, right.

14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: But it doesn't get mixed with

15 anything else? No cesium or --

16 MR. CYGELMAN: No. No radiation barrier.

17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right. It's just the physical

18 depth of the hole and --

19 MR. CYGELMAN: Right. The barrier, the

20 nonproliferation barrier is the geological structure

21 between where the plutonium is and the surface of the

22 earth.

23 PUBLIC CITIZEN: So in both cases this

24 processing and in the third case there's reactors where we

25 again do processing to make a MOX fuel.

1 MR. CYGELMAN: Uh-huh [yes].

2 PUBLIC CITIZEN: But then we put the fuel into a

3 reactor and we gain something, we gain an energy value

4 from it. Where the other two, we're still spending money,

5 we're still creating nuclear waste. It may be less

6 nuclear waste than making the MOX fuel but in the long run

7 we have an economic value from it also.

8 MR. CYGELMAN: Yes. You've got to look at the

9 total picture. As we mentioned earlier we are doing

10 economic analyses and we do use the energy value of the

11 plutonium as a cost factor, as a cost offset. And when we

12 publish the report in June/July, you will see the relative

13 value that's being used for the energy content of the MOX

14 fuel as it's burned in the reactors.

15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Now, just really quick. We

16 have the potential right now to reprocess reactor fuel if

17 we want to?

18 MR. CYGELMAN: Yeah.

19 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I mean, we could.

20 MR. CYGELMAN: We could. Okay, go ahead.

21 PUBLIC CITIZEN: We have the technology, we have

22 facilities.

23 MR. CYGELMAN: It depends -- not commercially,

24 though, okay?

25 PUBLIC CITIZEN: No, but I'm saying we could if

1 we wanted. The immobilization and the borehole, once
2 that's done it takes very sophisticated types of equipment
3 and processes to get that material out. So in the future
4 if we decide to use that plutonium, would we be better off
5 processing reactor fuel later than the immobilization of a
6 borehole?
7 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, let me make some comments
8 first. The immobilization technology really doesn't use
9 very sophisticated --
10 PUBLIC CITIZEN: It's physical separation is all
11 that would be required to pull it back out.
12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Have you been through DWPF?
13 MR. CYGELMAN: Wait, wait. One thing at a time.
14 Your point was that to immobilize you need very
15 sophisticated equipment. In general it's not that
16 sophisticated.
17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: What -- excuse me --
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: DWPF is not sophisticated?
19 MR. CYGELMAN: Huh?
20 PUBLIC CITIZEN: DWPF is not sophisticated?
21 MR. CYGELMAN: Not -- it's the pretreatment --
22 wait a minute. The pretreatment is your real problem at
23 DWPF. You've got to get -- if you get the right
24 composition you're --
25 PUBLIC CITIZEN: The spout that didn't drip.

1 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, we've been doing the tests.
2 MS. WHERLEY: Let me interject a question. Was
3 your question whether the technology to immobilize was
4 sophisticated or --
5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: No.
6 MS. WHERLEY: -- whether it was going to take
7 sophisticated technology to recapture that at some point?
8 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Recapture.
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I guess I'm saying that we
10 heard earlier that we are not making any decision on
11 generations in the future if we need plutonium as a future
12 energy source. But to me it seems like if I immobilize or
13 deep borehole it, I'm going to have a more difficult time
14 in trying to reverse that situation than I am with MOX
15 fuel and burning it in a reactor right now and storing it
16 as a spent fuel.
17 MR. CYGELMAN: Let me answer the question very
18 directly. This program is about getting plutonium out of
19 it, not planning on reusing it, okay?
20 PUBLIC CITIZEN: But don't we have the
21 responsibility to really consider -- I mean, we're not
22 doing a final disposition.
23 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yeah.
24 MR. CYGELMAN: Yes.
25 PUBLIC CITIZEN: That's what this is.

1 MR. CYGELMAN: Sure.

2 PUBLIC CITIZEN: That's the point.

3 [Several participants speak at one time.]

4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Did I not hear we are not

5 making a final disposition of plutonium as a fuel?

6 MR. RUDY: No. What you heard, and I can try to

7 clarify this, the scope of this document and the scope of

8 this work is to apply technologies which bring the weapons

9 plutonium to the Spent Fuel Standard, and that's where we

10 stop. This program does not preclude nor does it

11 prejudice a future decision which you may decide to use on

12 plutonium. Once you get to the Spent Fuel Standard, this

13 program doesn't look at reopening the Spent Fuel Standard

14 and reprocessing or recycling and then to do it all over

15 again.

16 PUBLIC CITIZEN: But if I take action such as

17 immobilization and deep borehole and it costs me a hundred

18 times more, if later in the future I decide I need that

19 plutonium, then the spent fuels, would I not do an

20 injustice at this point making that decision?

21 MR. RUDY: I see what you're saying in terms of

22 if a driver, one of the drivers that you would express

23 would be the energy value or extracting the energy value.

24 So that's an interesting point that how do these options

25 take advantage of or extract the energy value either right

1 away or in the future is what I'm hearing you say.

2 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right. That's what I mean.

3 MR. RUDY: And that's very important. And we

4 don't --

5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I --

6 MR. RUDY: Go ahead.

7 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I think he's right, Rudy, but I

8 think it may be academic. If you look at the amount of

9 plutonium that they're talking about here relative to the

10 amount that's otherwise going to be generated in

11 commercial reactors over the fifteen or seventeen years,

12 it's about 2 percent of the total that's otherwise

13 available.

14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Then you go for the

15 commercial --

16 PUBLIC CITIZEN: You go for the commercial first

17 and they'll be around for thirty/forty years, so you're

18 talking less than 1 percent. And this is probably down in

19 the minutiae worrying about that relative to all of the

20 plutonium coming out of commercial reactors.

21 MR. RUDY: And those decisions are left open and

22 are impacted by what we would do here on the commercial

23 side.

24 PUBLIC CITIZEN: This thing, if you don't go to

25 MOX fuel you're closing the door on nuclear power for the

1 future. You're going to lose all the technology, you're
2 going to lose the competence, the know-how. This was
3 brought up in your weapons program you're going to try to
4 keep those people. The people who knew or know how to
5 reprocess, they're going to be gone. If we want it we're
6 going to have to go to France or England or Russia and ask
7 them to help us.
8 And I think that's a point for most people in
9 the United States to look at -- we were the leaders, now
10 we're going to be the beggars.
11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: She's still writing.
12 MS. WHERLEY: Sorry. I wanted to capture the
13 idea that one of the concerns is this loss of nuclear
14 competence knowledge as one of the comments.
15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I have a comment and then a
16 question, please. The comment is that a lot of the
17 dialogue here and last Thursday was because of the -- and
18 we were only dealing with the excess plutonium. The same
19 thing with the excess highly enriched uranium. Where
20 people really don't have an understanding of the spent
21 fuel issue for commercial and they don't know what's
22 happening to the nonexcess. So I think a lot of the
23 confusion would have been cleared up had both -- had the
24 EIS dealt with total highly enriched uranium and total
25 plutonium, even if just background.

1 The question I have is how do you apply Spent
2 Fuel Standards to immobilization and deep borehole where
3 you don't change the chemical or isotopic composition of
4 plutonium?
5 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, that's a good question. In
6 fact we've been struggling quite a bit with it. But the
7 bottom line is the way we're looking at it is, is the
8 keywords is how easy or how difficult it is to use that
9 plutonium relative to what you have in plutonium and spent
10 fuel. By that I mean, okay, if you take the geological
11 barrier for a deep borehole as an example, you drill
12 several kilometers in the ground. And then the question
13 is, okay, seal it. Now, what does it take to get that
14 plutonium back up to the ground -- up to the surface? If
15 it turns out that in terms of resources and in terms of
16 time it's worse than processing spent fuel to retrieve,
17 then obviously that --
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: But you're calling that Spent
19 Fuel Standard.
20 MR. CYGELMAN: Yeah, that's meeting it. Right.
21 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I've got a problem. Excuse me.
22 MR. CYGELMAN: Yeah.
23 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I hear that on one hand that
24 you do this and the other hand you do that. Now -- and
25 then we have this statement about the waste generation.

1 And it just seems that some of this stuff is taken out of
2 context where you people are supposed to have put this
3 altogether, considered this, considered that. I think
4 that Mr. Rudy over here spoke about the discouragement of
5 canistered materials, that it has a fairly good radiation
6 condition that would discourage that type of thing. I
7 think that it is -- it's not confusing to me because I do
8 pick these things up, but I think that we just keep kind
9 of chasing our tail a little bit.
10 And I think we have to realize that some of the
11 people are here, they're trying to get something out of
12 it, but they are not able to grasp some of this. I think
13 we've got to settle down a little bit. And it's not only
14 a matter of grabbing all the comments which are important
15 to people, but it's trying to get them in the right
16 perspective with each other again. And waste generation
17 of MOX fuel is another element that we are not exploring
18 even a little bit.
19 And it bothers me in that sense that we are
20 getting a lot of comments. I've been in this community
21 thing from the advisory board formation and all that. I'm
22 not on the advisory board or anything like that, but I've
23 been in with Dr. Fiori's comments and all that type of
24 thing. And it just bothers me that we seem to be chasing
25 our tail.

1 We hear statements from you, it's get rid of
2 plutonium. And then on the other hand we're generating
3 plutonium. And I understand there's a difference in
4 grades because I enjoyed Mr. Rudy's statements and I
5 thought -- but it's a little different situation. But
6 you're not getting rid of plutonium, you're generating
7 plutonium.
8 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, let me -- no. In this
9 program --
10 PUBLIC CITIZEN: But --
11 MR. CYGELMAN: Let me -- I hear -- let me make a
12 statement and then you can tell me if I misstated it or
13 not, okay?
14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay.
15 MR. CYGELMAN: We have weapons-grade plutonium
16 and as we pointed out there is non weapons-grade
17 plutonium, okay? This program is focused on controlling
18 and managing weapons-grade plutonium. I do recognize what
19 you've said which is outside of the weapons-grade
20 plutonium there is plutonium being produced in commercial
21 light water reactors.
22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: If you burn MOX fuel, what are
23 you going to have? Weapons grade plutonium?
24 MR. CYGELMAN: If we burn MOX --
25 PUBLIC CITIZEN: In a residue?

1 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, if we burn MOX fuel we will
2 end up with a residual of the plutonium that went into the
3 fuel, okay, plus some that is also produced as U-238. But
4 let me make -- I'll give you a chance. The point is we're
5 making -- we're meeting a Spent Fuel Standard. With
6 regard to this country, the opinion is that once you meet
7 the Spent Fuel Standard and you do not reprocess -- and
8 you do not reprocess -- then that plutonium is not
9 available at least in the shorter ten/twenty years. If
10 you do not reprocess, that plutonium is not available for
11 weapons use, okay. I don't know, did that answer your --
12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, it still leaves that
13 point of we're trying -- the gentleman spoke at the last
14 Thursday meeting was talking about the problem of getting
15 the Russians to do what we want them to do and all that
16 type thing. I think we're fooling ourselves. I mean, I
17 grew up and I knew people and that type of thing, and a
18 lot of people I would have liked to had them do what I
19 would like to have them do, but they didn't do what I
20 would have liked them to do.
21 MR. CYGELMAN: Well --
22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: They would have did something
23 anyhow. And I just have a feeling that we are fooling
24 ourselves, that we're saying we're going to do this, we
25 expect you to do that and sometimes that does work a

1 little bit. But I think what we have to do is look more
2 at our program and what we can do and how we can go
3 forward and that type of thing rather than trying to tie
4 in with somebody who is unpredictable maybe, you know.
5 And I just am trying to justify what we're spending our
6 time on. That's my problem.
7 MR. CYGELMAN: Okay. Let me try to answer your
8 question in the following way which recognizes what you've
9 said. We are looking at storage in the event that, one,
10 we're not able to move forward with disposition is number
11 one, and, two, in the event that we're able to move
12 forward with disposition but it's at a slower rate or it's
13 intermittent we do have safe secure storage. We are
14 working with the Russians. The way we move forward
15 disposition will depend to a large extent on agreements
16 that we have with the Russians.
17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, I'm sure that there's
18 an element, but it's an element of uncertainty. And
19 that's --
20 MR. CYGELMAN: There's no question about it.
21 PUBLIC CITIZEN: -- a big element of
22 uncertainty. And if we can go ahead and do what we know
23 what we can do the best we can do it, which is what we go
24 to school for, prepare life and all that type of thing. I
25 think that our perspective should be along those lines

1 rather than this business of -- and I understand there's a
2 political aspect of the things.
3 But I'm just bothered that the Cold War went on
4 so long. I think the Russians recognized themselves,
5 not -- we didn't tell them. I think we wore them out,
6 that they would be better off trying a capitalistic system
7 after a while. They found that that didn't work. But I
8 don't think at one time we wanted to go in there and tell
9 the Russians what to do because I don't think it would
10 have been received very well.
11 And that's -- this has come out of all of these
12 meetings and everything that we're having and I appreciate
13 that. But I just am bothered that we seem to take things
14 out of context. We take one thing and all of a sudden we
15 jump on it and then it's dropped and people get the wrong
16 impression. And I'm sure these people are searching over
17 here for information.
18 MS. WHERLEY: Okay.
19 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay, I'm done.
20 MS. WHERLEY: No, no, that's fine. What I was
21 going to suggest is to see if there were other people who
22 had some questions or comments directly on your point so
23 we are fracturing the discussion quite so much because I
24 think that's a very valid point. Did you have --
25 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yeah. I was just going to ask

1 what the process is. How is this EIS process impacted as
2 the -- looking directly at this chart with the political
3 agreements and technical economic placements and all that
4 related? Kind of, is this just working in parallel with
5 the EIS process conditions with Russia and how -- for
6 instance, the recent summit, how does that impact the EIS
7 process right now?
8 MR. CYGELMAN: Okay. What the EIS does is
9 analyze the environmental impacts of the technologies that
10 are being proposed, okay. What the Record of Decision
11 will do, which is a little different, it will select
12 either one or more technologies that this country plans to
13 move forward with in the future. When the Record of
14 Decision is made, it will take into consideration what the
15 Russians may do or what agreements have been made with the
16 Russians or what possibly could be agreed with the
17 Russians.
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: So that's before or after the
19 ROD?
20 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, that would be factor that
21 you saw before the ROD to the extent that there is
22 knowledge, okay.
23 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay. Yeah.
24 PUBLIC CITIZEN: My understanding -- first of
25 all let me ask this. There is no final disposal site,

1 correct?

2 MR. CYGELMAN: That is correct.

3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: How then do we place the

4 plutonium disposition discussion within that framework?

5 MR. CYGELMAN: That's an excellent question.

6 What we've done is the following. We've looked at what

7 this country was planning to dispose of in terms of the

8 long term. What we saw was we have spent fuel that we've

9 been trying to dispose of and we have the defense high

10 level waste that we were planning to dispose of.

11 So when we started this program we said, okay,

12 we want to get rid of this plutonium in the long term.

13 Let's look and try to put it in a form that's as similar

14 to what we're planning to dispose of right now. So we

15 have commercial spent fuel that we're trying to dispose of

16 so we said MOX fuel, why don't we look at it because what

17 we'll do is we will put plutonium in about 4 percent

18 concentration in reactors. What we end up with at the end

19 of the radiation period is fuel that looks a lot like what

20 the commercial spent fuel is but it's not exactly alike,

21 it's got more plutonium for one thing.

22 And so what we've done is we've worked with

23 another DOE department which is in charge of the final --

24 of the repository. And we've been asking them to do

25 analyses with regard to what -- with regard to MOX fuel

1 first, what is the impact of having more plutonium in
2 spent fuel than is currently in U.S. spent fuel.
3 With regard to other critical concerns is number
4 one, and leaching in terms of would that plutonium leach
5 out and cause a problem in the long term. We don't have
6 any definitive solutions but the initial indications we
7 have is, yes, we could use MOX fuel and then dispose of it
8 very similar to the way we are planning to dispose of
9 commercial spent fuel. We will take some extra
10 precautions because of the plutonium, high plutonium
11 compound, but it looks like it can be done, okay.
12 In regard vitrification, we've looked at it very
13 similarly. Right now there's very little plutonium in the
14 defense high level waste from DWPF. So we've done a
15 similar approach, we said okay, we're going to add some
16 plutonium to this glass. You repository people, could you
17 give us an evaluation if we added up to 4 percent
18 plutonium, would you be able to accept this in the
19 repository. Now, it's very cursory. It's an initial --
20 it is in the final answer. But again we got an indication
21 which is, if you keep the plutonium in glass around 4
22 percent/5 percent or below, it should not be a real
23 problem. So that's how we're dealing with it. Have I --
24 was that --
25 MS. WHERLEY: Are there any more questions

1 correct?

2 MR. CYGELMAN: That is correct.

3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: How then do we place the

4 plutonium disposition discussion within that framework?

5 MR. CYGELMAN: That's an excellent question.

6 What we've done is the following. We've looked at what

7 this country was planning to dispose of in terms of the

8 long term. What we saw was we have spent fuel that we've

9 been trying to dispose of and we have the defense high

10 level waste that we were planning to dispose of.

11 So when we started this program we said, okay,

12 we want to get rid of this plutonium in the long term.

13 Let's look and try to put it in a form that's as similar

14 to what we're planning to dispose of right now. So we

15 have commercial spent fuel that we're trying to dispose of

16 so we said MOX fuel, why don't we look at it because what

17 we'll do is we will put plutonium in about 4 percent

18 concentration in reactors. What we end up with at the end

19 of the radiation period is fuel that looks a lot like what

20 the commercial spent fuel is but it's not exactly alike,

21 it's got more plutonium for one thing.

22 And so what we've done is we've worked with

23 another DOE department which is in charge of the final --

24 of the repository. And we've been asking them to do

25 analyses with regard to what -- with regard to MOX fuel

1 first, what is the impact of having more plutonium in
2 spent fuel than is currently in U.S. spent fuel.
3 With regard to other critical concerns is number
4 one, and leaching in terms of would that plutonium leach
5 out and cause a problem in the long term. We don't have
6 any definitive solutions but the initial indications we
7 have is, yes, we could use MOX fuel and then dispose of it
8 very similar to the way we are planning to dispose of
9 commercial spent fuel. We will take some extra
10 precautions because of the plutonium, high plutonium
11 compound, but it looks like it can be done, okay.
12 In regard vitrification, we've looked at it very
13 similarly. Right now there's very little plutonium in the
14 defense high level waste from DWPF. So we've done a
15 similar approach, we said okay, we're going to add some
16 plutonium to this glass. You repository people, could you
17 give us an evaluation if we added up to 4 percent
18 plutonium, would you be able to accept this in the
19 repository. Now, it's very cursory. It's an initial --
20 it is in the final answer. But again we got an indication
21 which is, if you keep the plutonium in glass around 4
22 percent/5 percent or below, it should not be a real
23 problem. So that's how we're dealing with it. Have I --
24 was that --
25 MS. WHERLEY: Are there any more questions

1 before we switch subjects? And I think you're next. Are
2 there any more questions on this issue of the relationship
3 of this action to the ultimate disposal constraints?
4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: In the final EIS, I've got a
5 copy of NEPA right here, a lot of things in your current
6 PEIS are not there. Could you tell me one by one if these
7 will be addressed in the final or by some interim action?
8 Effect on future generations.
9 MR. CYGELMAN: Well --
10 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Just yes or no.
11 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, it's hard for me to say yes
12 or no because I think we've done it. And I know you --
13 PUBLIC CITIZEN: The future generation, two
14 words, are not in that PEIS I would venture to say.
15 MR. CYGELMAN: And as we indicated in --
16 PUBLIC CITIZEN: The longest you've got is
17 twenty years maybe. That's not generation.
18 MR. CYGELMAN: Well --
19 PUBLIC CITIZEN: What happens two hundred years
20 from now when we run out of fossil fuels? Even if we
21 drill a hundred -- a mile and a half into the ocean,
22 [unintelligible] Bay's running out. I know they're
23 finding new ones but there is a finite limit. NEPA says
24 you should consider the impact of making energy resources
25 inaccessible or irretrievable. And one of your objectives

1 in this as stated in the EIS is you're going to make them
2 as irretrievable as possible. That's an objective.
3 So what is the impact on future generation? I
4 don't mean the year 2010, I mean the year of maybe 3000.
5 You're worried about twenty-four thousand half -- year
6 half-life on plutonium. Let's look at the impact on
7 people. Enough on that one.
8 Will you look at the alternatives? For
9 instance, if you complete or partially complete a reactor
10 or reactors or build new ones, they will supplant fossil
11 fuels in generation of electricity, in any event. When
12 you look at the reduction and the amount of CO2 in the
13 atmosphere -- Vice President Gore signed a compact in
14 Brazil saying we would cooperate and reduce our CO2
15 emissions. I don't see much evidence of that.
16 MR. CYGELMAN: You're right.
17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay. Will they look --
18 MR. CYGELMAN: We had that comment --
19 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Will they look at the reduction
20 in oil spills on the high seas or smaller spills in the
21 rivers? The less oil you transport the fewer you're going
22 to have. You can do this as accurately as some of the
23 other projections where you look at statistics. Reused
24 coal, fly ash. It's been reduced. It's being reduced
25 more and more. The DOE budget for next year says you're

1 working on cleaner ways of burning coal. To me that's
2 like a half a glass of water. Is it half-full or half
3 empty? Are they going to develop cleaner ways of burning
4 coal or less [unintelligible] ways of burning coal?
5 And the last I knew, RCRA exempted ash -- coal
6 ash, fly ash and so forth, which exceeded their limitation
7 of radioactivity to prevent putting it in a low level
8 waste dump and yet the coal industry is excluded from
9 that. They can put radioactive material, ash, in the
10 dump. We were going to get something on cost and cost
11 benefits and I assume they will include the cost of R&D of
12 other plants. I saw at least one report. I'm not sure, I
13 don't think there was --
14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: This is repetitious.
15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: -- that recommended building
16 four vitrification pilot plants to see what was a good
17 process. Lord of Mercy, what we've been through here at
18 Savannah River --
19 MS. WHERLEY: Sir --
20 PUBLIC CITIZEN: -- we ought to have a pretty
21 good handle on that already.
22 MS. WHERLEY: Excuse me, sir, because you're
23 going through your list so fast, is there any way I could
24 ask you to make a copy -- let us copy that so we can give
25 it to the notetakers and make sure we capture that?

1 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I will.

2 MS. WHERLEY: There's a few other people who
3 haven't had a chance to speak and we need to rejoin the
4 larger group. So I'd like to give them an opportunity for
5 just a few more comments and then we have to wrap up.
6 Thank you, I really appreciate it.

7 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I wanted to go back to the
8 discussion on the Russians and the need for pairing the
9 two programs. Mr. Rudy made the comment speaking highly
10 of the CANDU option because it did seem to have some
11 benefits coordinating with the Russian program.

12 What are the barriers that DOE sees to having a
13 closer coordination with the U.S. program including use of
14 the -- of U.S. existing light water reactors, perhaps even
15 to burn the Russian plutonium in addition to the U.S.
16 plutonium? What barriers are there that you perceive and
17 what are you doing to try and break them down?

18 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, you have a multi-question
19 there. The first one is we still do not have the Canadian
20 government's approval. That has to be overcome, okay. An
21 important factor.

22 Two, the MOX fabrication would probably be
23 either in the United States or Russia, depending on where
24 it was going to be -- if it was Russia the MOX fuel would
25 probably be fabricated in Russia, the U.S. would be

1 fabricated in the U.S. and shipped to Canada.

2 The other factor, of course, is shipping

3 material into Canada, plutonium material into Canada. It

4 could be a potential problem, but that would be addressed

5 by the Canadian government as to whether they thought they

6 wanted to move forward with it.

7 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Let me try and reclarify my

8 point. It's that you're looking at the CANDU option as

9 being attractive because it has the pairing relationship.

10 MR. CYGELMAN: Right.

11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: How can you take the benefits

12 of that pairing relationship and apply it to the U.S.

13 light water reactors to look at disposing of both the U.S.

14 and the Russian program? What are you doing to use U.S.

15 reactors to do that?

16 MR. RUDY: Andre, that's --

17 MR. CYGELMAN: In pairing?

18 MR. RUDY: Yeah. No, that's not precluded,

19 interestingly enough. The Russians have indicated -- the

20 Russians also, and I didn't mean to over-imply that the

21 Canadian thing is the best thing since sliced bread, just

22 unique options --

23 MR. CYGELMAN: We're planning to use VVR-1000,

24 if that's your question.

25 MR. RUDY: Yeah, it's just a very unique option.

1 But when you look at the Russians, their statement has
2 been they see energy value in plutonium and thank you very
3 much we, the Russians, would like to use it here in Russia
4 in our Russian reactors. So it would be very difficult in
5 a political face-saving sense for Russia at this time to
6 take its nuclear weapons and give those to America.
7 That's one difficult thing to get over. But even equally
8 difficult to that, Russia believes sincerely that there's
9 energy value that they want to extract for their nation at
10 some date using their reactors. So would they be willing
11 to use U.S. reactors to dispose of that plutonium? Maybe.
12 But they see opportunity to dispose of it there
13 in their reactors. They're interested in talking to
14 Canada and the Canadian prime minister at the Russian
15 Summit, in a separate meeting with Yeltsin, signed an
16 agreement -- it's not as formal as a treaty -- to work
17 nation to nation, Canada to Russia on this because maybe
18 Canada can work with Russia. So they're willing to talk
19 to them. But, you know, Russia hasn't committed one way
20 or the other. If they were going to use plutonium, they'd
21 prefer probably to use it in their reactors.
22 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Or to -- in the high enriched
23 uranium discussions I know there are segments of the
24 government that would advocate paying a premium to the
25 Russians or paying them to get control of the material

1 instead of having it remain in Russia. Why can't the same
2 logic be applied to the plutonium situation as well?
3 MR. RUDY: It might, it might. And with the
4 highly enriched uranium there is already -- and thankfully
5 so -- a contract. It's like a treaty but it's more
6 economical. This country has signed a contract with
7 Russia to buy five hundred metric tons after Russia blends
8 it down in Russia.
9 So Russia maintains the sovereignty of that
10 nation to keep their weapons material and blend it down,
11 and then they ship low enriched uranium. There is a
12 process that worked with highly enriched uranium. With
13 plutonium you can't dilute it or blend it down, so we
14 don't have the same type of industrial model that we
15 applied to the uranium cycle. And there aren't as many
16 nations who are on a MOX cycle as there are on a uranium
17 cycle.
18 So there's some ingredients of it, but the
19 Russians are seriously looking at the option of burning
20 this plutonium in reactors.
21 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Just one quick wrap-up comment.
22 I see a lot of momentum going towards the Canadian option
23 because of this pairing relationship and I don't think the
24 U.S. option or the U.S. pairing relationships have been
25 fully explored enough, so I'd encourage you to take a

1 harder look at that.

2 PUBLIC CITIZEN: A follow on to that --

3 MS. WHERLEY: I've got --

4 MR. CYGELMAN: I think -- excuse me, but I think

5 if you look at what we're doing in research and

6 development and also looking at utilization of reactors,

7 they're getting about the same amount of weight. We're

8 not preferring Canadians.

9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yeah. A follow on to the

10 Canadian option, they're not going to do this for free.

11 The Russians don't have the money to make MOX. It looks

12 like it's a U.S. tax dollar that's going to make the MOX

13 and the energy value is going to be expected in Canada.

14 I'd like the comment to be noted that I as a citizen, I

15 don't see my tax dollars being meaningfully applied in

16 that scenario.

17 MS. WHERLEY: I'll add that to the list. I

18 think we need to rejoin the rest of the group. There will

19 be more a chance to make comments in the summary session

20 and to ask questions as well as hear what happened in the

21 other groups. Thank you all very much.

22 [The breakout session is moved to another location.]

23 MS. WHERLEY: Can we all get together again so

24 you all have a little more opportunity to talk to the DOE

25 folks about the storage and disposition of the plutonium.

1 If we can kind of gather towards the front.

2 And I have a strong sense that there was more to

3 be said before we left the smaller room. Here we have a

4 little bit more room to spread out and hopefully some of

5 the people that were in the other groups will join us

6 here. And we'll just continue where we left off. So

7 forget the wrap-up that we did and we'll just start over

8 with new subjects. I brought the listing from where we

9 were before and we had talked a little bit about the

10 Russian-U.S. combined activities, the negotiations going

11 on there, the impacts on this program and this program's

12 impact in relationship to those activities. Are there any

13 other comments or questions about that subject?

14 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Where in Russia are you

15 dealing?

16 **MS. WHERLEY:** Did you hear the question?

17 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Where are we dealing in Russia?

18 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Yeah. Who are you talking to

19 in Russia? What areas?

20 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Our primary point of contact of

21 course is [unintelligible], but as you have heard we're

22 also dealing on a lab to lab basis. Some of the people

23 we're dealing with are at, let's see, Minsk, Kokcetav

24 [phonetically spelled]. There's about five or six

25 institutes that we're dealing with.

1 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Have you been to Novosibirsk
2 [phonetically spelled]?
3 MR. CYGELMAN: Excuse me?
4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Novosibirsk, [unintelligible].
5 MR. CYGELMAN: I believe so. The way it's
6 operated, by the way, is we have the lab people dealing
7 with their counterparts. What was the place you
8 mentioned?
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: [Unintelligible], Novosibirsk.
10 MR. CYGELMAN: Yes.
11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Central Siberia.
12 MR. CYGELMAN: I believe so. I'm trying to
13 remember the list of the names and I think that was one of
14 the cases. And the way it's worked is we are working
15 through the Amarillo National Resource Center who is doing
16 a lot of the coordination working with [unintelligible] of
17 various institutes. And what we do is actually after it's
18 set up it works on a lab to lab basis.
19 And right now we're in the stage of recording
20 some preliminary reports on six groups that we formed in
21 the [unintelligible] studies. These cover the storage,
22 they cover immobilization, cover reactors, let's see, the
23 deep borehole. And we also have a similar group that's
24 dealing with economic analysis and stabilizations, and
25 as -- also safeguard and security.

1 MS. WHERLEY: Any questions or comments? I
2 really thought there was a whole lot more energy in that
3 room when we were there, and thank you for having it. I
4 had concern that y'all wouldn't have enough opportunity --
5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes, I'm joining you a little
6 late but I think you made a comment about the deep
7 borehole. Has that been approved for Savannah River Site
8 [unintelligible]?
9 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, let me -- what we have done
10 with the deep borehole, it's been analyzed on a generic
11 basis. We really haven't analyzed it on a site-specific
12 basis. So if in fact we were to select the borehole we
13 would have to do quite a bit of analysis on the specific
14 site.
15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, doesn't Texas have a deep
16 borehole already?
17 MR. CYGELMAN: No, to my knowledge the only deep
18 boreholes that are in the United States -- I think they
19 are in other countries, has to do with either oil
20 expiration at least in this country, in Russia it has to
21 do with disposal of some of the toxic wastes.
22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: You should ask that because I
23 know a lady by the name of Phyllis Grave [phonetically
24 spelled] and she's from Texas. And I'd like to give you
25 her information to call her. They have serious problems

1 with a private company owning that particular borehole and
2 with them putting certain things in it. And all the
3 workers there at that plant was sick and had other
4 complications. I would like to give you that
5 information -- that information a little later on.
6 **MR. CYGELMAN:** All right. Thank you.
7 **MS. WHERLEY:** Okay. Any other follow-up
8 questions or comments on that point?
9 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** I've got one question. Last
10 Thursday we sat here and formally discussed the
11 nonproliferation issue and haste was a major consideration
12 that some action need to be done as quickly as possible so
13 that the Russians and the U.S. would ensure that
14 plutonium, MOX grade plutonium would be nonproliferation.
15 I guess my question is, of all of the options that you've
16 outlined, are there any that have major stumbling blocks
17 that preclude us from making this criteria of resolving
18 this issue as fast as possible?
19 **MR. CYGELMAN:** On a technical level there aren't
20 what I would consider major stumbling blocks. And other
21 than technical there could be options that have more
22 obstacles than others, specifically as I -- the borehole
23 for example. There's no legislative -- there's no regime
24 for that particular one. We'd have -- you would have to
25 have new legislation to set up how it could be licensed,

1 and that could take quite a bit of time. That is not
2 shared by -- the same extent, by either reactor or the
3 immobilization.
4 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Just a follow-up on that. If I
5 understand correctly, then, the whole PEIS is to look at
6 the environmental impact. And what you're basically
7 saying is here's all our options. Based solely on the
8 environment we're going to evaluate these as potential
9 risks -- for similar risks, ones have more risks and one
10 has a lot less risks, and then they will all be from
11 viable options that have acceptable environmental impacts.
12 And then you will look at these other issues and the
13 technical study and costs and so forth of that issue, is
14 that correct?
15 **MR. CYGELMAN:** That's correct.
16 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Okay. I just wanted to clarify
17 that.
18 **MS. WHERLEY:** Any other questions or comments?
19 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** You mentioned that in your
20 June/July time frame you will be coming out with the
21 economic and political evalua- -- or economic --
22 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Economic.
23 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** -- evaluation. You set up a --
24 what essentially amounts to a competitive process with
25 utilities for the reactor option by coming out with this

1 expression of interest and then saying that you're going
2 to be going out for a request for quotations. At some
3 point if that were to be the option chosen, given that --
4 given that setting, what are you using as the basis for
5 evaluating the costs associated with the reactor option?
6 Because you have not been through the RQ process.
7 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Well, I would say that we have to
8 make assumptions. And we really won't know, with regard
9 to reactors specifically of the MOX, what it really is
10 going to end up costing us when we sit down and negotiate
11 something [unintelligible]. But of course you can make
12 assumptions and you can make a range of assumptions -- is
13 it working? Okay. You can make a range of assumptions
14 where you think it bounds what you can expect from it, and
15 that's what we're trying to do.
16 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** How deep would the borehole go
17 and exactly which radioactive waste would you put in it?
18 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Okay. The borehole depends
19 actually on the location that you would do it in the
20 United States assuming you would select it. The criteria
21 there is to find the geological structure where there
22 hasn't been any water movement on the geologic times. And
23 that can vary depending on where you are in the country
24 from a few kilometers, let's say two kilometers, to maybe
25 10/15 kilometers deep. So it depends on the part of the

1 United States.

2 MS. WHERLEY: Anyone else?

3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Could you briefly summarize the

4 considerations about waste with which of each of the

5 options -- the quantity and the relative hazards connected

6 with the wastes through the processing for each of these

7 options?

8 MR. CYGELMAN: By summarizing, meaning the

9 quantities and the nature of them?

10 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Quantities and the nature,

11 including their hazardous nature, yes.

12 MR. CYGELMAN: Okay. Let's see. On Savannah

13 River in term -- with regard to disposition options, if

14 you were to look at MOX fabrication we would be -- we

15 would expect to generate in the TRU waste, transuranic

16 waste, roughly 306 cubic meters of that type of waste.

17 With regard to the low level waste we would be expecting

18 157 cubic meters. And with regard to non-radiological

19 waste, we would be expecting to generate 157 cubic meters

20 of hazardous waste. These would be solvents, adhesives.

21 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Andre, are those annual numbers

22 or are those --

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Wait, wait, just a

24 second.

25 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Are those numbers annual

1 figures, so many cubic meters per year, or is that the
2 total of the lifetime of the --
3 MR. CYGELMAN: My best guess is that they
4 probably are totals, but let me double-check.
5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: How would they compare with the
6 uranium fabrication?
7 MR. CYGELMAN: These are annual? Okay. They're
8 annual then. They're annual. Your question was how do
9 they compare to uranium?
10 PUBLIC CITIZEN: If you -- a uranium fuel.
11 MR. CYGELMAN: Uranium fuel cycle?
12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: No, the fabrication. You're --
13 MR. CYGELMAN: Fabrication of uranium?
14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: You're talking MOX fuel
15 fabrication, are you not?
16 MR. CYGELMAN: Yes, that's correct.
17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay. Compared to uranium fuel
18 fabrication.
19 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, my first answer to you is I
20 would not expect any significant TRU waste with regard to
21 fabrication of MOX --
22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: For practical purposes they
23 would be about the same?
24 MR. CYGELMAN: Huh?
25 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Are you saying for practical

1 purposes they would be about the same?

2 MR. CYGELMAN: Other than TRU I don't know why

3 you would want to generate more low level waste or

4 hazardous wastes offhand. I don't have the

5 [unintelligible].

6 PUBLIC CITIZEN: If somebody wants to dig, I

7 think they're in the PEIS.

8 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, I'm saying the fabrication

9 process is very similar. The only thing is you don't have

10 plutonium. Yes.

11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Andre, how can you get

12 transuranic waste and then you process it, starting with

13 [unintelligible]? I mean would it step into that?

14 MR. CYGELMAN: How we get the TRU waste?

15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yeah.

16 MR. CYGELMAN: As far as the process you're

17 going to get some equivalence [unintelligible] plutonium.

18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: And what was the volume that

19 you had?

20 MR. CYGELMAN: According to this, 306 cubic

21 meters.

22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: A year?

23 MR. CYGELMAN: That's what apparently the

24 analysis is --

25 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I think that that number

1 probably sounds better for lifetime.

2 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, we'll double check it.

3 MS. WHERLEY: All right. The gentleman here.

4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Could you get a specific answer

5 to that and mail it to us? To me it seems like an

6 important question and a very important answer.

7 MR. CYGELMAN: Sure.

8 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I'd rather not let it slip by.

9 MR. CYGELMAN: Yes. We'll -- I have your card

10 and we'll send it to you.

11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Let me ask you a question.

12 Relative to repetitive statements in the summary part of

13 the document that -- and one I don't believe is correct.

14 And let me quote you. This is over and over again. I'm

15 reading from S-20, page S-20. It says, because of the

16 higher percentage of minority and low-income populations

17 in certain counties surrounding SRS, the potential exist

18 for these populations to be disproportionately affected in

19 an accident. I've looked at a number of EIS's. This is

20 the first EIS that I recall seeing this kind of a

21 statement. They've always basically concluded that, that

22 they are not able to distinguish the difference in terms

23 of -- and there is no disproportionate results from

24 accidents at Savannah River. Now, the other places I

25 don't speak for. But it looked like to me that's an

1 incorrect statement. And we would like to hear some more
2 about it. And then you need to see if it is; if it is,
3 fix it and so forth.
4 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Okay. I think with regard to
5 that statement we probably need some clarification. There
6 is some clarification that is buried on page S-20. The
7 clarification says, however, examination of meteorological
8 data shows that the average wind flow would not expose
9 minorities and low-income populations disproportionately.
10 Actual expose to these populations under time of the --
11 under the accident scenario would depend on the magnitude
12 of airborne releases and actual wind direction.
13 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** May I suggest that in the final
14 that that be reworded so that it states the whole
15 conclusion rather than the bad part and then but; but, oh,
16 incidentally it's not a problem?
17 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Yes. Yes.
18 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Let me ask another question
19 here where you continually talk about all of these cases
20 do not keep the population, those commitments, from the 80
21 kilometer population within a 100 person-rems. And
22 apparently somebody has decided that's a level that we'll
23 talk to these things. And where it exceeds it we'll talk
24 about it and all the ones that doesn't exceed it, you
25 quote the 100 person-rem. I don't understand the intent

1 or the basis behind the 100 person-rem.

2 MR. CYGELMAN: I think we're going to reexamine

3 those.

4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Thank you.

5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Talking about doses, in these

6 three places, it's probably for all of the sites you look

7 at, you give a table of background radiation levels.

8 Obviously they vary, but I think it would be much more

9 informative to the uninformed public of which there are

10 quite a number -- and I don't mean that derogatorily, but

11 if you would give the range of background radiation level

12 within 50 miles or whatever, just as you want, because all

13 of them use the same number of radon, 200 millirem a year.

14 And that could vary from one house to the next. It can

15 vary from one yard to the next. And then if you compare

16 the person-rems, the variation of the person-rems to the

17 person-rems of the Savannah River Site people would be get

18 a grasp of how minuscule this increase is.

19 That -- when it doesn't come out they just see,

20 gee whiz, we're getting 400 millirems a year. And then

21 the next page they're getting a half a millirem a year

22 from the nuclear facility, but they don't tie the two

23 together.

24 I'm just trying to let the people be as well-

25 informed and get a grasp of this because I think we've

1 seen here, and again I'm not saying it derogatorily
2 because some of these people who don't know much about
3 this subject probably know a hell of a lot more about many
4 other subjects than I know. We can't all be experts on
5 everything. But when you just throw around bare numbers
6 without comparison with something with which they're
7 familiar -- and incidentally one of the highest radon
8 problems have been found in the state of South Carolina is
9 some schools where our children are. And the state of
10 South Carolina has loads of studies all over the state,
11 city after city, county after county, on radon. But that
12 other stuff I don't know, but I think that the flow of
13 Savannah River is what we call the fault line
14 [unintelligible] . There's uranium in that
15 [unintelligible] so the background level there is
16 something like 500. So people that live near it
17 [unintelligible] better check it. Okay, forget -- I mean
18 put things in context.
19 **MS. WHERLEY:** We will go through that.
20 [Off record momentarily to change tapes.]
21 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** . . .[unintelligible] displace
22 basically -- or if you with MOX you displaced some uranium
23 fuel. But if you didn't go MOX and went vitrification,
24 you would have that waste plus the additional you would
25 need for uranium which is 5 million cubic meters mill

1 tailings and 3400 cubic meters of enrichment tails caused
2 by mining [unintelligible]. So that kind of puts it into
3 perspective. And, of course, you guys would want to
4 verify that.
5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right.
6 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Could you repeat those numbers?
7 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay. You would 340 cubic
8 meters of high level waste glass and you would have 5
9 million additional cubic meters of mill tailings and 3400
10 cubic meters of enrichment tails.
11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: You're comparing oranges and
12 apples.
13 PUBLIC CITIZEN: That's just saying -- you know,
14 that's what you would have if you didn't have a MOX fuel
15 option. That's --
16 MS. WHERLEY: Wait, wait, wait. We've got --
17 please say that again.
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yeah, I'm sorry. If you didn't
19 have a MOX fuel option that's what you would expect from a
20 uranium fuel cycle. That would be the waste generated if
21 you did not go the MOX fuel.
22 MR. CYGELMAN: This would mean [unintelligible].
23 MS. WHERLEY: Before we go on from this, is that
24 -- is your references and quotes, and maybe you can make
25 us some copies so we have those. We can -- thank you.

1 Okay. There was a hand over here.

2 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** This is a very simple question.

3 You had mentioned the number of material annually from the

4 low level transuranic hazardous waste. How many years if

5 you went the MOX route would you estimate to burn up the

6 material that's in this EIS?

7 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Well, what we're looking at right

8 now is about ten years of MOX fabrication and about

9 fifteen years of reactor radiation under MOX fuel.

10 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** I just wanted to follow up on

11 that question. Now, when you say it's going to take ten

12 years for the fabrication and fifteen years to burn the

13 fuel, now, what do you mean? Do you mean in that fifteen

14 years you're going to burn all of this plutonium or do you

15 mean in that fifteen years you're going to convert it from

16 weapons grade to a different grade?

17 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Okay, this is what I mean. Let's

18 take the scenario we make a Record of Decision in the end

19 of this year, okay. And the scenario is that we will be

20 able to start reactor irradiation roughly, let's say, ten

21 years from now. And then once we start the irradiation it

22 would take approximately fifteen/sixteen years of

23 irradiation, okay. Prior to -- obviously prior to the

24 start of the irradiation, you would have to get some fuel

25 fabrication on line. We would then have to operate that

fuel fabrication in parallel with the irradiation to keep the size of the fabrication facility down. So in summary what we mean is, as I said earlier, if we had to build a capability in this country we would start, at the earliest, fabricating fuel six to eight years. We would then get an accumulation of one or two years of MOX fuel at the minimum before we start the irradiation. And we would start irradiation and irradiation would last maybe fifteen years. It depends on the reactors. It's very dependent on the number of reactors. It also depends, as we mentioned earlier, on the what the international environment is.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: I'm sorry. I don't think you understood my question.

MR. CYGELMAN: Okay. Let's try again.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: The core of the question was you said you were going to burn plutonium in fifteen years.

MR. CYGELMAN: Yes.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Now, what does that mean? Does that mean that plutonium is going to be gone in fifteen years?

MR. CYGELMAN: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. What it means is that the MOX fuel, the plutonium in the MOX fuel is converted to spent fuel in about fifteen to sixteen

1 years. At the end of that period there is still plutonium
2 in the spent fuel just like there is in commercial. There
3 is a high level of plutonium in the spent fuel, however,
4 because you started out with plutonium to begin with,
5 okay. But roughly, depending on the fuel cycle, roughly
6 you would burn up or actually destroy about six/seven
7 percent per year. It depends on the reactor, it could be
8 higher. So let's say you had three years -- if your cycle
9 was three years from the original amount, you would
10 destroy 21 percent, right. In the meantime you're also
11 building up some of the plutonium. So on the average at
12 the end of the cycle you could be about at 30 percent,
13 25/30 percent of the original amount that's actually left
14 destroyed. Does that answer your question?
15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: What about the isotopics?
16 What's your input of the isotopics?
17 MR. CYGELMAN: Okay. On the isotopics,
18 obviously it changes. I mean, you go from a weapon based
19 plutonium which is roughly, oh, let's say, in the ninety
20 percent, ninety-three/ninety-four percent Plutonium 239.
21 And then depending on your irradiation cycle if in fact --
22 obviously the longer you work the more you build up
23 Plutonium 240, 241 and the more you depart from the
24 weapons base plutonium. I would say at the end of a maybe
25 three or four year cycle we're pretty close to what we

1 call a reactor grade type plutonium in which case the
2 Plutonium 239 content, it's probably, taking a guess,
3 maybe 75 percent plutonium and the buildup or the balance
4 is 240 and 241. And obviously 238 which is a potent
5 isotope would be [unintelligible] to how weapons-usable
6 the plutonium is.
7 MS. WHERLEY: I'll take your question in just a
8 minute. I just want to do a general reminder in case all
9 of a sudden everybody else comes back before we have a
10 chance. For those of you who have a lot of questions, if
11 we don't get to your questions especially if it's a
12 detailed question, I just want to remind you of two
13 things. In the exhibit hall there are what is -- the DOE
14 calls unanswered question cards. It's an opportunity if
15 you have a specific question that you didn't get a
16 complete answer to today, put it on the card and either
17 hand it in at the registration desk and DOE will get an
18 answer to that question.
19 There's also a comment table in there with
20 comment forms and pencils, so if you feel that your
21 comments that you really want to be reflected in this
22 process did not get totally captured here today, please
23 take a few minutes and write them down on one of those
24 forms. And, again, hand them to one of the facilitators
25 or to the registration desk. Thank you. And we have a

1 question here.

2 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Yes, I'm going to follow up on

3 a question that I asked and Mr. Rudy answered this

4 morning, and this was relative to the pits that would be

5 coming from Pantex to Savannah River. And he said that

6 they could either be surplus plutonium or they could be

7 war reserved plutonium. Okay, I understand that. But

8 basically this EIS that you're looking at is basically a

9 nonproliferation or a perception of nonproliferation

10 objectives. I think it's very unwise to store both those

11 that are to be returned to the war reserve, should they be

12 needed, or -- and that that is surplused in the same

13 facility in the same kind of container. And I think

14 that's an unwise decision to approach it that way in the

15 Environmental Impact Statement.

16 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Okay. Let me make a clarifying

17 statement. One, the surplus plutonium would be physically

18 separated from the nonsurplus plutonium, is number one.

19 If it is in fact, and it can be in the same facility,

20 there would be -- well, I have to be careful. In terms of

21 storage the surplus could be under IAEA. There would be

22 no mixing of the two, number one. And people that go to

23 the surplus area would not be able to go into the

24 nonsurplus area. So while they may be in the same

25 facility, which is an option that we're looking at, they

1 are very physically separated. There's no linkage between
2 the two, so to speak.
3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: That helps I think
4 significantly in terms of the perception of what we're
5 doing and what we're trying to do. But you certainly
6 wouldn't want somebody to go in and find it.
7 MR. CYGELMAN: No. We are taking great efforts
8 to make sure that they are very distinct. In fact one of
9 the things that we -- we're having difficulty with is
10 determining what in fact needs to be IAEA inspectable. So
11 in some cases because of what may turn out to be IAEA
12 inspection, we're actually getting -- the trucks come in
13 two different loading areas, they're not even sharing a
14 common loading, such that when the nonsurplus goods come
15 in you can't tell -- you're not there to see it from the
16 surplus.
17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay. Now, another question
18 goes back to last Thursday night's meeting. And it was
19 the application of this EIS to plutoniums that are residue
20 or scraps. And let me go to a very clean residue in
21 carbon oxide. Is that covered or is it not covered? It's
22 illogical if it's not covered.
23 MR. CYGELMAN: As I said, we have oxide but now
24 you have -- when you go down in residue, you start looking
25 at what percentage of the plutonium there is in the oxide.

1 And one of the things we have been working with waste
2 management and EM is what in fact -- with regard to the
3 residues we can range anywhere, the one you're talking
4 about, from two percent up to, I think about [inaudible].
5 In general, whatever EM decides that they're going to
6 stabilize and not dispose of we will [inaudible]. But
7 overall -- well, there isn't that much of mixed oxide that
8 would occur, but there is some.
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Significant?
10 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, I guess mixed oxide might
11 be --
12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I would call it mixed oxide,
13 but let's just call it oxide.
14 MR. CYGELMAN: Okay. I'll call it oxide.
15 MS. WHERLEY: I just want to make a short
16 announcement. The other groups are switching again, or
17 potentially in about five minutes. So if there is anyone
18 here who hasn't had a chance to participate and would like
19 to in either the Pantex or the Stockpile Stewardship, you
20 can join in those groups. I'm not sure if they're
21 switching or going in progress, but they are giving their
22 people another opportunity to switch. So I just wanted to
23 invite you all to have that same opportunity. And we'll
24 just keep going as long as there is an interest here.
25 Thank you.

1 PUBLIC CITIZEN: This is to repeat a procedural
2 question. Can you give me any idea or can you give to me
3 as a reason on the possibility of an extension? I intend
4 to submit written comments. Seven days is not much time
5 to do it. I have no secretarial help, I am a lousy
6 typist. And I'll have to bust my gut to try and get it in
7 by the 7th, but if I do that, and on the 8th I hear
8 there's a twenty-days extension, I'm going to
9 [unintelligible].
10 MR. RUDY: Yeah. There is no extension planned.
11 And to the degree you could get that in, handwritten is
12 fine. And if there was any need for clarification we
13 would call you on that, if we couldn't understand it. The
14 Notice of Intent that established the sixty-day period did
15 say that to the extent practical, comments received after
16 the 7th because of mail and timing would be accepted and
17 accommodated. So naturally through the mail process there
18 is an opportunity for a few days for things to clear
19 through the system. So I urge you try to do that. And
20 again even if you only do it handwritten, that's how you
21 should do it. If we didn't understand it, we'll call you.
22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: All right. Thank you.
23 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes. Could you clarify what
24 the gentleman was saying behind me a couple of statements
25 before. He was talking about minorities and them being

1 the focus of a lot of plants that have [unintelligible]
2 community. Was he saying that it was not true that
3 minorities, those people of color, communities are not
4 ones that's targeted with dangerous --
5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They're not
6 disproportionately targeted in studies that I've seen
7 dealing with that, correct.
8 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, this -- I just want to
9 make one point. I'm from Hyde Park here in Augusta,
10 Georgia and that's a community that was impacted. And the
11 people have cancers and just because they're from the
12 other side of the tracks, I don't believe you're clear
13 about that. I say that not with hostility, but certain
14 facts, looking at the children that has tumors bigger than
15 they are and other impacts that we have. And we need to
16 be careful because DOE was needed and we could resolve it
17 as best we can in an orderly way. But people of color are
18 impacted. And I think this meeting shows that people of
19 color have -- have great impact in what's going on with
20 the DOE movement. Could we do more PR relations maybe,
21 public relations so people would know to come out so they
22 can have some input, because I got the word like a week
23 ago. And I will be back to this evening's session but I
24 think people of color because we are impacted already, we
25 could have some voice in this decision process.

1 MR. CYGELMAN: Greg.

2 MR. RUDY: Yeah. I think Dr. McLane

3 [phonetically spelled] made that exact comment this

4 morning. And Ernie Chaput, the Site's Deputy Manager who

5 is here with us now, will be back this evening to talk

6 about the Site and what kind of process does Savannah

7 River Site in particular have to assure, you know, the

8 wide outreach for that. So if that's your point --

9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes.

10 MR. RUDY: Thank you.

11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Thank you.

12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Would you describe for me the

13 technology that -- the knowledge that we have now on the

14 deep borehole concept that you're talking about here? It

15 sounds in the EIS like it's a fairly generic facility. We

16 look at each site, but I don't get any warm fuzzies

17 relative to how much we know about it and how safe it is,

18 et cetera.

19 MR. CYGELMAN: Okay. With regard to the

20 technology itself there's quite a bit of experience in

21 regard to drilling holes that are about the size that

22 we're talking about to the depth that we're talking about,

23 okay. There's quite a bit of knowledge of that. The area

24 that we have less knowledge about is in predicting what

25 the movement would be of these materials after the holes

1 have been drilled.

2 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, that's the basic

3 question. Is it going to be stable? Is it going to be

4 safe?

5 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, as I said, you know, that's

6 part of the analysis that we really don't know that until

7 we've done some exploratory work, okay. We need to -- to

8 put it to that. Does that answer your question?

9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes, I guess it does. I guess

10 the only issue then is can it be credibly considered as an

11 alternative in the EIS or credibly weighted when the final

12 decision comes out?

13 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, it's credible to the extent

14 that the technical people feel that they have predictive

15 tools whereby they can use to analyze it and that the --

16 they can drill exploratory holes to validate their tools,

17 okay, their predictive tools.

18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: And is this the same as we

19 thought twenty years ago in the Carlsbad situation, we

20 said that hey, that's a safe geological repository for

21 everything?

22 MR. CYGELMAN: I think that the borehole

23 [unintelligible] has a lot of technical attractive

24 features. It does have an obstacle and one of the

25 obstacles happens to be there is no legislative regime

8/95

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2094

1 existing to license that particular one. And in order to
2 license we would get into the issues with regard to the
3 particular moves or the migration of material.
4 MS. WHERLEY: I would just like to follow up
5 with a question since your -- you've raised questions and
6 Andre answered them about the state of technology. But do
7 you have a -- in those questions, a comment that you would
8 like to record for the record on your feelings about the
9 credibility of that alternative?
10 PUBLIC CITIZEN: At this point in time, no. I
11 expect I will, but at this point in time I --
12 MS. WHERLEY: Okay. I just wanted to check and
13 make sure I wasn't missing it. Thank you. Someone
14 else?
15 Well, if we have no more comments and we feel w
16 have exhausted the subject this afternoon, I certainly
17 appreciate it and I know DOE did, all of you sticking wit
18 it and moving around and taking time to raise your
19 questions and concerns and provide for input. I might as
20 you if since -- you're welcomed to take a break and then
21 rejoin the summary and plenary session, hear what the
22 other groups did. But if you want to take a look at the
23 flip charts, I will be summarizing these in the plenary
24 session. If I missed any comments that you made and wan
25 to be sure are recorded, please let me know or just spea

1 up during the plenary and we'll hear what the others have
2 to say. Again, thank you very much for your
3 participation.
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

- - - - -

MR. LAWSON: I'm going to -- one of my responsibilities is to come back to the larger group and let's talk about some of the issues that get discussed throughout the morning. Let's start in, anybody have a comment, questions you would like to raise? Yes, go ahead.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: In terms of finishing off on the preferred alternatives there was one part you haven't addressed yet, the high explosives.

MR. WHITEMAN: Oh, I keep forgetting to. At the meeting in Pantex last week that was 90 percent of the meeting. I always forget to mention that other site. That is the one part of the whole program we have not declared A preferred alternative. It's -- out of a billion dollar a year program it's probably $5 million a year. It's not a big high-cost operation. Today the fabrication mission is at Pantex and they have huge modern facilities for that. We also have large capable facilities above Lawrence and at Los Alamos that are not nearly as large as Pantex's but are big enough for what we would need to support production in the future.

The -- there isn't an obvious solution on that

1 one yet. From maintenance of core competency it's
2 essential that we keep the labs in the HE business and
3 keep them very knowledgeable. And a small level of
4 production mission would be a base upon which to build and
5 the ongoing fabrication that they would do for their R&D
6 programs.
7 So from a core competency standpoint it's very
8 attractive to move the mission from Pantex to one or both
9 of the two laboratories. In fact, the discussion has gone
10 on about splitting it between the two laboratories and
11 giving each of them responsibility for making parts for
12 their systems. That's the -- that's a -- there's not an
13 obvious -- the costs aren't too large or too different
14 regardless of where you do the job. Though if you were to
15 split it between the two labs that's more expensive than
16 leaving it at Pantex or doing it out of one lab or the
17 other.
18 And so as you can imagine it's a -- it's an
19 emotional subject and it's one that's of core competency
20 that we have to address and we're still working on that.
21 We just haven't made the decision.
22 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Okay. So the primary work is
23 in the development areas as opposed to production?
24 **MR. WHITEMAN:** Well, there is -- the historical
25 level of fabrication at the laboratories in support of

their development program is about the same level of, you know, pressing machining and fabricating, that level of activity is about the same as what we would expect in the future for production. So --

MR. LAWSON: It would also in the high-explosives alternative or issue. Other interests?

PUBLIC CITIZEN: If he could -- I'd be interested in hearing more about your role in this whole program. I mean, personally I wasn't at the first part, perhaps you introduced yourselves.

MR. WHITEMAN: Okay. I've been -- for defense programs I've been in charge of working the stockpile management side of this.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: You're a DOE employee.

MR. WHITEMAN: I am a DOE employee.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay. Forrestal Building [unintelligible]?

MR. WHITEMAN: No, I'm from Albuquerque strangely enough.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay.

MR. WHITEMAN: And I've been working the stockpile management part of this, Steve Kadiz has been my twin and he's been -- he's from Albuquerque as well. And he's been working the stockpile stewardship aspect of this. And we've been -- both been working this, we both

1 live in Albuquerque but we've been doing this for defense
2 pro- -- in the name of defense programming.
3 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Seems that one of the primary
4 outcomes here is that there's an implication that -- or
5 that we're getting to the point of having -- maintaining
6 the two labs that's --
7 **MR. WHITEMAN:** Well, there was --
8 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** -- part of the decision.
9 **MR. WHITEMAN:** Well, maintaining the three --
10 well, you mean about the two, you mean Lawrence and Los
11 Alamos, yeah. The Galvin Commission, I don't know if you
12 remember that, it was chartered to look at the labs, the
13 future of the labs several years ago. They recommended
14 that DOE should seriously look at getting out of Livermore
15 for the weapons business. And that comes up periodically.
16 In fact, when we were here for scoping meetings last
17 summer it was still potential alternative in this PEIS was
18 to look at removing the weapons mission from Livermore.
19 Part of the -- what changed between last summer
20 and now was the position the administration took on
21 negotiating comprehensive test ban treaty. And that the
22 -- one of the assurances for entering into a comprehensive
23 test ban treaty was that we would have a Stockpile
24 Stewardship program with peer review of the two
25 laboratories to compensate for -- you know, one method of

1 compensating for a lack of underground nuclear testing.
2 So the CTBT negotiating position sort of sealed Livermore
3 being a part of the program for some -- certainly as far
4 as we can see in the future.
5 Half of the weapons systems in the stockpile to
6 date are Livermore design. And so even though we'll be
7 dismantling a number of those over the next five years,
8 from a practical standpoint it's important to us in
9 Albuquerque that Livermore is there to help and assist in
10 that dismantlement. So certainly over the next five years
11 they have a very key role to play.
12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: And the decision on the
13 national ignition facility, what were the key factors in
14 that?
15 MR. WHITEMAN: Well, the decision was made
16 before we entered this PEIS process. That the preferred
17 alternative site would be Livermore. So going into the
18 PEIS, the preferred alternative had already been
19 identified for that one though we looked at a -- located
20 at four different sites. The principle reason for
21 selecting Livermore was that that's a -- the national
22 ignition facility is the next generation facility for the
23 initial confinement fusion program and most of the high
24 energy laser technology associated with that has been at
25 Livermore over the years. So it was a natural outgrowth

1 and continuation of that.

2 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Was that a decision or a

3 preferred --

4 MR. WHITEMAN: It's still a preferred

5 alternative.

6 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Is the time table for that the

7 same as it is for the EIS?

8 MR. WHITEMAN: Yes.

9 MR. LAWSON: Any other concerns?

10 MR. WHITEMAN: What is your sense around here

11 relative to the stewardship and management of PEIS, do you

12 sense the people are comfortable with where it's gone or

13 is there something uncomfortable things people have?

14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I'm not at all in touch with

15 what people tend to think about that. And because of the

16 -- these alternatives being available, my interest is sort

17 of met by this. But I couldn't say what other people --

18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: The issue around here is jobs

19 and the impact related to jobs of either of these -- any

20 of these three PEISs, is somewhat limited. So perhaps in

21 a different era where people weren't so concerned about

22 jobs there might be more interest in these just for

23 their --

24 MR. WHITEMAN: Well, and what we're doing on

25 stewardship and management, we're not leaving any site,

1 you know, we've left three sites in the last few years,
2 Panelles, Mount and Rocky, and you know, going into this
3 process it wasn't really clear on whether we would
4 recommend leaving some other sites as well. But --
5 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Is that something you avoid or
6 you don't think of that?
7 **MR. WHITEMAN:** Well, we let the -- we let the
8 numbers speak for themselves, you know, and the
9 programmatic risk and the environmental impact. So we
10 didn't go into this with any preconceived outcome relative
11 to that. And frankly, I expected once we -- you know,
12 that I expected the numbers would argue for closing at
13 least one of the plants when we entered the process but it
14 didn't. It said that, you know, the right answer is to
15 rightsize things, you know, appropriate to the word for
16 where we're at. And that was the recommendation from the
17 department.
18 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Yeah, it was an interesting
19 change from, what did we call it, Complex 2000, what was
20 it?
21 **MR. WHITEMAN:** Complex 21.
22 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Complex 21, yeah, that's right.
23 Well, the focus there was so much consolidation and
24 everything like that. And it -- consolidation seems to --
25 I guess by virtue of the numbers, units have been dropped

1 as an end in itself.

2 MR. WHITEMAN: Yeah.

3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Consolidated where the

4 numbers --

5 MR. WHITEMAN: Yeah. Back -- before we, you

6 know, we did a lot of programmatic analysis independent of

7 PEIS and before the PEIS started looking at, you know,

8 what direction the program might go. And we knew

9 programmatically that it was feasible to -- well, the --

10 the phrase that was coined is three plus one. That, you

11 know, three labs plus a weapons assembly facility in

12 Nevada could do the whole job. And the question was but

13 was that the right answer. And the analysis we've done

14 says, well, yeah, you could do that, but it's not the

15 right answer.

16 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I'm interested in what you

17 might -- what might be talked about for options with the

18 rest of Y-12, you said there was 15 to 20 percent of it

19 would be used. Would that just be --

20 MR. WHITEMAN: Yeah. We're going to be

21 downsizing the footprint there to -- well, actually the

22 operating space will be about literally 11 percent of the

23 historical footprint. We're going to keep one of the

24 buildings there in a cold standby condition, as a

25 contingency that we could reactivate and add capacity in

1 it very cheaply if we needed to. And that will -- so the
2 operating space will be about 11 percent and then a few
3 more -- I've never calculated this exactly. My guess is
4 on the order of it increases that to about 15/16 percent
5 of the historical space counting the contingency cold
6 standby capacity. So the other 80/85 percent of the space
7 there will, you know, we've got to work out what to do
8 with that. It -- if there's alternative missions or
9 alternative programs, that would optionally be the ideal
10 use, of somebody else moving in and moving work in, but as
11 you well know, there's not a lot of people out there with
12 work that they're looking for a home for. Most of it
13 already has a home and people are holding onto it very
14 tightly. So --
15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Do they have a future uses
16 study or a --
17 MR. WHITEMAN: They're just working that now.
18 You know, it's only been in the last few months that
19 they've identified how they would downsize. So it's --
20 the next step is to do exactly what you're talking about.
21 I know there's an organization there in Oak Ridge that DOE
22 is leading -- I can't remember the name of it -- but it
23 has to do with industrialization of the excess facilities
24 there, because K-25, the large gaseous diffusion plant was
25 decommissioned several years ago and it's going through,

you know, D&D and so on right now. And there are a number of private companies I know that are participating in that -- in that activity and so I would expect that they would build on there in Oak Ridge that -- that work as they look at Y-12 facilities.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yeah, one company is building boxes, I mean, using --

MR. WHITEMAN: Yeah, I know.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: I think they're even called K-25 boxes. Something like that.

MR. WHITEMAN: Well, in some -- Manufacturing Sciences is the company. They're at the edge of Oak Ridge that -- and they just built a new plant there to -- yeah, they make waste boxes out of contaminated equipment out of K-25. I know they've got a large contract to do that right now. Yeah, the K-25 portion of that may have that in their name, I don't remember. But it's Manufacturing Sciences is the -- they're on the east end of Oak Ridge.

MR. LAWSON: Anything else? Our 25 minutes has passed so I know that there's probably a lot of people in there and you're welcome to join them or Pantex or stick around for a lively discussion.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: I think it's fascinating that in the last few years Department of Energy is making some of it's most significant policy decisions in -- you know,

8/95

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2094

1 in the context of Environmental Impact statements. And --
2 I mean --
3 MR. WHITEMAN: We do it more than most any
4 federal agency.
5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I mean, this is -- I was --
6 grad school in energy policy. Nobody ever said you
7 determine your departmental policy on the basis of your
8 environmental impact statements. And I'm not saying it's
9 wrong, I'm just saying it's --
10 MR. WHITEMAN: Well, it --
11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: It's interesting that so much
12 is happening in the context of EISs.
13 MR. WHITEMAN: But there's an awful lot that's
14 happening outside as well. I mentioned in that one chart,
15 you know, everything that's happened with the Department
16 of Defense planning, nuclear posture review, et cetera
17 over the last couple of years the START I, START II, the
18 CTB Treaties are very strongly influencing policy. And
19 we've done a lot of planning within the department
20 that's -- that preceded -- preceded with a PEIS. So in
21 the reports here, you know, are looking at this from a
22 cost schedule risk standpoint as opposed to an EIS. So I
23 think they're companion efforts. But yeah, certainly
24 there's more decision-making through the NEPA process than
25 you might see in other organizations.

1 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Certainly more visible.

2 MR. WHITEMAN: Yeah.

3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yeah.

4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: The other, you know, DOD and,

5 you know, forest service and these people they do EISs but

6 I don't think anybody does the big programmatics, you

7 know, like we've been doing.

8 MR. LAWSON: Thanks very much.

9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: What is your plan for releasing

10 cost data relative to the options?

11 MR. WHITEMAN: I'm glad you asked. These

12 reports are out there on the table. If they've picked

13 them all up, leave your name and we'll mail you one.

14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay.

15 MR. WHITEMAN: But this shows -- the larger of

16 the two shows all the source data, project descriptions,

17 cost schedules, and so on. And then this shows

18 recommendations, conclusions, schedules, implementation

19 schedules and so on.

20 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, I didn't see any out

21 there but maybe I didn't look for them. I'll go look, you

22 know.

23 MR. LAWSON: Stewart's just went to look.

24 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I guess I'm curios in terms of

25 the -- of course, I'm basically, you know, might as well

8/95

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2084

1 get up front. I want to do pit manufacturing at Savannah
2 River. It's my bet that to establish a viable pit
3 manufacturing capability at Los Alamos we'll consume
4 essentially all of the capability of TA-55. You know, in
5 order to do that -- well, you've got two problems. I
6 mean, one, I think it will, you know, I know you're
7 shaking your head the other way. But I think it will
8 consume most of the capability of TA-55. And you'll have
9 to construct that while -- as Los Alamos claims they have
10 all these vital, ongoing plutonium missions. Because in
11 fact that was -- I know some earlier numbers I saw said,
12 oh, you know, we'd have to do work at TA-55 even if I
13 built the pit facility at Savannah River. And there was
14 investment at -- added -- out there because they have all
15 these vital, ongoing missions.
16 Well, you've got the problem of trying to
17 construct your pit capability at Los Alamos while you're
18 conducting those. It's a big problem. We tried to do it
19 at Savannah River and it's a big problem, you know. Keep
20 ongoing operations going while you do major capital work.
21 And secondly since I suspected we'll end up
22 consuming most of the capability of TA-55 most of those
23 ongoing missions are going to have to be relocated and I'm
24 wondering if any of that money, for instance, upgrade of
25 CMR facility is included in those cost estimates.

1 MR. WHITEMAN: Any ideas?

2 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Uh-huh [yes].

3 MR. WHITEMAN: What you're -- I'm sorry, we're

4 getting back into [unintelligible].

5 MR. LAWSON: Well, there are some other people

6 who will be coming down in a few minutes. The Pantex

7 people just broke up.

8 MR. WHITEMAN: Okay.

9 MR. LAWSON: Were all three of you there this

10 morning when Earl gave his presentation?

11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Uh-huh [yes].

12 MR. LAWSON: There are some people, maybe 20

13 people who came who didn't hear his presentation. So I

14 want to make sure that they got, not the whole thing over

15 again, but at least a summary of it. We can just pick up

16 and go into discussion of issues that are important to you

17 if you want to have Earl put this -- do you want to put

18 this back up again so we can have a frame of reference.

19 MR. WHITEMAN: Yeah.

20 MR. LAWSON: So because we have a small group

21 here we can keep this as informal but as direct as you'd

22 like. So, I just -- I'm going to be making a few notes

23 because I have to report back some of the things that were

24 talked about, but I'd certainly open it up and let you ask

25 any questions that you might or any comments that you'd

1 like to make.

2 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I think I'll start. I'm a lay

3 person. I'm here for understanding. I'm here on a

4 search-and-find mission. I am from Savannah, Georgia. My

5 concern in all of this is, is I work with babies. I work

6 with birth defects, I'm substance abuse and I know the

7 range, the broad scale that substance abuse has on

8 children and I'm looking at that aspect as being in the --

9 this field also, the Savannah River Site being the reactor

10 site. And what down the line how will it affect our

11 children, how will it affect the births, you know. This

12 is what I mean. I'm on a search-and-find mission today.

13 MR. LAWSON: All right. When people get settled

14 in we can address that issue. We're going to -- since

15 this is a relatively small an intimate group I'm just

16 going to open it up for questions or comments that you

17 have to make. We have a note taker who's going to take

18 more detailed notes, the court reporter's going to get

19 most everything by verbatim. I have to come back and make

20 all the reports so I'm going to keep a few notes on this

21 flip chart here. But we'll take it wherever you'd like to

22 go. One thing that maybe helpful is if an issue was

23 raised as you have and the question of effect on children

24 in the future and maybe we can deal with that issue and if

25 other people have some comments to make about it we can

1 deal with that before we go on to some other issue.

2 Do you want to restate your concern here so we

3 can --

4 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** My concern is birth defects

5 toward our children, the future children. I've read in

6 the past how different radiations has affect births,

7 pregnancies of mothers and I would like to know the same

8 situation in this area.

9 **MR. LAWSON:** Okay. Earl or Jay, any thoughts on

10 that?

11 **MR. ROWS:** Yeah, I mean, I can talk about it. I

12 mean, it's true that radiation can, you know, cause

13 cancers, can cause birth defects. And I would just point

14 your attention to -- I hate to just throw you to a

15 document but appendix E of our document discusses all the

16 human health effects from radiation, okay. So that's

17 where we discuss it, and the way we set up the EIS is

18 we're trying to make decisions on -- for a given mission

19 of where to site, you know, the mission, i.e., you know,

20 the one thing that's considered at Savannah River is

21 producing plutonium components. The other site we're

22 looking at is Los Alamos out in New Mexico. And we

23 essentially have to compare that site against this site as

24 to -- from an environmental impact, what are the

25 environmental impacts of doing that mission at Los Alamos,

1 what are the environmental impacts of doing it here at
2 Savannah River. So, again, we look across the whole
3 gambit of environmental impact, you know, how it's going
4 to effect water, how it's going to effect air, and we also
5 look at what the radiation effects are going to be. And
6 the data is in the EIS, I can sit here and tell you
7 numbers and things like that.
8 PUBLIC CITIZEN: No, I don't want that.
9 MR. ROWS: But that was our approach and it's
10 for the general population producing plutonium components
11 is a very, very low-risk mission. There's not a lot of
12 radioactivity emitted when you do that mission. So
13 essentially we don't see in our analysis any effects to
14 the population from this.
15 MR. WHITEMAN: Yes.
16 MR. ROWS: And I can cite you numbers.
17 MR. WHITEMAN: Let me comment. My wife and I
18 have two grandchildren in elementary school and the third
19 may go very soon, and it scares us to death what our kids
20 are -- you know, are seeing these days in the schools.
21 You know the drug problems, I'm sure what you see every
22 day, the violence. You know, it scares me to death to see
23 what those poor boys are going through. Believe me the
24 last thing I'm concerned about with those boys growing up
25 is anything, like, related to radiation. And we certainly

1 live in New Mexico at a very high elevation so the
2 radiation levels from the sun are much higher than here in
3 Augusta. But believe me those radiation levels are not
4 what I'm concerned about with those boys. I'm concerned
5 about what you see in the schools as well.
6 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I have a broad spectrum of all
7 of that but right now we're dealing with this aspect of it
8 and this is why -- where my concern lies because we also
9 had an outburst, I think it was Cumela [phonetically
10 spelled] in Savannah, the explosion in Savannah. They're
11 telling everyone, well, there was no harmful effect. I
12 really don't believe that. I really don't believe it.
13 Whether it's minute or what, I don't believe it was none.
14 And this is what they're trying to stay like, I think what
15 you're trying to tell me there now, it's such a small
16 scale of effect from this wherein the crimes in school,
17 the drugs and so forth. But I think enough different
18 companies, like we have Cumela in Savannah. We have Union
19 Bag in Savannah now. We have Savannah River Site, all of
20 this putting pollutants in the air, I still think it's a
21 concern in reference to our children.
22 Another thing is you said you live in Mexico in
23 the high elevation. They have a tendency to always put it
24 in the low income areas, also. This is with children that
25 don't -- they don't practice prevention, health

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 . FORM 2094

1 prevention, no how. So all of these pollutants in the air
2 is a downfall for them in that way, also. So out of all
3 of that this is just adding another stringent toward the
4 downfall of the youth today and I don't think we need
5 anymore.
6 PUBLIC CITIZEN: We have friends in Los Alamos,
7 too, and we're concerned about them.
8 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yeah.
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: And they live on a
10 reservations. And it's a dump in their yard.
11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay. This --
12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: So you can't say they're not
13 affected at all.
14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Could I just piggy back on
15 that? I'm just curious is there additional government
16 policies that certain demographic groups as being less
17 valuable, more expendable, whatever the term may be in,
18 you know, humane terms, as opposed to other populaces with
19 regard to institutions like SRS?
20 MR. WHITEMAN: No.
21 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Two things, Barry. I'd like to
22 -- I'd like to go back and give you my sentiments on the
23 note you read a minute ago that our concern is jobs only.
24 It's not. My judgment, it's not jobs. I want a viable,
25 technical facility that is capable of moving into whatever

1 defense direction we need to go in. Whatever
2 environmental research and development that needs to be
3 done that protects the environment and provides continued
4 sanctuary for our environment at -- as is out there now in
5 Savannah River Site.
6 So I think that to say we're interested in jobs
7 only is -- it's too small. And so I wanted to -- I wanted
8 to broaden it, and I'm sure that, you know, given another
9 minute I'd have thought of five more things but I don't
10 want to take that up.
11 MR. LAWSON: You did mention a couple of others
12 besides defense, environment, and what was the other one.
13 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Protection of the environment,
14 also that I want the facility to be good stewards. I
15 didn't say that but that's certainly where it comes from.
16 MR. LAWSON: Okay.
17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Protect the environment, the
18 wildlife, et cetera.
19 MR. LAWSON: Okay. Very good. Dr.
20 [unintelligible].
21 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I want to go back to the cancer
22 question. I'd like to know to what extent when the
23 analysis is made is there an integration of different
24 schools of thought. As we are aware, there are those who
25 think that exposure to low level radiation doesn't create

1 any real harmful effects. We have a school of thought
2 that doing what we're getting ready to do is not going to
3 really create a significant impact that we need to deal
4 with, but we from Chatham County, who has been cited as
5 the highest county -- the county with the highest
6 incidents of cancer, we're concerned around that so our
7 question becomes, how does the differing schools of
8 thought get factored into the analysis in a way that, at
9 least, we can see that that has been considered? Because
10 as you know Dr. Alice Stewart has a different view on
11 exposure to radiation and its effects. So is that kind of
12 scientific research being integrated so that you are
13 looking at sort of a balanced view or differing views to
14 come up with your final view. And I want to say
15 something, also, because I want this on the record.
16 This has happened three times now since we've
17 been here today. When we come into the discussion and we
18 bring our concerns as trite or minute as they may be, I
19 see a few scientists -- a few scientific-oriented people,
20 a few old hats who have been around here promoting SRS
21 actually get up and leave the room. And I don't know if
22 that's a function of us asking questions at such a mundane
23 level and it's just too elementary for you or it's on a
24 topic that you're tired of hearing or whatever.
25 But we're feeling a little bit put off because

1 that -- we do read body language, and this is not a part
2 of the PEIS but we -- this is a part of public
3 involvement. And when you invite the public you're going
4 to have those who have been retired from the plant, those
5 who are retired scientists, those who have opposing views,
6 those who are just simply searching for answers. And
7 certainly I don't want to continue to bring community
8 people into this process if they're going to feel
9 disrespected by the kinds of concerns and questions that
10 they're raising. Because they're valid.
11 We don't know the answers and we have not come
12 here prepared to say, you know, this is the final
13 recommendation. We came in search of answers. So if our
14 questions tend to be somewhat elementary than the other
15 folks, please excuse us. But we are simply searching for
16 answers that will enable us to be able to look at this
17 picture, not necessarily in a negative way, because there
18 are a lot of negatives out there and they're certainly
19 trying to drag us in.
20 And what we're trying to do is to be as neutral
21 as possible and to try to gather all -- because that's a
22 part of the so-called scientific process is you gather all
23 the information possible so that you can make an informed,
24 you know, summary of at least what's going on. And then
25 you'll be able to say to the Department of Energy, well,

1 based on what we have heard, what we have seen, what we
2 have gathered, this is what our position is. Because we
3 are new -- we are new kids on the block.
4 **MR. LAWSON:** Let me just say from my
5 perspective, I haven't heard any of the questions that
6 have been asked today as being too simplistic. No more
7 simplistic than any questions that we've heard in other
8 places around the country, so you shouldn't feel that.
9 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** We just noticed some people get
10 up and leave the room as soon as we came in or as soon as
11 we asked the question. They're gone. We're like, okay,
12 are we out of order or -- we just wanted to do a little
13 reality check.
14 **MR. LAWSON:** Sure. I don't know why people just
15 left now, but I do know that we did have a couple of
16 people who left an earlier discussion we have too. So I
17 mean either draw whatever you want in that but I
18 understand what you're saying. And no question I've heard
19 has been too simplistic.
20 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Because really we are just
21 seeking information to help us.
22 **MR. LAWSON:** Sure. And that's why the
23 Department is here. Okay. Now, you -- did you --
24 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Yeah, please, I had to go off
25 on that because, I mean, it's just happened so many times.

1 MR. LAWSON: Well, the question was, are there
2 different schools of thought and are they taken into
3 consideration.
4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Into the analysis that's made.
5 MR. LAWSON: Earl?
6 MR. WHITEMAN: Well, I thought there's a lot of
7 schools of thought and opinions relative to radiation
8 exposure but we have to deal with what's the generally
9 accepted scientific positions in the United States, and
10 that's what's reflected in our analysis. But I know
11 there's -- I know there's many different opinions.
12 MR. ROWS: But are -- the approach we take is
13 the most conservative approach with regard to low level
14 radiation doses. Okay.
15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: More specifically the approach
16 we use is the International Completion of Radiation
17 Protection. And so it's an international consensus group
18 that has gotten together to review all the data including
19 that of Alice Stewart and others. And put together a
20 position in what we call a dose conversion factor. Once
21 you calculate the doses due to release of radioactivity in
22 air and water an uptake from those sources that then this
23 dose conversion factor derives from this ICRP report. And
24 there are a number of ICRP reports available. The last --
25 one of the latest ones is ICRP 30. There's also another

1 committee in this country on the biological effects of
2 ionization radiation. Beir Report, B-E-I-R Report, the
3 report number five also contains that kind of information
4 as to the studies that have gone into assessing the
5 effects of -- biological effects of ionization radiation,
6 and how you then translate a dose to a health effect,
7 whether it be a cancer, a mutation, whatever necessary.
8 MR. LAWSON: Did you have a follow-up question
9 over here?
10 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, it's just kind of
11 something that has occurred to me. I know in these things
12 that you have all kinds of projections about cost and when
13 you're going to go online, that kind of thing. And I
14 never really -- I've wondered if there's a projection
15 about what will be considered a safe dose of radiation.
16 In other words, 25 years ago what we considered safe is a
17 lot different from what we consider safe today. And 25
18 years from now, what will it be?
19 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Exactly.
20 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I just think that our knowledge
21 about the eventual effect of radiation on the population
22 is very sketchy and it's, you know, it's getting to be
23 maybe more because we have more knowledge today than we
24 had 25 years ago but I think we're going to have a lot
25 more in 25 years.

1 **MR. WHITEMAN:** Let me just comment. The PEIS we
2 tried to avoid making statements of this is a safe level
3 or this is a safe, because I know everybody has a
4 different perception of what's safe and what's not safe.
5 So we wouldn't presume to judge for anyone what is safe
6 and unsafe but rather try to provide the basis in terms of
7 numbers and facts and let people make their own judgment.
8 I think it's important to always remember -- I
9 know radiation is a subject that is always utmost concern
10 to people -- but it's always important to remember that,
11 you know, as we stand here and live on earth that we get,
12 depending on which part of the country you live in, on the
13 order of 300 to 500 millirem each year of radiation.
14 Every time you go to the doctor and get an x-ray
15 you get an additional radiation; go to the dentist; every
16 time you fly in an airplane you get a higher level of
17 radiation than if you were standing here on the ground.
18 So there -- the human race has always been exposed to
19 radiation from natural sources, from the sun, from the
20 soil and so on. And so you always have to look in the
21 context of -- one of the things that always helps me in
22 this context is, is the additional amount of radiation
23 we're talking about very much different than the
24 difference between living in Atlanta versus Washington,
25 D.C. versus Philadelphia.

1 And if it's generally in the same sort of
2 difference that you'd see, just on living in different
3 parts of the country, to me that says it's not a large
4 risk. If it's something that's graded what I would see
5 from living in different parts of the country and that
6 might be something that I would want to know more about.
7 But we wouldn't presume to say to anybody, you should
8 accept this because it's safe, because you're the only one
9 that can judge what is safe for you.
10 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, even those doctors and
11 dentists now have machines that are a lot safer than they
12 were --
13 MR. WHITEMAN: Sure.
14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: -- 20 years ago. You have a
15 lead apron offered you, hopefully, and that you --
16 MR. WHITEMAN: But it still is -- the radiation
17 going to your tooth to make that x-ray is still radiation.
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Sure.
19 MR. LAWSON: We have a question here and then
20 one over here.
21 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay. My question concerns
22 with the weapons. The fact is that all -- this impact
23 statement deals with weapons and they are the spent rods,
24 the spent fuel from weapons which is a pretty highly
25 volatile source of plutonium. And these are the things

1 that we're really concerned about. This is what is going
2 to affect us. This is things that are in the environment
3 the transport, the storage, even to the point that it has
4 got to this point that we have so much of this spent fuel
5 and know that we're here as a -- you know, the -- as the
6 stewardship over this, where it's going to be at, and how
7 are we going to deal with it from that perspective I find
8 that it is sort of out of control, you know.
9 I mean, y'all -- I mean, y'all have let this get
10 sort of out of control. Now, it's like a check. There's
11 no check and balance here. I mean, we're taking this into
12 consideration yet I know the program is going to go on.
13 Y'all have -- y'all have already made up the decision that
14 this has to be disposed here, this has to be disposed
15 there. Well, we thinking well, we don't want no part of
16 this. We don't want no part of this weapon proliferation
17 or nonproliferation at all, you know, in this environment
18 right here.
19 Because this is the problem, is these weapons
20 then that's weapons of destruction. These are the things
21 that are going to destroy the people so, I mean, what --
22 what you going to store it. I mean, you're going to store
23 it or you're going to modify it in some sort of way yet
24 these are still -- but the main reason why it's got to
25 this point because they was going to be used for weapons

1 for destruction.

2 **MR. LAWSON:** So your concern is two points. One

3 is the weapons being here and then second for the weapons

4 that are being dismantled, whatever may be remaining from

5 the weapons being here, both of these?

6 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Right. Right. And all that is

7 out of control. I mean -- I mean, why -- you know, if it

8 wasn't -- if it had been checked from the beginning seem

9 like -- everybody said, well, okay, well, let have a ball

10 with -- with making all these weapons, for what? Who was

11 we going to kill with them? We have intention of killing

12 a bunch of people or everybody live on the same planet.

13 And everybody live on the same planet so where

14 -- what was in the minds of the people who designed this

15 plan for weapons of destruction. You know, I mean,

16 destruction of the world, so now we have it. I mean,

17 we're storing that. We're going to destroy the world with

18 just storing it, destroy the rest of the population,

19 destroy the water supply, everything. We're storing it.

20 This is what this impact statement is about.

21 This is what -- where we're at right now in this day and

22 time. I mean, from a scientific point of view we find

23 ourselves sort of stuck.

24 **MR. LAWSON:** Yeah. So let me translate this so

25 that we can address this. Maybe you ought to talk about

1 what the source of the decision for having nuclear weapons
2 is in the first place, and then second, what the options
3 are for either storing the weapons here or what to do with
4 this stuff that is taken from dismantlement.
5 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Right. Right. And -- well, I
6 mean, not to go on, but everything seems to deal with
7 policy. I mean, if we had some type of impact on the
8 policy making from the beginning then now -- it seems as
9 if now y'all are backtracking and want some type of input
10 from the community, when we don't really -- y'all did it
11 behind our backs all the time and now you expect us to
12 think y'all not going to continue to do this behind our
13 backs, I don't know. I'm sort of stuck on, why is it like
14 that.
15 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** You know, that's my concern as
16 well. I was discussing with Sister [unintelligible] and
17 [unintelligible] earlier and they already made that
18 decision. What's our input, how do we know this is going
19 to count. You already did what you wanted to do without
20 asking for permission, you're going to continue doing that
21 but this part is just really a bunch of bull crap, we're
22 just here.
23 So how we know what's going to be the outcome
24 and is the true outcome. If we say right now we don't
25 want no more -- we don't want to deal with this anymore,

is it going to take place, are you going to ship it somewhere else that's not going to happen where we don't want it to happen. Or it's already voted that this is going to -- hey, you're just here we already voted where it's going to go.

MR. LAWSON: Okay.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: So I guess a over-arching question would be, is there a -- does the Department of Energy have a preferred site and is that site SRS?

MR. WHITEMAN: Yeah, we do have a preferred site for plutonium fabrication and it's not at SRS.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay.

MR. WHITEMAN: We did not plan to add anything to SRS as a result of this EIS.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: May I ask what is that preferred site?

MR. WHITEMAN: Excuse me.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: May I ask what is that preferred site?

MR. WHITEMAN: Los Alamos.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Los Alamos.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: And that's covered in the EIS?

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Would that actually be consolidated where it was -- at the facility will be upgraded to store plutonium and high rich uranium. I

1 mean, is that one of the sites where --

2 **MR. WHITEMAN:** Let me refer you back to here.

3 We plan to have some missions at all eight of these sites.

4 In the case of Los Alamos this is -- the pit is a

5 plutonium fabrication, we have planned to add there.

6 Savannah River Site, the tritium facilities that are there

7 will continue but we don't plan to either add or subtract

8 any new missions from Savannah River. So the various

9 missions associated with the U.S. nuclear weapons program

10 are spread among these eight sites, and we don't plan

11 to -- generally we don't plan to move any from one site to

12 another as part of this. We're generally shrinking and

13 reducing the size of what we have at those eight sites.

14 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Is there -- is there an

15 effective way in which we as citizens can aggressively

16 approach in trying to actually close down Savannah River

17 Site and help you all focus on a particular site like,

18 such as Los Alamos, where we can just totally do away with

19 the Savannah River Site. Because we -- we're finding out

20 through you alls research that African-American or low

21 income people are the ones that's going to be accepting

22 all the waste, you know. So what we want to do to protect

23 our children and protect our families we want to do away

24 with the total site.

25 Because even when I called the -- I called the

national wildlife, the state national wildlife, and from not only the Savannah River Site but other plants that exist along the Savannah River, that actually destroy the natural habitat along the river. And if we allow these facilities, such as Savannah River Site, to continue to exist then we won't have anything, you know. And I mean, you'll get on a plane and go back to Mexico, everybody else will go their own way, and everybody else here we have to go back to our home town, you see. So -- to a nuclear dump in a sense.

MR. WHITEMAN: This particular PEIS, I -- because we're not looking at either adding or subtracting any missions from Savannah River, if you're concern is one of wanting to close Savannah River, I'm not sure there's a vehicle for addressing that through this PEIS. I think it's something -- certainly we're responding in the Department of Energy to policy guidance laws coming from our elected officials. And I think you're probably -- your best way to deal with that is through your elected officials, through your [unintelligible].

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Let me ask this. This brochure that came out that said the Department of Energy is interested in your comments. You all are familiar with this?

MR. WHITEMAN: Uh-huh [yes].

1 PUBLIC CITIZEN: It's a one-pager, we actually
2 have it just [unintelligible].
3 MR. WHITEMAN: I haven't seen that but I'm sure
4 it came out as a result of this.
5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right. And on that -- and so
6 I'm going to ask a practical question. At the bottom of
7 each description of the PEIS it says, DOE is considering
8 the Savannah River Site as one of the alternative
9 locations for the long-term storage of materials for
10 plutonium pit fabrication activities for the relocation of
11 interim storage of plutonium pits from Pantex. Is this
12 same kind of document being circulated at the other sites
13 and the same thing reads, DOE is considering Los Alamos as
14 one of the alternative on across the board so that this
15 is --
16 MR. WHITEMAN: Yes.
17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Because I tell you why you're
18 probably hearing some of our questions framed in the way
19 that it is is because we took this paper to mean that
20 Savannah River Site was the preferred site. And so it's a
21 little bit misleading, perhaps you can just put in
22 parenthesis and there are seven other sites that are being
23 considered as well, so that the citizens in this area
24 don't get confused that they are being -- they're the
25 number one choice and that while the PEIS is saying that

seven other sites are being looked at, that we are, in fact, the preferred choice.

MR. WHITEMAN: When we were here last summer for the scoping meeting on this, we identified all of the alternative sites, at that time, we were considering. And as it turns out we didn't change any of those, alter them from last summer till now. But, yeah, of the things that you mentioned there, you know, the pit fabrication is the one that's being considered as a part of this PEIS and that's the one that we've already made a declaration or the secretary of energy did about six weeks ago, that our intent or our preferred action was to do that at Los Alamos. The others that you mentioned there in terms of interim storage and long-term storage plutonium are being addressed in the other two meeting rooms here. And in those cases they have not yet made a preferred alternative selection. So those -- for those missions, that I don't know where that will be -- who knows where that will be made. Savannah River is still a potential for those others.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yeah, that's why we were trying to get a sense of the integration of the three activities, you know, the Pantex, the stockpile and stewardship and the disposition.

MR. WHITEMAN: Well, it would -- yeah, I think

1 that's why it's helpful having the three together because
2 there is some overlap issues seen in that.
3 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Yes.
4 **MR. WHITEMAN:** The decisions relative to
5 Savannah River, DOE -- relative for this PEIS -- DOE has
6 made it's public declaration of its intent and that is to
7 not add or subtract any missions from Savannah River. On
8 the Pantex EIS, DOE has also indicated its intent and that
9 is to keep those pits and the interim storage there at
10 Pantex, not to relocate them here. For the long-term
11 storage and disposition that's in the meeting room next
12 door, DOE has not made any decisions there. And so -- and
13 that won't occur until sometime in the next year.
14 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** But --
15 **MR. WHITEMAN:** But those are the -- that's the
16 one where there are potential decisions that would relate
17 to Savannah River that have not been made yet.
18 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** So the draft EIS would not have
19 the DOE's preferred site and --
20 **MR. WHITEMAN:** Well, the --
21 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** -- alternative decisions?
22 **MR. WHITEMAN:** The draft does not. The --
23 you -- DOE -- the way these EISs work, if you know what
24 you plan to do you should tell people. But if you're not
25 sure well, you, you know, you keep studying it. Well, in

1 the case of this PEIS, we determined, based on all the
2 studies we had done or what we wanted to do, and so we
3 told people. For the storage and disposition one next
4 door they're still studying the matter and there's no
5 declaration of what do we want to do. And so --
6 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, there will have to be
7 another one after the decision is made, once it is.
8 MR. WHITEMAN: Well, the final PEIS that will
9 come out this fall, at that point we have to say what we
10 would intend to do.
11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: And then you have to do another
12 EIS to say --
13 MR. WHITEMAN: No.
14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: -- what are the consequences of
15 doing that action at the site you want to do it at.
16 MR. WHITEMAN: No. That would contain all of
17 that information.
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: The final PEIS?
19 MR. WHITEMAN: Yes. Yeah. But -- so, anyway,
20 for two of the three DOE has made it's declaration of what
21 it plans to do because, you know, we knew so we told
22 people. And in those cases there was no change of new or
23 subtract or add to Savannah River. The third one that is
24 still up in the air and it could involve new commissions
25 here.

1 PUBLIC CITIZEN: May I ask a policy question?
2 MR. WHITEMAN: Yeah.
3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: By what process do you waive
4 strategic concerns against potential negative impact to
5 local populations?
6 MR. WHITEMAN: Well, that's -- that's what this
7 EIS is trying to do. I mean, that -- that's the vehicle
8 the government has for addressing these sorts of things.
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I was just wondering was any
10 particular formula, equation, process?
11 MR. WHITEMAN: Well, there's a -- for every area
12 that gets looked at in an EIS, whether it's water, air,
13 socioeconomic impacts, there's a standard way of doing
14 that that has developed in this country over the last 30
15 years so that there are people who are professionals that
16 work in those particular areas and that becomes sort of
17 the standard format.
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: But are you all working with
19 any type of independent entity that's not in total
20 opposition to DOE but, just in case -- you did a case
21 study, let's say for instance, cancer. And have you ever
22 brought -- have you -- are you all bringing out --
23 bringing in outside resources to say well, this is not
24 what I'm -- this is not what we're finding.
25 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Independent peer reviews.

1/96D
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 • FORM 2094

1 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right.

2 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Of a sort.

3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right. So it just won't be

4 coming -- just from strictly DOE because we've been --

5 we've been --

6 MR. WHITEMAN: Well, the way we've dealt with

7 that typically over the last decade or so, well, sometimes

8 with sites going back 25 years, we generally tried to deal

9 with an organization that people in the community can

10 trust, and because, you know, I know, it's hard whether

11 you live in Texas or New Mexico or South Carolina to trust

12 somebody coming in from Washington saying, well, I'm from

13 the government, you know, you should trust me.

14 So we try to get somebody that -- some

15 organization that people at the local level can trust to

16 be an independent body to overview those sorts of things.

17 In the case -- I know in New Mexico, you know, we -- we

18 fund the State of New Mexico's environment and health

19 organizations. We do that sort of work for us as well as

20 the Environmental Protection Agency.

21 I suspect here in South Carolina that the State

22 of South Carolina and perhaps Georgia, as well, are funded

23 to provide an independent view of the air monitoring,

24 water monitoring and, you know, all those effects around

25 here. I know the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta

1 has been contracted to do independent health effects
2 studies around our sites.
3 So we've -- it's hard to find, you know, an
4 organization that everyone believes is truly independent
5 because there will always be somebody say, well, you may
6 trust them but I don't, you know, so -- but we've hired
7 every group that we think are credible people that can
8 come in and look at how we're doing --
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, now, see, that's where
10 the problem may be at because you all hired them, you
11 know. I mean, we had, like, say, for instance, Citizens
12 for Environmental Justice based on the fact that they're -
13 - we're raising some very serious questions then you all
14 should be able to fund us with money for us to be able to
15 go out and find out own independent study -- own
16 independent researchers, the individual that will research
17 our problem for us. And then we could sit at a round
18 table and then y'all -- you-alls side and our side can sit
19 down and see can we come up with an answer, you know.
20 But just for you all to appoint us someone or
21 say, well, I got this person here you can call him and
22 he'll help you out. Man, that's not going to work because
23 that's no different than you all sending out doing the
24 independent research yourself.
25 MR. LAWSON: We have two other people who want

1 to put their oar in the water on this -- there in the back
2 there.
3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, I think it's worth noting
4 that the preferred selections that are announced are not
5 always the ones that are final choices, and that they're
6 not even always alternatives that were in the first draft.
7 That there is input from this -- these meetings and as an
8 independent that makes it through the process and it gets
9 looked at and sometimes selected, they get rewritten or
10 there are supplements that are issued.
11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Can you give us an example
12 of --
13 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Some of the spent nuclear fuel
14 in the basins, in the disassembly basins here in the
15 recent record of decision for that, there was an
16 additional month that -- or so longer maybe that was added
17 and there were new alternatives that were not in the
18 original document.
19 PUBLIC CITIZEN: And if there -- if you all say,
20 for instance, you all decided to use Savannah River Site,
21 what can we do as citizens to say that we don't want that?
22 If you -- in the record of decision and we -- we'll -- and
23 we don't agree as citizens with that, what proper step do
24 we need to take to say that we're not -- what proper step
25 do we need to take to reverse that decision?

1 PUBLIC CITIZEN: May I interrupt here? Are you
2 familiar with this citizens group that was formed recently
3 with Savannah River? They've had meetings down in
4 Savannah that a number of you people that are members of
5 it, are you familiar with that group?
6 PUBLIC CITIZEN: The Citizens Advisory Board?
7 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yeah.
8 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes, we're familiar with that.
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay. Are you participating in
10 that?
11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes, we do.
12 MR. LAWSON: Are you suggesting this is one
13 place to make --
14 PUBLIC CITIZEN: This is the place for the
15 citizens to have a voice. Now, they've been -- I'm not a
16 member of it. They have been able to change DOE's mind on
17 some of the things they did. I read the minutes of the
18 meetings, I've attended very few of them. But they meet
19 sometimes in Savannah, sometimes in Barnwell, sometimes
20 here, but that's your opportunity to participate at a very
21 influential level. Now, they're your neighbors.
22 MR. WHITEMAN: Yeah. Let me comment if I could.
23 The question you raised is a dilemma in a democracy, you
24 know, of how do you -- I think it's very valuable for
25 government organizations, whether they're DOE or whatever,

1 to stand up to and talk and answer questions and make sure
2 that the people who live in the communities that are
3 affected by the government's actions understand and have
4 an opportunity to provide feedback. The dilemma then is
5 of where -- you will never find everyone in a community
6 that agrees.
7 I mean, there will always be somebody that said,
8 well, I'm against that action, you know, I don't like you
9 to build the dam or I want you to build that dam and
10 you're not going to or I want you to do this. I think
11 it's incumbent on the government as much as we can to make
12 sure that we communicate our intent that we listen to
13 people and understand their concerns and factor those into
14 the information that we provide to the people who are
15 elected to make decisions for the government.
16 But at some point, you know -- and that's why
17 we're here is to make sure that we understand what are the
18 concerns and issues and questions the people that live
19 around Savannah River might have.
20 But you should understand as well this is a
21 democracy and the -- we have elected officials for us that
22 ultimately make those decisions, you know, I don't. I
23 work for the Department of Energy. I'm responsible for
24 making sure that I provide sound advice and judgment, you
25 know, as -- for the things I am responsible for and that

1 that advice and judgment gets relayed to people who will
2 then make the decisions.
3 But we do live in a democracy, I mean, it's -- I
4 think it's one that allows people to provide their point
5 of view but it doesn't always mean that every point of
6 view is the one that the government will follow.
7 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Well, I think I've got a
8 follow- up question. Excuse me, sister, and I'm -- I just
9 -- two things. One is that a more narrow question is, is
10 there a way to challenge the rod, not to necessarily
11 change it although it may get changed in your process but
12 his specific question is what is the procedure to
13 challenge a rod if you feel that that decision is against
14 your community.
15 **MR. WHITEMAN:** Yeah. Jay, can you answer that?
16 Yeah, there is a --
17 **MR. ROWS:** Yeah.
18 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** This is a more answer to --
19 **MR. WHITEMAN:** Yeah, and there is a process for
20 doing that and Jay --
21 **MR. ROWS:** Essentially when the NEPA was
22 written, you know, the legislature set up an avenue by
23 which -- and it's really through the administrative
24 procedure that I -- which NEPA falls under, it's kind of
25 complicated, but essentially when the decision makes -- or

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 • FORM 2054

1 when the government makes a decision on a NEPA document, a
2 record of decision, any potentially effected citizen can
3 challenge that and just file a lawsuit that DOE violated
4 the NEPA act, and --
5 MR. WHITEMAN: So the --
6 MR. ROWS: We get sued, I don't want to say
7 regularly, but Department does get sued and --
8 MR. WHITEMAN: And we win some and lose some.
9 MR. ROWS: We win some, we lose some.
10 MR. LAWSON: By this -- short of that though,
11 isn't there -- when the final EIS comes out there's 30-day
12 period in which, before the decision is made, extra
13 written pressure or whatever could be --
14 MR. ROWS: Oh, sure. I mean, that's why we have
15 a wait period between the final and the official record of
16 decision is so that people can weigh in on what's in the
17 final EIS and that may sway the decision maker in our case
18 that's the secretary of energy and then she'll make her
19 decision. But once the record of decision is made, really
20 your only practical recourse to change that is through the
21 legal course.
22 MR. LAWSON: I just wanted to get back to this
23 lady's point over here, that just because something is
24 preferred doesn't necessarily mean it will be accepted.
25 And so that if you need -- you shouldn't just say, well,

1 he said it was the preferred and then all of a sudden that
2 gets changed; if you have feelings about the preference
3 whether you agree with the preference or you don't, it's
4 important to weigh in in what your point of view is.
5 Because I mean --
6 MR. WHITEMAN: Well, I think you should take the
7 preferred alternative as an indication that, you know, the
8 government didn't wait until the last minute and say,
9 here's what we plan to do. It's based on everything we
10 knew at this point, the consensus was, this was the
11 decision that was most likely to be made and therefore we
12 should tell people that. I mean, it's not the final
13 decision but it certainly does -- the best knowledge you
14 know today.
15 MR. LAWSON: Excuse me, this woman over here has
16 been quite patient.
17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yes, she has.
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I was just wondering, I think
19 that these information sessions are great and I hope that
20 you take into account what people say but I must say your
21 own graphics would indicate that you don't because this
22 arrow for public information and involvement just goes off
23 to nowhere.
24 [Laughter].
25 And I really wonder is that the real

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 - FORM 2094

1 representation of how the decision is made?

2 MR. WHITEMAN: It certainly isn't what was

3 intended by that. I'm not sure if the --

4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: It looks pretty scary

5 [unintelligible] public.

6 MR. LAWSON: I missed that point.

7 PUBLIC CITIZEN: This arrow is not involved at

8 all with the decision.

9 MR. WHITEMAN: Yeah, it just goes on forever but

10 it doesn't --

11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: And that's what happens we just

12 go on for ever and ever.

13 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I have -- I've been writing

14 down questions.

15 MR. LAWSON: Okay.

16 PUBLIC CITIZEN: First off, you said to make the

17 process simpler, I agree, but lay people like me a lot of

18 things that you're saying, no, I don't understand because

19 I have not read that big book. I have the simplified copy

20 here now, I'm going home and read it. They've given me

21 some simplified --

22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Summaries.

23 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yeah, the summary.

24 MR. ROWS: Right, 41 pages. We put together --

25 PUBLIC CITIZEN: The summary.

1 MR. ROWS: -- right, 41 pages just for people
2 that --
3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right, just for me.
4 MR. ROWS: Just look at a document like this and
5 say, oh, my god, I can't -- I don't know where to start
6 and hopefully this gives you enough background and a good
7 enough snapshot of what this program could do at each of
8 the sites.
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right. I'm learning. I'm
10 learning so much today I need a degree in this after
11 today. The next thing is you made a statement that
12 Savannah River Site has already been taken off the list
13 for any new projects there.
14 MR. WHITEMAN: In this PEIS --
15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right.
16 MR. WHITEMAN: -- we considered one thing being
17 added to Savannah River and that plutonium pit fabrication
18 and the preferred alternative announcement that we've made
19 is that we would not plan to do that at Savannah River.
20 PUBLIC CITIZEN: That's the point I wanted to
21 make. You decided but yet we're here in a round table but
22 the decision has already been made, the --
23 MR. WHITEMAN: It's not the final -- that's why
24 we use the term preferred alternative.
25 MR. LAWSON: This is a very important point.

1 There's a difference between in saying what the
2 Department's preferred is and what it's final decision is.
3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: That's going back to what she
4 said, okay, going back to what she said.
5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right.
6 MR. WHITEMAN: It's not a final decision until
7 the Secretary of Energy makes a final decision toward the
8 end of the summer. But if -- if we were to make the
9 decision on everything we know today our preferred
10 alternative is what I just said, and I don't -- you know,
11 and we're getting public comments and input on that before
12 making the final.
13 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I understand better.
14 MR. WHITEMAN: Yeah.
15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Next one is, cancer as far as
16 Savannah. Savannah is known to be a cancer site. By
17 having the Savannah River Site there have you all taken
18 into consideration the amount of radiation that flows
19 through Savannah plus the cancer rate that we have
20 already, do you have statistics on that side of it?
21 MR. ROWS: Yeah.
22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: You do have statistics?
23 MR. ROWS: That's where I'm turning right now.
24 We --
25 PUBLIC CITIZEN: All right, the appendix E.

1 MR. ROWS: Appendix E on page -- again, this is
2 the big one -- E-61 and E-62. Okay.
3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I'm writing it down so I can go
4 home -- I got it -- and use appendix E.
5 MR. ROWS: E, yeah, E-61 and E-62. What we have
6 in there are a synopsis of the epidemiological studies
7 that have been conducted for the Savannah River Site that
8 kind of describe how past and present things going on at
9 Savannah River have affected cancer mortality rates.
10 MR. WHITEMAN: Is it unfair to say, Jay, you
11 won't find any information of that nature in here that you
12 haven't seen in other documents because we have not done
13 any new research in that, relative to that subject but
14 we're capturing the studies that have been ongoing and
15 done.
16 MR. LAWSON: Right, and these are independent
17 studies. Again, this isn't DOE doing this.
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: How old is the study?
19 PUBLIC CITIZEN: '79.
20 PUBLIC CITIZEN: That's almost 20 years.
21 MR. ROWS: And the other one is 1991.
22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: And you do have a recent '91?
23 MR. ROWS: Done by the national cancer
24 institute. Okay.
25 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I'll go back and check that one

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 • FORM 2094

1 out.

2 MR. ROWS: Right. And we have all the sites in

3 here that say, you know, how -- you know, where you can

4 find that, Journal of American Medicine Association, you

5 know which publication it's in, you know, get that.

6 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Yeah, I --

7 MR. ROWS: Actually this would be in the

8 Savannah River reading room because all the references

9 that we used -- so --

10 MR. LAWSON: Before we go on, and I'm going to

11 take your question. I have to ask a question. We're

12 going to break at one o'clock and we could go back into

13 the larger room for a summary. I don't know if all of you

14 have been to the Pantex thing, you want to do that or you

15 want to go back to the larger group. I have to know what

16 your preferences are.

17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, our bus is scheduled to

18 take us home at one o'clock. That's what it's been

19 contracted for.

20 MR. LAWSON: All right. So we can either go

21 back to the larger room and if you have questions about

22 that -- before you do, Bob, you have a question you'd like

23 to ask.

24 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I would like -- this is a

25 matter of information. There is a man at Neeses, you know

1 where that is?

2 PUBLIC CITIZEN: At where?

3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Neeses.

4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: John Tell, yes, we know of him.

5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Right outside of Orangeburg.

6 He is given a good contract by DOE to go back and study

7 the radiation release records at SRS. Now, they've been -

8 - there are documents, yea tall, about every year, every

9 quarter they report how much radiation got loose. This

10 man is trying to reconstruct that and compile it. He's

11 reading a whale of a lot of documents. On June the 1st,

12 1953 there was radiation got loose. Now, he's compiling

13 all of that.

14 While he's compiling it the Medical College of

15 -- no, MUSC, they are beginning to take that and look and

16 seeing what effect that radiation has had. People in this

17 area have had heart attacks, people in another area have

18 cancer, can that be traced to radiation released by SRS.

19 So that's what's going on now.

20 It's going to be another couple of years before

21 the guy at Neeses can wade through all that stuff, but in

22 the meantime, MUSC and Emory University are both working

23 to see what possible health effects that radiation might

24 have had.

25 One reason we have so many opinions is that no

1 ones been able to do a study that really pinpoints and
2 says, this cancer was caused by radiation and not genetics
3 or not diet or not something else. You can't get -- we
4 haven't the data to specify any particular person's
5 leukemia solely to radiation or solely to something else.
6 But the DOE is getting this information to see if it will
7 help in explaining this.
8 PUBLIC CITIZEN: We may never have a direct link
9 between the Savannah River Site's radiation release and
10 the cancer that lays latent for 15 or 20 years. But at
11 the same time we cannot prove scientifically that the
12 radiation from these federal facilities does not cause
13 cancers. So we have this --
14 MR. WHITEMAN: It works both ways.
15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, there was another unit.
16 I have a card in my pocket that when I die the undertaker
17 or whoever is around is supposed to call an organization
18 in Seattle. They will tell him to do an autopsy on me,
19 take part of my liver, take part of my bones, take part of
20 something else, and send it to them. They want that -- I
21 have some plutonium in me. They want that information to
22 see what plutonium has done on my body. They are
23 gradually getting more data. They finally got one body
24 that had a lot of plutonium in it and they got the whole
25 body. They've studied the bones of this individual. He

1 did not have any cancer in the bones. He did not die of
2 cancer but he had a lot of PU in his body. Now, that's
3 just one case. We need thousands of cases like that
4 before we can state specifically. So in the meantime we
5 just all speculate and we come to conclusions.
6 MR. LAWSON: I appreciate all your comments.
7 Given the time I think we should go back to a larger room,
8 I believe.
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I just have a -- I wanted to
10 ask a brief question about the computer modeling.
11 MR. WHITEMAN: Right.
12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: How -- I don't know if the word
13 is accurate -- reliable. How reliable under the
14 transportation question is the computer modeling and maybe
15 you might answer it in the --
16 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I'm not an expert on that code.
17 All I can tell you is that -- and this -- maybe somebody
18 in there on Storage and Disposition since they do more
19 transportation. Maybe Andre or the other guy can answer
20 that better.
21 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay.
22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: But essentially it's the
23 generally accepted scientific code that's used for
24 modeling radiation but I can't talk about how good it is.
25 MR. LAWSON: Okay. It's late so I just ask

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 • FORM 2094

1 people to hustle back to the other room.

PANTEX SITE-WIDE EIS

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

- - - - -

PUBLIC CITIZEN: What is the intent of the hole, the square?

MS. FOUNDS: The square, oh. That is, if you will look at this partly, you have these -- and they unload them, but that hole is where the beams or the -- let me try this again. This is a little bit different in that the actual mockup is such that when you have the automated guided vehicle, there's a boom that goes into that hole there. And this forklift can [unintelligible] either swing this boom and swing it around and place it -- these things on here. So that's really what that is for. It's sort of a guide to place it and it's also where the boom goes in terms of up there.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Thank you. The example didn't look like that though.

MS. FOUNDS: Yeah, it doesn't, but our video tapes do show the automated vehicle and how that boom works.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I assume that's gama. The worker at what distance for that 6 rem?

MS. FOUNDS: The worker -- the uninvolved worker's considered to be at about a hundred meters.

1 That's an uninvolved worker. What you're doing right here
2 is looking at the exposure based upon how operations are
3 currently performed at the Pantex Site to get an overall
4 dose to people handling it, because there are people that
5 are going to be in contact, you know, with the containers
6 themselves, putting them on pallets, forklifts, et cetera,
7 to handle them to get them placed into storage. So that's
8 what this corresponds to, whereas this corresponds to
9 noninvolved workers, people are involved with the
10 operation itself, and then starting to be members of the
11 public with this one being if a person was actually at the
12 fence line, what would that exposure be. So you're
13 getting the worse possible of all the public.
14 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I guess a forklift puncture --
15 MS. FOUNDS: Uh-huh [yes].
16 PUBLIC SPEAKER: -- a forklift driver is maybe
17 six feet away from the plutonium.
18 MS. FOUNDS: Uh-huh [yes].
19 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Now, he's going to be 6 rem at
20 that distance?
21 MS. FOUNDS: I think that that's correct because
22 you're -- remember that --
23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, this is alpha.
24 MS. FOUNDS: Yeah. You're talking about the
25 material itself getting out.

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07001 · FORM 2014

1 PUBLIC SPEAKER: That's the whole pit getting
2 out?
3 MS. FOUNDS: It was a portion of it because we
4 took a fairly conservative case in terms of how much of
5 the material. You have to remember that these are like
6 balls and we were actually, you know, in the scenario
7 looking as if it could actually almost be pressurized and
8 get some portion of that out and then a smaller portion of
9 it being the 10 micron range, for instance, that could
10 actually be inhaled.
11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's not an
12 instantaneous dose, either.
13 MS. FOUNDS: Right.
14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's over a fifty year
15 period assuming that he inhaled part of the dose and would
16 have resided there over that long period of time.
17 PUBLIC SPEAKER: That's not very realistic, is
18 it?
19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's not very realistic
20 that it would happen, but it potentially could happen.
21 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yeah. The sky might fall too,
22 though.
23 MS. FOUNDS: Well, actually these -- well, as I
24 said, this is a dominant one with the exposures associated
25 with, but the probability of that accident happening I

1 think is like one times ten minus a fifth, somewhere
2 around in that. So it is an improbable one and the
3 document goes in and looks at it as a risk perspective,
4 which is both the consequences plus the probability of it
5 actually happens. The document does look through that.
6 Sir?
7 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Isn't the newer method of
8 staging, it doesn't have a forklift rider on the forklift?
9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There is a point that it
10 does.
11 MS. FOUNDS: But there are points at which you
12 do use the forklifts but, again, if you go and look at the
13 videos it shows you of the things being placed, there's a
14 boom and there are censors on the front of this boom that
15 would stop its travel, for instance, if it was hitting up
16 against a canister. And those 18400A's they're, what,
17 three-quarter inch stainless steel is the inner container
18 and a quarter inch stainless steel is the outer container.
19 And I think Kevin can show you the mockup of one of those
20 18400A's. Did I get the dimensions on it right?
21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, but they're
22 backwards. The inner one is the quarter inch -- yeah.
23 MS. FOUNDS: Okay, and then there's three-
24 quarter inch on the other one, okay.
25 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I have a question. I missed --

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 - FORM 2094

I've apparently misunderstood what you said. You said when I load these things I'm going to put them in a Type A container.

MS. FOUNDS: Type E.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Type E container, okay, fine. Now, you never said I'm going to take them out of that Type E container.

MS. FOUNDS: Uh-huh [yes].

PUBLIC SPEAKER: So I'm assuming they're stored in a Type E container which is suitable for drop for 30 feet --

MS. FOUNDS: Yes.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: -- or puncture and so forth.

MS. FOUNDS: Uh-huh [yes].

PUBLIC SPEAKER: How in the world is a forklift going to ram a hole through it?

MS. FOUNDS: It's a very conservative estimate, sir.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I just -- Bob, I agree with you.

MS. FOUNDS: We try to ban the accident scenarios and as you can see the consequences are not great and we are looking at the probabilities of those accidents, and they're not large for this particular type of an operation.

1 PUBLIC SPEAKER: But, anyway, to pick up the 6
2 rem and say that's what they're going to be exposed to --
3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Less accident.
4 PUBLIC SPEAKER: And it's utterly ridiculous.
5 MS. FOUNDS: Well, I think, as I said, we go
6 through and we analyze these things. We analyze them as
7 conservative --
8 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yeah, and that's the game
9 that's been played with these EIS's and you're not going
10 to change it and I'm not going to change it, but somehow
11 we've got to put a little realism in these things.
12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But that is real. In
13 other words, that is the most credible type of action that
14 could occur. And the probability of that accident, as Nan
15 said, is very small but we have to report what the
16 probability is and should it occur, what are the
17 consequences, and that's all in this report.
18 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Has it ever occurred?
19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not that I'm aware of.
20 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Okay, how many forklift
21 operations has occurred?
22 MS. FOUNDS: But the probability is, is that
23 what we're saying, like the ten and the minus fifth is
24 that it would not -- it would occur like once in a hundred
25 thousand years. So, therefore, the probability of it

8/95
BENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2024

happening within fifty years is, you know, not having seen that would be consistent without probability.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, and we'll take the comment and see if there's some opportunity to phrase it differently in the EIS so that it puts a dose of reality in --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're going to get it both on the board, too, so we'll bring that up in summary.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let me get one more side. We've got about ten minutes.

MS. FOUNDS: Okay, so these are the -- again going back to --

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Let me ask a question. You know all those things are in the EIS, we can look at them, right?

MS. FOUNDS: Uh-huh [yes].

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I guess I misunderstood your words. Back in the beginning you said that our preferred alternative is continued operation. I don't find the preferred alternative in here. There's a proposed alternative.

MS. FOUNDS: That is -- it is a proposed, but it is also the Department saying that it is the preferred alternative. And it is not in there though.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Where have they done that?

1 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** It was in the Federal
2 Register Notice, correct?
3 **MS. FOUNDS:** Yes.
4 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Just to clarify that
5 again and make sure everybody -- I don't know -- so the
6 preferred alternative is the proposed alternative and
7 that's been in the Federal Register Notice as recently?
8 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** When we issued the EIS we
9 put the Federal Register Notice --
10 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** At the same time, okay.
11 **PUBLIC SPEAKER:** Does Pantex conduct a peuter
12 storage operation in facilities that are considered to be
13 nuclear facilities, rated nuclear facilities and, you
14 know, that conform to the DOE orders for nuclear
15 facilities 6431A, for instance?
16 **MS. FOUNDS:** Yeah, there's a lot of debate about
17 whether or not the storage facilities are a nuclear
18 facility, but the do conform to the SARs for instance that
19 are out there and we have --
20 **PUBLIC SPEAKER:** You have done SARs on those
21 facilities?
22 **MS. FOUNDS:** Uh-huh [yes]. On the Zone 4 area
23 there are SARs. And they went through an operational
24 readiness review in order to be able to store out in those
25 facilities. And for the past, I don't know, thirty or

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2094

forty years, we have been using those -- the similar magazines for weapons storage.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Plutonium vulnerability assessment.

MS. FOUNDS: Excuse me?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: You can fix -- familiar with plutonium vulnerability assessment done in November of '94? It says that operations of storage activities are continuing with a -- on the basis of a bio instead of approved safety analysis reports.

MS. FOUNDS: Actually, I mean the whole Department is going through a process of upgrading to what are called 5480 DOT 23 SARS and all of the sites have bios. They all went through and did an assessment and put up bios as we all upgrade to those DOT 23 SARS. The Zone 4 happens to have a SAR that was approved recently.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was approved in December '92 and they are currently going through and update the DOT 23 Standard, which I believe is on schedule to be completed by the end of this year.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Can you put that in English? You're talking to the public now. That's what this meeting's suppose to be. Upgrading to the SARS something or other.

MS. FOUNDS: There are certain requirements in

1 looking at -- in any facility. You go through very much
2 like this EIS. You look at the hazards. Obviously there
3 are hazardous material out there. There's plutonium in
4 what is called the Zone 4. I don't have any of those U-
5 graphs that showed Zone 4 with us, do I?
6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-uh [no].
7 MS. FOUNDS: And obviously, as I said, the
8 hazard out there is the plutonium and the possibility of
9 dispersing that plutonium. From normal handling accidents
10 there's not much of a risk of dispersing it. The greatest
11 threat out there is the fact we also have weapons out
12 there and you might have an aircraft impact into those
13 weapons magazines or into those pit magazines and creating
14 a possible dispersal accident. So what happens in a SAR
15 is you go through and you analyze all those different
16 scenarios, how credible they are, what the probability of
17 an accident is, and then the consequences from those
18 things. Very much like what we're doing here in looking
19 at a transportation accident because that's what we would
20 be doing to transport the pits here, and then what, you
21 know, you're storing the pits out here, how likely is an
22 earthquake, you know, that would potentially disperse some
23 of the plutonium in this area.
24 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I was surprised we only had a
25 few minutes to discuss, if we're moving on to the others,

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 - FORM 2094

and I've got a lot of comments that I'd like to make. I guess I'm going to have to put them in writing.

MS. FOUNDS: Please, go --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just keep moving on. Keep going.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're welcome to stay.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Are you going to -- if I stay you're going to have to hear me.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I've got a few more I want to throw in too, Chris.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, we -- we've got time now. We're going to just continue on. If you feel --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's just take comments, that's it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, just keep going.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I'm surprised as the Westinghouse Land-Use Coordinator that I didn't know that P-Area was proposed, okay. It's probably a good idea but I chair something called the Land-Use Technical Committee and nobody came to me and said, golly, gee, we would like to put this somewhere, okay. That's the first thing.

MS. FOUNDS: Well, we have a site point of contact.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's also in NEVA.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I know and I should be talking

1 to that person and they'll kill me 'cause I'm here as a
2 private citizen now but --
3 MS. FOUNDS: No, that's fine. I was just going
4 to say we have been interacting with the Site.
5 PUBLIC SPEAKER: The other thing is on your
6 evaluation list I had a question about why you didn't
7 discuss things in detail and why you did. For instance,
8 the facilities in infrastructure at SRS are excellent,
9 okay.
10 MS. FOUNDS: Right.
11 PUBLIC SPEAKER: But it says it's not discussed
12 in detail.
13 MS. FOUNDS: Well --
14 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Are you all aware of this Land-
15 Use Baseline Report that was put out?
16 MS. FOUNDS: Uh-uh [no].
17 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Well, I want to submit that for
18 you all to look at and read, okay. It tells -- it's a
19 synopsis of what the attributes of the Site are. Also, it
20 talks about things like you were talking about with the
21 fault line and you said it's not in a fault area. It's
22 near a fault area, but it's capable versus noncapable and
23 that's something you have to look at, but here it says you
24 didn't discuss in detail. One thing is the positive, the
25 Site doesn't have a wind -- a consistent wind

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2094

1 [unintelligible], okay, so if there is an accident it's
2 not going to head over or down to Savannah or it's not
3 going to go over to Evans, Georgia or whatever, okay,
4 because it's not predictable.
5 **MS. FOUNDS:** Right.
6 **PUBLIC SPEAKER:** Intrasite transportation, the
7 railroad, one advantage of P-Area is that it's right next
8 to a railroad classification yard, if you're using
9 railroads. I don't know if you --
10 **MS. FOUNDS:** We're not.
11 **PUBLIC SPEAKER:** Okay. And then I had another
12 question about the list, how come environmental justice is
13 broken out and it's not included under cultural resources
14 or socioeconomic resources? And having taught NEPA, we
15 normally would put it under there and not have it by
16 itself. And I noticed it was discussed in detail -- there
17 are only two things discussed in detail and the rest is
18 not. And that might be my --
19 **MS. FOUNDS:** Let me go back. One of the reasons
20 that we selected Savannah River is because it had those
21 assembly areas. They were sizemically qualified, those
22 types of things. There was a large warehouse. You could
23 have almost picked up the Pantex operation and put them in
24 P-Reactor. So when I say we didn't discuss them in
25 detail, we evaluated them but there was no need to discuss

them in a great deal of detail because the facilities --

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Well, this is misleading that way, then.

MS. FOUNDS: -- you know, and okay. But in terms of that we do not evaluate them in a great detail, but in the document each one of those areas is addressed. For instance, we're putting it in the P-reactor. Those are fine facilities. You would not have to modify them so, therefore, there's not a great deal of action necessary in order to consider them, you know, you don't have to construct, et cetera.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And there's a chapter devoted just to Savannah River to discuss all of those areas. But then we come to a conclusion, too, that there's no environmental impact and that's why we don't go into the detail. We don't need --

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Okay, but what I'm saying, this is misleading.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, thank you for pointing that out. We appreciate that.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: And, Rick, I'm sorry. Go ahead. I had my two minutes.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I think that also the other vulnerability noted for Pantex was that the -- Pantex is the only site, the only major plutonium site that is

8/95

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2094

1 identified as having a single barrier plutonium with
2 environmental public. Now, you know, that's a fact. Read
3 the book.
4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What do you mean?
5 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I'm curious what's being done
6 to upgrade and correct that before you talk about putting
7 more there. Also, I have the general comment that storage
8 at Pantex is like a lot of other DOE programs that really
9 is only interim action. It really doesn't lead to
10 anything. These pits, you know, eventually are either
11 going to be in the strategic reserves, stockpile
12 management program or the disposition program, and really
13 you're a lot better off with bringing them, you know -- my
14 particular bias, of course, is bringing them to Savannah
15 River where you get this energy of feeding into other
16 programs because Pantex is not an operating plutonium
17 site. Well, you just say, well, we don't really have
18 nuclear facilities, we really don't have plutonium
19 facilities. To do these other missions you need those.
20 So my general comment is that you ought to look at putting
21 them at a functional plutonium site, which there really
22 only happens to be one. Also, another subject is there
23 tritium involved in any of these pits? I don't see any
24 discussion of health impacts related to tritium.
25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, it's part of the

1 disassembly, the reservoirs are taken off and shipped back
2 to Savannah River. And we are just considering in ours
3 the impacts of Pantex of continuing to ship that back to
4 the Savannah River Site. Did you want me to try to answer
5 some of your questions?
6 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Well, most of them are related
7 to the aspect of nuclear facilities, plutonium sites, and
8 in particular the vulnerabilities that are noted and if
9 you'd like to address those, go ahead.
10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, going back to the
11 one -- well, let me start out with when you're talking
12 more like a long-term storage, we're looking at it for an
13 interim basis for the next five to ten years while you
14 make those decisions for the PEISs as to long-term storage
15 and those things. So basically, you know, operations are
16 to store them until these other decisions can be made.
17 That's one point I wanted to make. When you talk about
18 vulnerabilities at the site, actually the pit is encased
19 in metal. That's one barrier. The container is a second
20 barrier. And then you have the structures that they're in
21 that are containment but do preclude some of the accidents
22 or some of the consequences out at the Pantex Site. So it
23 is possible to go ahead and store those pits at Pantex.
24 But you're right in terms of there is no processing out at
25 the Pantex Site.

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2094

1 PUBLIC SPEAKER: That's, you know, the
2 structures are ventilated, the atmosphere --
3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And that's -- they are
4 not in containment.
5 PUBLIC SPEAKER: And, in fact, they're
6 [unintelligible] out in here that the storage container,
7 you know, is not sealed so it's not a containment barrier
8 either.
9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Wait a minute. The
10 storage container is not sealed?
11 PUBLIC SPEAKER: ALR8s being unsealed the ALR8
12 container does not --
13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They're sealed
14 containers. And the other point is that regardless of
15 which option we're going to the AT400-A, which have the
16 pit which is flat, the inner vessel which is welded, and
17 then you have the outer canister. So actually that's
18 layers of containment there and that's what we're going to
19 in terms of the AT400-A.
20 PUBLIC SPEAKER: What I'm hearing Rick say to
21 you is that he's reading another DOE document that's not
22 badly out of date and it's different than what your EIS is
23 saying and what you're telling us here. And in order to
24 go forward from here you need to take that document and to
25 make a review against your EIS, correct and modify as

1 necessary. Isn't that what you're saying, Rick?

2 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I think that's certainly

3 appropriate.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We will look at those

5 documents, but we're also very familiar with how the

6 operations are at the Pantex plant.

7 PUBLIC SPEAKER: But not how plutonium is

8 stored. The new 3011 for example --

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But I have gone out and I

10 watched how they take the weapon apart, where they put it

11 in there. We have this --

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have this and we'll

13 visit the issue.

14 PUBLIC SPEAKER: May I make a couple of

15 comments?

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Certainly.

17 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I think these are comments.

18 Basically on page 533, you're talking about the worker at

19 Savannah River health consequence and which you show on

20 your chart up there at four ten and a minus three as the

21 maximum exposed individuals. But you say the probability

22 of a cancer from all causes to the general public is

23 estimated to be twenty percent which implies that six of

24 the thirty workers are going to develop cancer. Now, that

25 doesn't sound like an insignificant consequence to me.

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2094

1 That sounds like a significant consequence.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But that's -- what that

3 is is saying that twenty people in the United States,

4 regardless of what they're doing, will over their lifetime

5 once that group, all of them, not twenty percent of them,

6 will have died from cancer.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's from natural

8 cause. Let me comment that the paragraph is unclear.

9 That's what I'm saying, okay. The paragraph is unclear.

10 I know what it means -- what it should mean.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you have the page

12 number for that?

13 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yes, it's on page 533.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

15 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Another comment is you claim

16 here and also in the document of the Savannah River

17 section fully evaluates environmental justice. And I read

18 the two or three pages on environmental justice and there

19 are a lot of facts, there are no conclusions, okay, and --

20 now, your companion EIS over here, the stockpile

21 maintenance -- stewardship, makes all kinds of erroneous

22 conclusions on environmental justice, okay. But you don't

23 make none. And yet you claim you --

24 PUBLIC SPEAKER: At least they weren't

25 erroneous.

1 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yes, you completely analyzed
2 them. The third comment is the comment that a large
3 fraction of the accident analysis is directed towards
4 airplane accidents -- airplane crash dispersing material.
5 And you go through that at Savannah River which is very
6 improbable and low consequence should it happen, and you
7 consider that a bounding accident. I question whether it
8 is in fact a bounding accident for a Class I facility like
9 the P-Area reactor. I don't know that you've analyzed the
10 bounding accidents.
11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The bounding accident was
12 a forklift accident.
13 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Okay, now then you're coming to
14 my next point. It is the conservatism that you put in the
15 bounding accidents are way too conservative. They need to
16 have some credibility even though they are bounding
17 accidents. You can't just assume like the safety analysis
18 does everything is the worse, NEPA doesn't allow that.
19 NEPA says that you will develop reasonable but bounding
20 accidents and I concluded from reading it before Bob
21 raised the question here earlier in the day that the
22 accidents were not reasonable. They were bounding,
23 certainly. You know, I could have said that the guys
24 consume each of the whole -- or inhale the pit and,
25 therefore, that's bounding, but that's certainly not the

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 - FORM 2094

intent of a NEPA process. I find -- the last point that I want to make is probably the more important one to Savannah River and that is that the process for establishing the program for Pantex should be considered to be totally moved to Savannah River Site or should be evaluated as part of the Environmental Impact Statement, not to move 8,000 or 20,000 pits for interim storage to Savannah River Site.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When you say the entire program, what do you mean by that?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: The pit operation --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Assembly, disassembly operations.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Assembly, disassembly.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's being considered in the Stockpile Stewardship EIS. We do not --

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I've not seen that as an option.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right, but that's considered within that EIS whether it should be -- that mission should be moved or not.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There is a section that talks about the relocation of operations other than storage. When they did that initial analysis of alternatives they concluded that there was only one

1 possible place that they could relocate the operations at
2 a reasonable investment and that was for Nevada. That was
3 analyzed but it is not a preferred alternative.
4 PUBLIC SPEAKER: It doesn't matter where --
5 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Is this [unintelligible] that
6 it's going to have to take place anyway?
7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just a second. Let's
8 finish up with this question.
9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We will take your comment
10 and also give it to the Stockpile Stewardship.
11 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Thank you. I'm going to make
12 the Stockpile Stewardship --
13 PUBLIC SPEAKER: You don't have to.
14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I assumed so but, anyway,
15 that will be a crosscutting issue.
16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And before we get to your
17 question I just wanted to check and see because we're
18 not -- I might get in trouble with Mr. Barry in a few
19 minutes but we want to continue this.
20 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I'd like to --
21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, and we have -- how
22 many people do we have still wanting to provide comments?
23 I just want to get a feeling so I can tell him how long
24 it's going to take? More comments, okay. I just -- good,
25 let's keep going. Go ahead. Thanks.

8/95
PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 · FORM 2054

1 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Work chart is totally confusing
2 to me. And how a dose rate of one rem per year at one
3 meter at the surface of the trailer, why does that
4 [unintelligible] affect the human dose based on geography?
5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This is, again, looking
6 at the shipment of 20,000 pits. So this is looking
7 cumulative dose over however long it's going to take us,
8 okay, in order to ship those pits, those the public would
9 be getting for Savannah River a 3 person rem. The entire
10 public. That's an additive dose.
11 PUBLIC SPEAKER: That's the transportation dose?
12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.
13 PUBLIC SPEAKER: All right, now, what's the
14 natural radiation dose?
15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Background radiation for
16 people it's like a --
17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have that in the
18 document.
19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- I believe a milligram.
20 PUBLIC SPEAKER: From the radon that you're
21 getting sitting here in this room?
22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's correct.
23 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Now, I submit Pantex has a much
24 higher background radiation than Savannah River. Now, you
25 do not say we ought to move it to Savannah River in order

1 to get -- decrease the number of people at Pantex, did
2 you? Get the people out of that god-awful place.
3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are you saying that this
4 meeting -- you're saying that there is a dose at Pantex
5 that you would average out, for instance, from having
6 those containers at Pantex versus at the Savannah River
7 Site, is that what you're saying because of the background
8 radiation?
9 PUBLIC SPEAKER: No, I'm saying we ought to
10 decrease the population at Pantex --
11 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Move over to Savannah River,
12 huh?
13 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yeah.
14 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Sounds good to me.
15 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I agree. Put that down. Put a
16 double check mark.
17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Moving people from Pantex
18 to Savannah River, right? Okay, we'll get that down --
19 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Take away the jobs at Pantex
20 and we'll reduce cancers, right.
21 [Several participants speak at one time.]
22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We won't put the word
23 deplete.
24 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Talking about aircraft
25 accidents --

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But, again, you can also
2 see here when we talk about the risks this is what we're
3 looking at, too --
4 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Sunday I had occasion to go
5 from Wichita Falls back here and that ASA plane could
6 cause no damage whatsoever to any facility.
7 MS. FOUNDS: We do look at those things when
8 evaluating an aircraft crash and one of the reasons we
9 don't do it in detail for Savannah River is because,
10 you're right, there isn't a lot of air traffic around
11 Savannah River Site. So, again, you go through a
12 screening process and because you don't have a lot of
13 air -- a number of aircraft operations, you can,
14 therefore, eliminate that as a very credible accident at
15 the Savannah River Site.
16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, Nan, while we take
17 just a second and get some more questions, this comment
18 period goes to July 12th and there are copies of this
19 available for people who have not yet seen it, right?
20 MS. FOUNDS: That's correct. They are in the
21 exhibit hall. You can just go in and pick those up.
22 PUBLIC SPEAKER: There are copies of the
23 record -- are the Deferred Action Notification in there?
24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In our document?
25 PUBLIC SPEAKER: No, somebody --

1 **MS. FOUNDS:** But it's the Federal Register
2 Notice. It's the Federal Register Notice and we can get
3 that to you.
4 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Okay, so we need to get
5 you a copy. If we can, make sure before we break up we
6 get you a copy of the Federal Register Notice so. Okay,
7 there's several people who want -- so, Donna, we'll need
8 to get those name before we get out of here. Let's get
9 your names and make sure we get you on a list to get that
10 Federal Register. I think we have cards available to do
11 that.
12 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Yeah, if you put it on a
13 card, we'll make sure and mail a copy to you.
14 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Okay, now, moving on.
15 Any other comments? Yes.
16 **PUBLIC SPEAKER:** I have a comment. It's a
17 crosscutting issue, it should be brought up in each one.
18 I'm past chair of something called the CSRA Planners Group
19 which means that -- you know what CSRA stands for? The
20 people in the area have a problem with DOE coming in
21 saying that -- what am I trying to say? The State of
22 South Carolina is concerned with any new project coming
23 into the area if Yucca Mountain doesn't come about. And
24 that really has to be addressed strongly. And I've heard
25 it from folks in the governor's office and folks in the

area around here that before we can have any of these, that issue should be solved at the policy level, like somebody -- you were talking the policy I think --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Of state's concern of moving additional operations here with South Carolina?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Without their feeling that they will be a dumping ground.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: And that Yucca Mountain should be the dumping ground or whatever, but it's -- the issue is let's not have it stop here, and each one of these projects should be looking at the waste issue and even DWPF is not suppose to have its glass containers stay here. So that's something that has to be stressed somewhere as a crosscutting issue. I know it's not unfamiliar with you-all.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But across all three or what -- across many, more than the three, okay. Okay, thank you. Other comments, questions, concerns? Anybody want to make a statement on the record?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: How do the people at Pantex feel about this?

MS. FOUNDS: Well, there is a large group -- we -- let me go back to our scoping.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You want Bob Juba

1 [phonetic] to answer?

2 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Yeah, I can do that but -

3 - okay, what is it?

4 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Yeah, Bob.

5 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** The people at Amarillo

6 and the Panhandle are very supportive of the operations at

7 Pantex. Plutonium's been at Pantex for over forty years

8 and, you know, weapons were a pit form. Support is

9 unanimous among local elected officials, state elected

10 officials, federal elected officials. Public opinion

11 polling places Pantex is supported around 80 percent, so

12 overall the support for those continued operations is

13 there.

14 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Thank you, Bob.

15 **PUBLIC SPEAKER:** I have one other -- it's a

16 question. I don't know the answer to it, but I found

17 nothing in the EIS that addressed the aging of a pit

18 relative to what happens as a pit goes from 35 to 50

19 years. You talk about a ten-year window, even the ten-

20 year window is not clearly described in my way of thinking

21 in the EIS.

22 **PUBLIC SPEAKER:** And in specific, related to

23 that, when you look at the impacts of releases and pit

24 failures, are you taking into account the aging of pit

25 stockpile increasing the probability or the frequency of

1 failures?

2 PUBLIC SPEAKER: You know, that's basically

3 where I'm going. You know, but the question -- I've heard

4 it stated and certainly it is a case based on experience

5 that the pits are good at peace. You know, you can store

6 the material in there. Certainly our experience today,

7 that's been the case. What are we estimating to take

8 place in those units as they continue to age that would

9 influence or cause increased frequency or increased

10 consequence of damage? Oxidation or growth, grain growth

11 or --

12 MS. FOUNDS: Okay, but one of the things is, of

13 course, those things are sealed containers, so you're

14 trying to not expose it so that you don't have, as you

15 call, the growth and things like that. They were part of

16 the vulnerabilities in that study that we done. But there

17 is a surveillance program that is established by the

18 laboratories to look at these aging effects and to pull

19 containers out, open them up, look at the pit, you know,

20 ship them back to Los Alamos for some testing and things

21 like that. So there is an active evaluation program and

22 it is described as part of the Pantex piece of this

23 document that that surveillance activities are going to

24 continue.

25 PUBLIC SPEAKER: That certainly has been the

1 case in the past when we talk about them as part of the
2 war reserve. They are no longer, some of them, from the
3 answer that I got to my question this morning which was
4 surplus and which were not. They're going to be stored
5 brother and sister right there beside each other. I doubt
6 that the 2A program that's been set up for the weapons is
7 going to continue to look at surplus materials as
8 thoroughly as they're currently looking at those things
9 they might reuse.
10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sandia is actually
11 setting up a program by which they are going to -- and
12 have certain milestones, et cetera, to polling those,
13 doing a random sample of them in order to evaluate the
14 effects of having those storage. And so there is a QA
15 program in place for that -- will be in place for that
16 material.
17 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I hope that you will in your
18 final EIS talk to this issue, talk to and commit to
19 whatever happens if Sandia's work finds that they are
20 deteriorating, what do you do?
21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thanks, that's a good
22 point.
23 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I have some comments that I'd
24 like that are more crosscutting --
25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: But rather than jump around from room to room, I'd like to make them here, if that's -- is that okay?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, that's fine and we'll share the ones you --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We'll get them to everybody. We'll share them in the session when we get a chance.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I'm not here to give a class. I'm not going to use all these but I thought I would -- and Lee has heard some of this with future environmental uses and all that so he can go onto the next one.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are you going to leave us a set of these?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, great.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: This is a modified presentation that I gave the federal planners of the American Planning Association, and I'm the immediate past chair of the Federal Planners Division. Two weeks ago we got all the federal planners together from the Navy, the Army, DOE wasn't there as much as we would like, but anyway we had a few of the folks and we looked at future uses, that was just one of them. So I'm not going to go through the

1 whole thing. What I want to do is if you-all will skip
2 past the situation, this is the main point I want to make,
3 okay, that environmental uses -- since this is a NEPA,
4 National Environmental Policy Act, we can expand
5 environmental uses on federal facilities. And now I'm
6 talking more specifically to SRS without affecting current
7 missions.
8 It's my view that we can take all three of these
9 missions and not hurt any of the environmental uses, and
10 I'll get to that. However, you're going to need
11 thoughtful planning. You just don't throw these things in
12 there as you all know. And I showed a little version of
13 this somehow, let's see. This is the way environmental
14 planning, this is from NOSS in 1987, this is how
15 environmental planning used to be where you protected a
16 core of the environment, okay. And then as you went out
17 the use intensity increased. And then as you go into
18 the -- I call it the target, okay, as you go into the
19 target, protection increases. And that's a pretty basic
20 way of doing environmental -- or doing planning, excuse
21 me.
22 However, at federal facilities, I haven't been
23 to Pantex so I don't know, but I've been to Hanford, Oak
24 Ridge, Los Alamos, a lot of the labs. But let's look a
25 the bigger ones like Hanford, SRS and Oak Ridge. You've

1 got -- imagine on this map that is in that baseline report
2 and say this is the Savannah River Site. Obviously, it's
3 not a circle, it's got the little tail down here, but the
4 major industrial area and say P-reactors right over here,
5 right on the edge of it, okay. That's where you-all are
6 thinking of putting your uses. What you can do is have
7 that but also on the outskirts, the first buffer zone, the
8 first part of this target, you can have types of
9 recreation, research. This goes with this National
10 Environmental Research Park concept that Dr. Fiori's
11 looking at, the NERP concept you can have here. You can
12 even have some sort of forestry or forest management. We
13 can even have red-cockaded woodpeckers which we have
14 onsite. Our big issue, we've got several other threatened
15 endangered species but, anyway, in that area. Then as you
16 go to this final one, and out here it's just farmland,
17 okay. We've got one little town of Jackson over here and
18 Barnwell's over here, but most of it's farmland. You can
19 have more active environmental activities happening. Even
20 public education. We have five or six thousand people
21 that come to the Site per year. That can be -- my
22 contention is, again, that it can be increased. And I
23 just mentioned basically what the environmental uses can
24 be, a lot of technology demonstration. Even associated
25 with these projects that are coming we can demonstrate

1 ways of reclaiming environmental -- or reclaiming land
2 back to "clean level". Natural resource land, but again I
3 mention these, too.
4 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I had a question about the --
5 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yeah, sure.
6 PUBLIC SPEAKER: -- the previous slide.
7 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Oh, yes.
8 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I was -- I didn't quite
9 understand what that was saying. My view of the way the
10 land is used is that the closer you get to the core
11 nuclear facilities and the nuclear materials the
12 protection increases. I've always felt that way. And
13 that arrow shows that it's just the opposite. And I would
14 be concerned if people might get the impression that --
15 PUBLIC SPEAKER: That's a good point.
16 PUBLIC SPEAKER: -- that the protection is good.
17 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Different kind of protection,
18 environmental protection, okay. The protection that
19 you're talking about is --
20 PUBLIC SPEAKER: All environmental protection.
21 PUBLIC SPEAKER: -- safety security.
22 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Okay. I see.
23 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I'm talking about multiple
24 environmental uses, but, yeah, I didn't mean to make it
25 like Wackenhut is stronger out here and not here. That's

1 our protective guard.

2 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Chris, help me get to where

3 you're trying to get to relative to these EISs.

4 PUBLIC SPEAKER: What I'm saying is that

5 Savannah River --

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I hear what you're saying

7 in terms of the program, but that's --

8 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Savannah River can take these

9 projects and it won't affect the environment, okay. As a

10 matter of fact, if you use a careful planning you can take

11 these projects, put them in the core, we've got 310 square

12 miles, put them in the core and even increase

13 environmental activities in these four or five areas.

14 Does that help?

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, the message I think

16 is --

17 PUBLIC SPEAKER: That's about -- I'm sorry, that

18 --

19 PUBLIC SPEAKER: -- is Savannah River has the

20 capacity to do those.

21 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Let's develop it.

22 PUBLIC SPEAKER: That point is great for me

23 'cause I --

24 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yeah, I'm sorry, yeah. You

25 know -- these come from the Citizen's Advisory Board,

Land-Use Technical Committee, my research and a group for Environmental Justice, the Environmental Advisory Committee which is a group of scholars that advises the Site. So what I did was I took them and thought it was smart to get it into the record at least that we're saying the boundaries should not change. That doesn't matter too much to what you-all were talking about. However, this is what I'm talking about here is that we should have -- we should keep the Site industrial. This goes back again to what Lee's question was, and this is why that we may need it for future projects. SRS is unique and we can go into that, but it -- and I don't want to get into Pantex versus SRS. But it has a lot of unique characteristics. I won't get into that. I mentioned this, I mentioned this, I mentioned that and that. So it's basically, this is the bottom line on recommendations.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I have a question on that one, too.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yes, sir.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Natural Resources Management. What are the opportunities for public involvement in the way the resources are -- the natural resources out there currently are being managed?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: You mean how do they --

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I get the impression that the

timber industry is out there well represented. What's the representation vehicle for the public right now?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: On the public, it has something to do -- Natural Resource Management means cutting trees, yes, but it also means setting up red-cockaded woodpecker colonies. We started -- when I started this particular job, four years ago we had fifty birds. Now we've got eighty-some and we want to get to 450 birds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Chris, I think the issue is I think that you do have other federal agencies like the Forest Service, the Official Lawn Service actively participating in Natural Resources Management at Savannah River.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yes. South Carolina D&R manages the hunting out there --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So you can get involved.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yeah, you can hunt. You can't fish because of possible contamination. Is that the sort of thing you mean? I mean --

PUBLIC SPEAKER: No, my question I think was slightly different. What are the -- I don't see similar discussion opportunities for those issues with the public. I know that perhaps with the Citizens Advisory Board you're saying that there is some of that, but largely it just seems that the timber industry is very well-

1 represented in terms of how that land will be used. It's
2 quite a resource.
3 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Well, there's a lot of research
4 there but if the average Joe or Jane that wants to come in
5 there, they can come in and hunt. They can -- we're
6 trying to open that up so they can come in and look at the
7 endangered species and the cultural resources and that
8 sort of thing, the archaeological resources there that are
9 -- what happened in 1950 is the Site just stopped being
10 seven communities and there are all sorts of resources
11 there and have been built -- the forrest land's been built
12 up and the cultural resources weren't destroyed. But as
13 far as public access to those avenues, we're trying to
14 increase them.
15 PUBLIC SPEAKER: What's your guess as to when
16 things may open up?
17 PUBLIC SPEAKER: I'd say in the next three to
18 five years I think they'll open up. And talking to these
19 other federal planners that's the -- those are the trends
20 to open up these sites. And, finally, federal facilities
21 but SRS -- too often we talk about these things as
22 liabilities. We call them waste sites, they're
23 contaminated and, yes, some parts of them are, but 310
24 square miles of Savannah River Site or 562 miles at
25 Hanford are not contaminated. So we should see them as

1 environmental assets, not just economic assets.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And that's all sites?

3 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Yes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, thank you, sir. I

5 appreciate that. And thanks to everybody for being

6 flexible in these abbreviated sessions but I wanted to go

7 ahead, and any other comments or questions at this point?

8 The one session I know has broken sometime ago. The other

9 one is, I think, winding down next door. You're more than

10 welcome to stay for this session. Nan, you had a couple -

11 -

12 MS. FOUNDS: I just wanted to make sure. You

13 can give us additional comments, also. There is faxes, we

14 have a fax number out there. We also have a hotline if

15 you have additional comments that you'd like to make --

16 PUBLIC SPEAKER: We can call from here, right?

17 MS. FOUNDS: -- after reading these. We also

18 have an E-mail address so if you happen be able to E-mail

19 them that way, and did I miss out on any of the --

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, we've got phones

21 that they can actually call in.

22 PUBLIC SPEAKER: You'll allow me to write you a

23 letter, won't you?

24 MS. FOUNDS: That's right. You can write --

25 well, that's okay, too.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: That's one of those options.

MS. FOUNDS: I would sincerely like to thank everybody for participating. This has been a good discussion. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I appreciate it and come back and join us again. Thanks.

DISCUSSION SUMMARIES

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

- - - - -

MR. LAWSON: Before I start and before I move merely on my way under that assumption, are there people who do have final questions or comments they would like to make so I'll know how much time to allocate to the summaries? There's one -- okay. Well, let's get into it as quickly as possible. And why don't we start with the Pantex, who was in Room A. Jim Parham.

MR. PARHAM: Thanks. Pantex Site-Wide EIS had a good turnout. And we have a lot of comment areas that people brought up during the session and we've got a list of those, but just quickly several points made. There was again concerns raised or questions about accident scenarios and the analysis. Questions on the forklift operations, as well as aircraft operations. And there Nan and Donna both heard comments about are the accident scenarios and information analyses too conservative. And that was duly noted and that will be considered and also brought out in the comment response document.

Also the issue of clarification, if the proposed action is the preferred -- preferred alternative. And there are several people who didn't -- who were not aware of that and also wanted copies of the Federal Register

1 Notice that may have indication. So that is something
2 that was very good to hear on the Pantex Site-Wide EIS.
3 Someone mentioned that the Pantex mission should
4 be moved to the Savannah River Site. I heard several
5 comments on socioeconomic issues and activities such as
6 that. A very interesting point was brought out by the
7 aging of the pits. And there were people looking, quite
8 frankly, for a better explanation of that, that by over a
9 period of time [unintelligible] deterioration levels or
10 whatever would happen. Also taking into account that
11 longevity well could be the accident analysis or scenario
12 of a possibility for a problem. I think that -- Nan, I
13 think you said that you wanted to make sure this is
14 incorporated in the comment response document.
15 Also, the Savannah River Site selection criteria
16 for pit storage. And I think that Nan had something that
17 she noted and will be addressed also as far as the
18 concerns of people about the criteria used.
19 MS. FOUNDS: Just in terms of that, several
20 people made the case for Savannah River having good land
21 use, et
22 cetera. And as is obvious in our document, we selected
23 Savannah River as one of the sites to consider and we will
24 try to, in our comment response, show those criteria and
25 how we evaluated them for Savannah River.

1 MR. PARHAM: Thanks, Nan. Some people -- I
2 wanted to make sure that you were heard on that. And also
3 environmental justice, the issue was raised that the
4 impacts were shown that neither characterized it as
5 significant or insignificant. And that's something we had
6 a good discussion on, and I think you noted that to
7 respond to.
8 So, Barry, I think that is a quick summary. So
9 if we have other things that [unintelligible].
10 MR. LAWSON: All right. Pat Wherley for Storage
11 and Disposition.
12 MS. WHERLEY: We had a very spirited discussion
13 on the various -- primarily on disposition alternatives
14 that are being considered. There are strong feelings on
15 both sides of the subject as to whether the MOX fuel and
16 reactor alternatives were a wise thing to pursue. And
17 some of the concerns that were raised and comments that
18 were made led to the amount of waste that would be
19 generated by pursuing that option versus the other
20 options. Concerns about the safety environment, but then
21 on the other hand a sense that the MOX fuel was a very
22 environmentally sound process that had been proven in
23 several places.
24 There was a strong feeling from some people that
25 the EIS should make sure it is considering, especially in

1 the cost studies, the energy value of the plutonium and
2 that resource value not be lost. On the other side we had
3 the same concern about not pursuing the reactors. There
4 was concern that if the reactor option wasn't pursued that
5 the United States might further lose its nuclear
6 competence knowledge by not exercising that knowledge.
7 I wanted to catch one other -- okay, there's
8 another part of the discussion that was raised and this
9 was because of the CANDU reactor option. Was the work --
10 the statements made earlier in the day about that option
11 possibly offering some opportunities to facilitate the
12 negotiations to joint decisions potentially being made
13 between the United States and Russia. There were several
14 comments on that. One, that DOE not preclude looking more
15 proactively and actively into using those same kinds of
16 relationships existing with domestic utilities. And
17 another side to that question was the sentiment that the
18 United States is probably going to support and some way
19 fund the development of the MOX fuel. And if they do that
20 and then the fuel goes to the Canadian reactors there
21 would be the energy value, whereas our tax dollars may be
22 paying for it. So that was an issue that was raised in
23 terms of MOX analysis as well.
24 There was some clarification provided by DOE
25 during this session on the waste generation rates that I

1 mentioned earlier and a commitment made to make sure that
2 those numbers were sorted out and clarified and pointers
3 in the comment response document on whether the numbers
4 were annual or totals and where the documents could be
5 found.
6 There was also a question on how the
7 environmental justice conclusions were stated in the
8 summary document and a request that that language be
9 clarified. It's in two separate places, I guess, and it's
10 a little bit confusing.
11 One of the overall comments that was made that
12 was -- again, although we try to integrate these meetings
13 and these documents, looking at the surplus plutonium out
14 and not the total plutonium makes it harder for people to
15 understand what the DOE is doing overall. So if we can
16 continually remind DOE that that context is helpful in
17 looking at the [unintelligible] actions.
18 There was a question on some of the health
19 effects, both in terms in putting the results in context
20 of [unintelligible] radiation and the range of values that
21 might be associated with that, as well as the 100 person-
22 rem practical that's used to characterize some of the
23 results. And here we had stated that there were people
24 looking at that.
25 There was also clarification of the comment made

1 about not storing strategic reserves and surplus pits
2 together. And DOE clarified that while they might be
3 located in the same facility they would be separate, very
4 separate. So that's -- I think that was answered.
5 And then finally, that there were a few
6 suggestions from the ones meeting in the large group this
7 afternoon -- I mean this morning that DOE considered
8 making a larger effort to reach out to the minority
9 populations around the Site on a regular basis to make
10 sure that they are informed of the actions that may affect
11 them and have a chance to participate in meetings such as
12 these.
13 Was there anything I missed from that group? We
14 had a very long useful chair session.
15 MR. LAWSON: Thanks, Pat. And finally in the
16 Stockpile Stewardship Management program there were
17 probably a dozen or a dozen and a half issues that came
18 up. Let's just hit some of those, but we have notes on
19 the details of all of them. One thing that I wanted to
20 spotlight, Bill, I don't know if you want to say anything
21 about this, the question on the high explosives and
22 whether it was a preferred or a non-preferred option. It
23 was -- I think you all realize that the intervention to
24 this in passing in this morning's session that we expect
25 high explosives -- that's one area in which DOE has not

1 been selected as a preferred option. It's not a
2 particular high cost option but yet a preferred
3 alternative that has not been chosen. And that wasn't
4 chosen between the Pantex facility and Los Alamos.
5 We talked a little bit about maintenance of the
6 labs, decisions on consolidation, and so forth. And
7 somebody noted that the focus of the Department seems to
8 be away from consolidation of facilities, at least more so
9 than was seen three or four years ago. There were
10 concerns about -- or concerns with discussion of what
11 would happen to the Oak Ridge facility since perhaps up to
12 85 percent of the existing footprint would -- might be
13 vacant or would be available for future uses.
14 Then there was the question about the -- from a
15 woman involved in substance abuse about what the radiation
16 effects on children will be in the future from the
17 Savannah River Site as well as other facilities that may
18 be DOE or non-DOE facilities in this area. And it was
19 pointed out that there was a comparison of these effects
20 between Savannah River and Los Alamos that essentially the
21 problem came up that the module effect of the DOE
22 facilities were pro-risk. And there was a statement made
23 by someone from the public that it seems as though there
24 is a tendency towards later locating these kinds of
25 facilities in low-income areas, whether they happen to be

1 in this area or in New Mexico.

2 Another gentleman made a statement that he felt

3 that the important thing was that if the intent -- I think

4 here with respect to Savannah River, that there be a

5 viable technical -- technological facility which is

6 capable of going where necessary for defense purposes, but

7 at the same time being a good stewart for the environment

8 and for environmental protection.

9 There were questions on the different schools of

10 thought were brought to bear in this study with respect to

11 the exposure, the effects of exposure and all the

12 different schools of thought considered in the EIS that is

13 put together. Is there a projection of what will be

14 considered a safe dose in the future. And the Department

15 knows that different people have different ideas about

16 that and at least in the Stockpile Stewardship Management

17 Program it was not -- the decision was not to say what

18 would be a safe dose in the future, but just say what the

19 projected dose would be in the future and leave it up to

20 other people to determine whether it's safe or not.

21 A person made the comment that there was concern

22 that the spent fuel reuse fuel for weapons as well as the

23 weapons themselves needs to be under control and that

24 there needs to be some better feeling for, at least on the

25 part of the public, that there was some control in place

1 here and that there was just not waste or weapons being
2 stored at different places.
3 Let's see. People wanted to know what the
4 process would be to make sure that the public is assured
5 that their input has an effect. And in this overall NEPA
6 process and, for instance, upon how the public had
7 influenced decisions that are made, including the prospect
8 for closing the Savannah River Site. And a person cited
9 some of the wildlife destruction that is alleged to have
10 been somehow related to the Savannah River Site.
11 A person made a comment that the ad for this
12 meeting gave the impression that the Savannah River Site
13 was preferred choice in each of the three programs. And
14 we went through a clarification of that. And then a very
15 important question was asked about how do you balance the
16 strategic considerations, I suppose that's the Defense
17 strategic considerations, against the possible effects of
18 people. And the difficulty of doing that was acknowledged
19 by the Department.
20 And then somebody else raised the question about
21 -- a question of whether there are independent parties
22 that are overseeing DOE to make sure that it's -- that
23 there's sort of a peer review there and not necessarily
24 just determined by the DOE and perhaps DOE should fund an
25 outside group to hire people to do that. That kind of

1 works in that, at least two different points of view that
2 are considered.
3 A point was also made that the preferred
4 options, even though they are identified as preferred, are
5 not necessarily the ones that will be decided upon by the
6 Secretary. So that if people have comments one way or
7 another it's still relevant to make comments on that,
8 because even if something's preferred it does not
9 necessarily mean it will be chosen.
10 And those were the major points. If you'd like
11 to clarify or enhance, it's fine.
12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I wasn't in the group, but I
13 had a question as to your squares.
14 SPEAKER: Yes.
15 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Sometimes they're filled in and
16 sometimes they're not. What does that mean?
17 SPEAKER: Oh, that was just notes to me on the
18 ones that I thought that I wanted to make sure I covered.
19 I covered a few more here than I did just the ones that
20 was solid.
21 PUBLIC CITIZEN: They're not anymore less
22 important?
23 SPEAKER: No. No, in fact the notetakers and
24 the court reporters have all those as well. I was just
25 trying to cut down on the things that were really

1 highlights. I was hoping to make it three or four, but I
2 couldn't have done that. Any other comments regarding
3 that? You're very observant, by the way. Now, I know
4 there's at least one comment to be made.
5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Basically this is a very brief
6 comment. We are from Savannah, Georgia, representing the
7 concerns of our citizens. There are two things that we
8 want to bring to the attention. And we've already
9 mentioned one, and that is there really needs to be beyond
10 an outreach effort to minority communities to bring them
11 into this process that is leaning toward decisions that
12 they will have to live with for some time to come.
13 Outreach in the forms of radio announcements, TV
14 advertisements, brochures and the like are not enough
15 because they're simply announcements. And then you in
16 your busy schedule as an African American working and
17 trying to be an active part of your community trying to
18 make decisions, can you take the time off to come to this
19 meeting that starts at eight o'clock in the morning.
20 Other reasons why we do not have more people with us that
21 should have been here this morning is because we could not
22 get them professional leave to attend this meeting. If
23 they were going to take a day off of their jobs, they
24 would have been penalized not only monetarily, but they
25 were going to be written up by their supervisor because it

1 was deemed that this was not an important part of life,
2 nor was it related to any part of their jobs.
3 So it is incumbent upon the Department of Energy
4 at the Savannah River Site to try to think through ways of
5 going beyond the cursory outreach at this, to bring
6 particularly downstream communities and rural communities
7 into the roundtable discussions that are going on in the
8 name of public involvement. Beyond just talking to them
9 there also has to be a strategic effort that is launched
10 that will begin to train these communities in the
11 information, because it's not enough for us to come to the
12 table and politely nod. We want to be able to contribute
13 substantively. In order to do that we have got to build a
14 base of understanding amongst not only the "minority
15 populations" which I hope they'll move from using that
16 term to perhaps people of color or effected communities
17 because it's not only affecting African-American
18 communities, it's also affecting low-income communities.
19 We also want to see the analysis take into
20 consideration the exposure of low-income or affected
21 communities to not only what the operations are at the
22 Savannah River, but those industrial entities that's also
23 exposing those communities to chemical hazards. To be
24 able to assess if there is a result or an impact from
25 those combined exposure to exposed to what's going on from

1 SRS, exposed from what's going on at Piedmont or
2 [unintelligible] because that's very important to us.
3 We do not want to come to another meeting where
4 there isn't a substantial representation if it's held in
5 North Augusta or Augusta without the black community being
6 here because we feel that you cannot continue to make
7 these decisions without our input and still live up to the
8 requirements of NEPA. And in addition to that, we have
9 read the NEPA regulation and our understanding is that it
10 calls for the involvement of local elected officials,
11 which is a component to us that's very important, and we
12 have not been able to somehow register that with the
13 Georgia side. I don't know about the South Carolina side.
14 And we feel that it's very important. So to the extent
15 that DOE and SRS can begin to filter this information to
16 our city councils and our county commissioners and
17 encourage them to be involved, it will be very helpful to
18 us, because there seems to be a disjuncture between the
19 citizens of Georgia and the government that's running
20 Georgia and its relationship to DOE because the Site does
21 not sit in Georgia, it's in South Carolina. But there are
22 two things that are a consideration for us; it's, one,
23 that the waterways from Savannah River Site end up in
24 Georgia, and the other one is that so much of our work
25 population works at the plant and they have to come home

1 to the families, and so there is that intimate
2 relationship there. So we hope that these things will be
3 noted in the comments.
4 And finally, it is almost a disservice to us who
5 are just regular people to ask us to wade through 1875
6 pages of the Disposition and Storage EIS and then 1465
7 pages of the Stewardship Stockpile and then 1233 pages of
8 the Pantex. That is just horrendous because you must take
9 into consideration that in a lot of these communities the
10 reading level is at third grade standard. And so if we
11 have to go through all of this, it's really cumbersome,
12 let alone just outright difficult. And so we've got to
13 find ways to get this information into the heads of
14 laypeople where they can understand it, interpret it and
15 translate it, and then be ready to give an intelligent
16 response as well as to raise the kinds of questions that
17 will help us to understand the whole picture, because
18 right now we're neutral people. We're not pro this or
19 anti that. We know that we're pro help and we know that
20 people must have jobs, but we don't want the two just
21 oppose against each other. And then we want the facts not
22 only from DOE but reputable, independent scientists that
23 we can trust and rely on as well.
24 **MR. LAWSON:** Thank you very much. We appreciate
25 that. Is there anyone else that has a comment that

1 anybody can make or questions to ask? Any DOE people have
2 anything that you'd like to add? Okay, this person over
3 here.
4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: My name is Arthur Smith and I'm
5 from Augusta. I live in this area and I'm also from the
6 impacted area called Hyde Park. But I also have been
7 working hand in hand with Dr. McLane and the organization
8 Citizens for Environmental Justice. And I just wanted to
9 put another pin in that point about people coming out and
10 start inputting at these meetings, because it's important
11 to us, too. And there's got to be another way to get word
12 out to them because like Dr. McLane was saying, we feel
13 with our heart but we've got to live with the situation
14 once it's here. But we all need to be at the table
15 together, you know. We don't want the situation to be
16 where it was when Savannah River Site was built. We
17 understand the urgency then to make the nuclear bomb and
18 now we have to deal with what we have here.
19 I just want to say that we are interested, but
20 like Dr. McLanie said, a lot of my friends wouldn't come
21 because of the work situation. More will be here at six
22 o'clock. But you need to get another word put out to let
23 them know there's other people, because we are people, all
24 of us, and we want input from people with color. Thank
25 you.

1 **SPEAKER:** Thank you. Anyone else? There's a
2 comment up here.
3 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** I don't know how many SRS
4 employees are here, whether it's DOE, Westinghouse or some
5 of the other contractors and subcontractors. But as I
6 said earlier, I took my day off to come here as a private
7 citizen and speak. And I happen to be living in Georgia.
8 I agree with Mildred where she says that let's concern
9 ourselves with Georgia. Thirty/forty percent of the
10 people that work at SRS are Georgia citizens. But there's
11 another unrepresented group here as well and I think
12 that's employees that work at Savannah River Site. And,
13 for instance, we were told -- you said you found out a
14 week ago. There were --
15 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Well, not quite --
16 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** There were ads in the paper.
17 We got an E-mail yesterday that said if you'd like to come
18 to this, come at six o'clock or come on your own time.
19 And I think over the last 45/50 years the employees, and a
20 lot of them are retired in this audience as well, have put
21 out an awful lot of work and sweat and blood and it would
22 be good if we, since we're being all-inclusive here, to
23 maybe bring them in. Have DOE find some ways to bring in
24 their own employees and contractor employees and say,
25 look, this affects you, I know you've got bowling and I

1 know you've got your jobs and I know that you've got
2 church work and that sort of thing, but this really does
3 affect you. And maybe even to the point of having
4 meetings on the Site like when Secretary O'Leary came when
5 they had selective people talk with her. This affects
6 them more than Secretary O'Leary coming to the Site.
7 There's future uses and future missions and environmental
8 problems and health problems. And I think it would be a
9 disservice not to include all the employees, because the
10 outside world sees SRS employees as SRS people. They
11 don't know whether you're DOE. They don't know whether
12 you work for Brown & Root or Westinghouse or whatever. So
13 I think while they're including everybody here, let's
14 think of the employees as well.
15 MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Any other
16 comments? Well, let me just add a few things in closing.
17 First of all, from my own perspective and certainly from
18 the Department, we all appreciate your taking the time off
19 you did today to come and making your comments and giving
20 the input that you have. I think we can safely say that
21 with all notetakers and court reporters it has been duly
22 noted. As I indicated before, all these comments become
23 the basis for a public response document which will
24 respond to all the comments that have been made and all
25 the meetings that have been held. Second, I would like to

1 remind you that there is a meeting as you -- nice
2 transition -- there is a meeting this evening between 6:00
3 and 10:00 or 11:00 in which you're invited to come back.
4 The program will be basically the same. Whether we break
5 into small groups or large groups will all be determined
6 by the amount and the size of the people -- the group of
7 people, not the size of the people, the number of people
8 who are here.
9 And I also just want to remind you again that
10 the comment period is coming to a close on Material
11 Disposition and Stockpile Stewardship. Those comments
12 should be in by the 7th. The other, Pantex, goes until
13 July 12th. And there are other ways, there's the phone,
14 fax, electronically mailed. You can write them down and
15 send them by mail or phone or whatever you want to do,
16 whatever is most convenient to you. And I hope that you
17 take advantage of that.
18 By the way, is there anything else -- there are
19 feedback forms that if you haven't filled out, if you
20 would fill those out before you leave that would be good.
21 And those written comment forms are also there in case you
22 have some written comments you want to send in after this
23 meeting. Yes, sir.
24 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Based on the amount of comments
25 coming from a particular area, let's say for instance from

1 Savannah --

2 MR. LAWSON: Yes.

3 PUBLIC CITIZEN: -- if we were to rally up a

4 100,000 votes -- I mean a hundred thousand people to

5 actually call in and write that we are in -- that we

6 oppose any type of new facility being constructed on the

7 Savannah River Site or anything -- as a matter of fact,

8 I'm in favor of opposing the whole site and I believe

9 consolidate it at another site.

10 MR. LAWSON: Right.

11 PUBLIC CITIZEN: But if there was, say for

12 instance, a 100,000 people from Savannah called in at the

13 DOE Department or faxed the information in, how effective

14 is that going to be for ROD or the Record of Decision?

15 SPEAKER: Well, I can't answer that. I'd say

16 that somebody -- you'd get somebody's attention if you had

17 100,000 of them --

18 [Several participants speak at one time.]

19 MR. RUDY: No, I think if you could get that

20 many the phone lines would be certainly busy. But the

21 Secretary would understand as the ultimate decision maker,

22 she'll understand not only the comments from this session

23 but from all the other sites that we have. In fact,

24 that's a part of her decision process, to get briefed from

25 us on what we hear, what we learn, what the extent of

1 these comments are and what the people feel. So the
2 Secretary would be exposed and have an appreciation of
3 that. So if there were lots of calls and lots of letters
4 and lots of faxes, she would see that.
5 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, I hope they ain't quoting
6 it like that paper that -- I don't see it. There was a --
7 what was that paper she had where --
8 MR. LAWSON: Oh, the advertisement for this one?
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, all the arrows pointing
10 from the one for the public should be straight down to the
11 bottom and everything for the Record of Decision is coming
12 from DOE. You know what I'm saying? So I mean that's the
13 reason why I made that -- I asked the question that I
14 asked.
15 MR. LAWSON: Very good point. And another
16 question or comment?
17 PUBLIC CITIZEN: The gentleman that just spoke,
18 I resent his statement about transferring everything to
19 some other area. I would like you to briefly state what
20 his position on it.
21 MR. LAWSON: Well, that's up to him. If he'd
22 like to, that's fine.
23 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Okay, that's all right. That's
24 all right.
25 MR. LAWSON: The gentleman was asking you if you

1 have a preferred site that you would like to see stuff go
2 to. It's up to you to answer if you'd like; if you don't
3 want, that's fine.
4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Well, according to the Summary,
5 I would think that Oak Ridge would be one of the preferred
6 spots. I mean if the decision was being made -- was made
7 by [unintelligible] Pantex, but not here at Savannah
8 River Site. Maybe because low income people or people of
9 color are definitely at risk and that is one of the main
10 reasons why I'm here. Now, if there was any other
11 community like such as native Americans, then this
12 audience would be full of native Americans, okay. So
13 because they are not at risk at this particular point in
14 time, then I'm here because I have a daughter and I have a
15 family. And you-all stated in here that people from low
16 income are definitely at risk. It's nothing that we said.
17 This is what you-all said. So that's the reason why I
18 said let's move Savannah River Site to Pantex or Oak Ridge
19 or the West or anyplace else besides here.
20 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Let me just put a little tidbit
21 on that and that is that we do not want to fall into the
22 syndrome of not in my backyard but in yours. So what
23 we've got to consider is what is going to be the impact if
24 it's in anybody's backyard and how do we make it in such a
25 way that we minimize the risk to the workers, their

1 families and the communities because I know if I call up
2 Juan Montez [phonetically spelled] out at Los Alamos and
3 tell him that we in Savannah are going to send it over
4 there, I know the people who run the [unintelligible]
5 festival and who live near Oak Ridge, and we're talking
6 about [unintelligible] they're going to say, well, how did
7 you do that.
8 So I understand the point because we're looking
9 at how it's written up in the summary documents and how
10 you've analyzed the impact when you say, okay, there will
11 be an adverse effect -- a disproportionate impact on low
12 income and minority populations. But the humanitarian
13 that I am, if it's going to kill rich, white folks, I'm
14 opposed to that, too. So we've got to figure out how do
15 we deal with this in such a way that we minimize the risk
16 to human beings and our health and environment.
17 MR. LAWSON: Okay. Thank you very much for that
18 comment, and thank you all. And I appreciate it very
19 much. We will reconvene another session at six o'clock.
20 Thank you again for coming.
21
22
23
24
25

EVENING SESSION

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

- - - - -

MR. LAWSON: Right now the floor is open for any comments or questions that you have about the Stockpile Stewardship Program, either the overall program or it's relationship to the Savannah River Site. Any questions or comments? Yes, we have one back over in this corner here.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: I would like to know can we go to the Reading Room in Aiken to get the full -- you know, the complete impact statements? I think I've received some or a phone number we called to get a list of -- you know, I know a lot of the environmental impact statements come out from time to time and I want to get the full range. Is there a number, a 1-800 or -- where would I find those located? Or a name?

MR. WHITEMAN: Maybe someone at the desk out here can help you. We have copies of the -- I'm sure we've got copies of the PEIS here at the meeting that you can get a copy, if we still have some.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Anyone else have a question on the Stockpile Stewardship? Okay. And this doesn't mean if you get a question later you can't ask it.

At this point now I would like to call on Nannette Founds who will give some background on the environmental work that was done on the Pantex, and we'll do the same for the other program.

PANTEX SITE-WIDE EIS

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

- - - - -

MR. LAWSON: Okay. That was a quick analysis. Is there -- are there any questions or comments that folks would like to make? Back on the left-hand side.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: A quick question. I just want to make sure that I'm clear and everybody else is clear. The pits that are discussed in this EIS, are those strategic reserve or is there a mix between strategic reserve and surplus or what?

MS. FOUNDS: Right at the moment these are the ones that are coming from the dismantlement operations and they're not divided into strategic reserves or surplus. Right at the moment we're considering that all the same material.

MR. LAWSON: Anyone else? Yes, right over here.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: Could you explain again the basis for the current limitation of the 8,000, I gather it was, pits that you're allowed to store? Is that a state limitation or DOE imposed or?

MS. FOUNDS: That was DOE imposed. We had done an environmental assessment for the storage at the Pantex Site through citizen participation. They wanted us to look at that in greater detail in terms of -- you know,

they wanted us to look at effects on the aquifers out there, et cetera. So it was a negotiated position. And we have about 6,000 in storage at the time. There were about -- at a rate of 2,000 dismantlements a year nominally, and it would take us about three years to do an EIS. So that was how the 12,000 was arrived at. It wasn't because there was, you know, a jump or anything else in terms of accidental risks.

MR. LAWSON: Any questions or comments? Anything further? Okay. Let's now move on to Storage and Disposition.

STORAGE AND DISPOSITION OF

WEAPONS-USABLE FISSILE MATERIALS PEIS

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

- - - - -

MR. LAWSON: Again, I'll open it up for any questions or comments regarding Storage and Disposition. I have two up here. Let's take this gentleman in the front first, please.

PUBLIC CITIZEN: After going through the experience with the Department and suffering with the Department for the last couple of years in their attempts to get foreign research for reactor fuel [unintelligible], it seems like this program in particular would be benefited by accelerating the selection of the site for the disposition activity up to the same time frame as the storage decision is. What's going to be -- otherwise you're going to be in the same situation as FRR. You're going to say, okay, I'm going to bring it to this site but I'm not deciding what or when or how or where to do with it after that. I think you could be better served by saying, well, it's important to the site and I'm going to bring it in here and I'm going to do the disposition activity here, not what technology I'm going to use for the disposition.

MR. CYGELMAN: We accept the comment.

1 **MR. LAWSON:** Thank you. The gentleman right
2 behind you.
3 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** My question might be a little
4 bit related, and that is perhaps from a longer-term
5 perspective. And as we all know, plutonium is going to be
6 around for millions of years. And disposition in some of
7 these alternatives appear to simply transform the
8 component from an as is configuration to some other
9 configuration like a spent fuel. There's no discussion or
10 consideration of the full life cycle costs of taking the
11 plutonium from the as is configuration into a form
12 suitable for, say, geological repository where it can live
13 out it's remaining --
14 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** A million years.
15 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** -- millions, like 250 thousand
16 plus -- plus years. Some of these alternatives appear to
17 have built into it some future mortgage. And from the
18 analysis that has been discussed I don't know how that
19 future mortgage of creating a lot of, say, contaminated
20 MOX fuel rods that will then sit for disposition somewhere
21 is entering into your decision making and the equation.
22 Shouldn't all the analysis be to some terminal
23 end state where you can take a look at the true long-term
24 implications of plutonium disposition as opposed to some
25 short sighted case in one, and when some of the options

1 appear to offer you a perfectly acceptable long-term
2 geological repository?
3 MR. CYGELMAN: The answer to your question is,
4 yes, we do plan to look at the mortgage. And that will
5 appear, as Greg Rudy mentioned, in our costs scheduling
6 reports that are due out sometime in June/July time frame.
7 In that particular report we will be analyzing for each of
8 the alternatives the costs of actually implementing that
9 alternative and it would include the mortgage cost that
10 you brought up. But it is not part of the environmental
11 analysis. It is part of the Record of Decision.
12 As you remember, Greg Rudy put up a chart that
13 showed at one area that you have the environmental
14 analysis and in another area your cost schedule policy
15 consideration. They both merge or contribute to what the
16 Record of Decision is going to be.
17 MR. LAWSON: You would like to follow up?
18 PUBLIC CITIZEN: If I could.
19 MR. LAWSON: Please.
20 PUBLIC CITIZEN: Again, the end state of the
21 material from the stabilization appears to have some
22 significant potential relative even to the environmental
23 impact. Plutonium placed in a [unintelligible] glass
24 canister that's in interim storage at Savannah River has
25 one mortgage to meet compared with a -- you know, a MOX

1 fuel element that is sitting in a wet basin or in dry
2 storage pending some longer-term disposition. There's an
3 environmental mortgage associated with the material as
4 well. How are you calculating that environmental
5 mortgage?
6 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Okay. We'll be looking into more
7 environmental mortgage with the [unintelligible] -- what
8 we're trying to do is with regard to the MOX or with
9 regard to the immobilization one is to put it in a form
10 that is as close as possible to the form that's being
11 analyzed for the long-term repository. And with that in
12 mind, we believe that when that environmental impact of
13 long-term repository is in fact completed, that would be
14 included in that. We are contributing a relatively small
15 quantity relative to the other quantities.
16 **MR. LAWSON:** Your face tells me that you're not
17 quite sure that he answered the question that you were
18 asking.
19 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** I'm not quite sure he's
20 reaching an equivalent end state.
21 **MR. CYGELMAN:** An equivalent what?
22 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Equivalent end state.
23 **MR. RUDY:** May I give it a shot?
24 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Sure.
25 **MR. RUDY:** I don't know if I can help in that

1 one, but whether it would be mixed oxide fuel or vitrified
2 waste or both, the concept would be the bottles. For
3 example, at DWPF, they would have an ultimate end state
4 which is presently planned under the National Waste Policy
5 Act to be placed in a geological repository. So we, in
6 one instance, have a plan to close the circle on the
7 glass-based canisters. If can in can was such a concept
8 utilized it would submit -- go along with those canisters.
9 Right now there is, I believe, approximately 6,000 bottles
10 planned in that canister. This can in can, the volume you
11 would displace would be approximately 150 to 200 or two
12 and a quarter additional bottles which would be procured.
13 So it would be a relatively small additional number of
14 bottles, again, with an end state contemplated.
15 Under the MOX option it would displace light
16 water reactor fuel. Light water reactors, for example, in
17 this country, if that was the option chosen for MOX, would
18 typically plan to run anyway and produce spent fuel, low
19 enriched uranium spent fuel. The concept here would be to
20 not utilize low enriched uranium fuel, rather utilize MOX
21 fuel. You would not extend the life of that reactor and
22 therefore it's waste production. You would simply thereby
23 extend its life. Some of this waste would be mixed oxide
24 fuel and some low enriched uranium. Again, both of those
25 spent fuel blocks have an ultimate path forward planned

1 for a geological repository.

2 Now, certainly we as a nation are still working

3 on and trying to get resolution of the ultimate geologic

4 location site. But there is a National Risk Policy Act.

5 There is a process established to get on with that job.

6 And while we're looking at that and observing it we have

7 the job to get on with of reducing this nuclear danger.

8 And again, these technologies can [unintelligible] with

9 that process. So does that help a little bit?

10 PUBLIC CITIZEN: If you believe you have the

11 ability -- if you believe that you have a certifiable

12 waste core for MOX fuel and you believe that used or spent

13 MOX fuel can be placed in the geological repository, do

14 you have that waste form certified?

15 MR. RUDY: We literally don't have it certified

16 at this point. But from a programmatic prospective we

17 think that there's enough work that we have done within

18 the Department of Energy waste program with the initial

19 conversations and discussions with the Nuclear Regulatory

20 Commission, that we feel that this is a viable and likely

21 path. So we have not confirmed that, it's not licensed,

22 but all indications would be to us that it may very well

23 be. Otherwise, of course, you would not proceed with

24 that. So we need to cover that and close that question,

25 but we know that that's an open question.

1 MR. CYGELMAN: I think I -- I hope it was this
2 session. I thought I indicated we have two -- two major
3 considerations. One is the nonproliferation, which is we
4 want to put the material in a form that's less weapons-
5 useable. At the other end I thought I communicated that
6 we have a concern with regard to introducing plutonium
7 into a repository. At the present it doesn't have much
8 plutonium. It has some trace.
9 So what we've been doing -- and that's what I
10 mentioned a little bit earlier. We've been working with
11 the RW Program in DOE. And as we in fact develop -- have
12 developed this initial technology, we have been
13 interfacing with them and saying, okay, this is what the
14 package looks like. Is it close enough to what you have
15 been looking at either from a defense high level waste
16 which is a glass, DWPF type glass, or with regard to
17 commercial spent fuel. Is the product that we are
18 planning to deliver at the end of our implementation
19 either similar enough or -- and where it's different is it
20 still acceptable with regard to what you think is going to
21 be acceptable in the repository. And so far we've been
22 working such that the product immobilization or spent fuel
23 is -- in fact, we're getting some indication that it would
24 be acceptable.
25 I'm not quite sure if I still have answered your

1 question, but we have been looking at what do you do with
2 it after you have your product. And as I've indicated
3 earlier, one of the things we have structured this program
4 is to make things look as much like other things that the
5 Department has been working on so we're not plowing new
6 ground, so to speak.
7 MR. LAWSON: And given those responses do you
8 want to make a comment or --
9 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I would just say, you know,
10 from my perspective I accept it as an open issue that will
11 be dealt with in the programmatic EIS and the analysis by
12 the addition of funding or allowances for something to
13 derive some equivalency into the life cycle costs. There
14 are unknowns here. The unknowns need to translate into
15 economic and/or environmental impacts that get added to
16 the analysis when compared with other alternatives that,
17 perhaps, might not have the same degree of unknowns.
18 MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. I appreciate
19 it. Comment over here, Pat.
20 PUBLIC CITIZEN: In the decision-making process
21 what is the weighting that will be given to realizing a
22 economic benefit through energy production of the
23 investment by the taxpayer in this material versus
24 treating it as a liability for disposal?
25 MR. CYGELMAN: We haven't attached any

1 weighting. The weighting will be decided by the decision-
2 maker, and right now I don't know how she'll weigh, or
3 whoever makes the decision, will weigh that.
4 PUBLIC CITIZEN: But the energy value is --
5 MR. CYGELMAN: Is being considered, yes. But --
6 PUBLIC CITIZEN: It's an offset of the cost --
7 MR. CYGELMAN: Yeah, it's an offset of the cost.
8 But when we do the economic analysis and it will be
9 published in June or July, with regard to what is the
10 energy content, it will be taken into consideration. You
11 will see how we -- how we attach the cost value to it.
12 And you'll see with both what the initial investment is,
13 and we'll be addressing the life cycle costs of each
14 alternative. The sale of electricity or the sale of the
15 energy content associated with plutonium will enter in the
16 analysis where it is appropriate.
17 MR. LAWSON: Would you like to follow up or --
18 MR. CYGELMAN: Excuse me a minute.
19 [Mr. Andre confers with audience member.]
20 MR. CYGELMAN: Thank you.
21 MR. LAWSON: Right here, sir.
22 PUBLIC CITIZEN: My name is John Dewes and I'm
23 Vice Chairman of the Savannah River Section of the
24 American Nuclear Society. Our local section consists of
25 some 800 scientists and engineers in the Central Savannah

1 River Area. On behalf of the Section, I would like to
2 make a statement concerning the PEIS.
3 We believe that all of the long-term storage
4 options are acceptable from the standpoint of
5 environmental, safety and health. We also believe that
6 any of the long-term storage sites proposed have
7 sufficient infrastructure to handle the engineering and
8 design of such a facility.
9 We strongly support the recommendations
10 contained in the American Nuclear Society Special Panel
11 Report on the protection and management of plutonium.
12 This panel was chaired by Glen T. Seaborg, who discovered
13 plutonium almost 60 years ago. This report recommended
14 implementation of the reactor irradiation option for
15 disposal of surplus weapons-useable plutonium.
16 The stated goal of the PEIS is to make surplus
17 plutonium inaccessible and unattractive for use as nuclear
18 weapons. We believe that the reactor irradiation option
19 has several advantages over the other options in meeting
20 this goal. It is the only option that converts weapons-
21 grade plutonium to reactor-grade plutonium. This is a
22 crucial point, because our weapons testing history
23 indicates that, although possible, it is extremely
24 difficult to build a successful nuclear weapon from
25 reactor-grade plutonium, and that the infrastructure

1 required to either build a successful weapon or to purify
2 the plutonium to weapons-grade represents a tremendous
3 barrier to diversion. The reactor irradiation option is
4 also the quickest way to reach the goal of the spent fuel
5 standard for protection from misuse.
6 Jill Lytle, Deputy Assistant Secretary, in her
7 prepared comments for the Citizens Advisory Board
8 Plutonium Forum, indicated that she wanted a sustainable
9 decision, one in which -- one which considers the issue in
10 light of other decisions under review and one that garners
11 long-term public support. The decision should therefore
12 reflect the long-term need to protect the public from
13 diversion of the materials in question. The French have
14 recognized this issue, and are currently taking advantage
15 of the long-term protection associated with the use of
16 mixed oxide fuel for their civilian stockpiles of
17 plutonium.
18 We believe that if the mission of DOE is to
19 ensure a stable energy supply for our country's needs,
20 then the energy value of the plutonium, estimated at 32
21 billion dollars, should be considered when selecting the
22 preferred alternative. And I believe you indicated that
23 it would be. Plutonium is not a waste. It is the closest
24 thing to a peace dividend our country will ever see. We
25 also believe that the DOE needs to pay attention to

1 scientific facts related to plutonium rather than
2 irresponsible and irrational statements made concerning
3 its toxicity and potential impact on the population.
4 We strongly urge you to select the reactor
5 irradiation option as the most beneficial and effective
6 method for dispositioning of weapons-useable fissile
7 material. Thank you.
8 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Any other comments or
9 questions? Any other comments or questions about the
10 other programs or any relationship between or among the
11 programs? Yes, sir. Right up here, please.
12 PUBLIC CITIZEN: I know that you had spoke
13 previously about DOD meeting goals as weapons. And having
14 been on both sides of the fence I know that DOD is very
15 slow to change mission statements and responsibilities.
16 How have you integrated what you're suggesting doing with
17 DOD mission and responsibilities and their obligations?
18 MR. CYGELMAN: I think, Earl, you're better to
19 answer that question.
20 MR. WHITEMAN: There have been -- well, first of
21 all let me say the Department of Defense in its command
22 structure has realigned itself with the end of the Cold
23 War. When the Cold War ended the -- all three services
24 including the Army had nuclear weapon access and
25 stockpiles that figured into their planning. The Army no

1 longer has nuclear weapons, and the Navy and Air Force
2 have combined commands so that there is now a strategic
3 command that -- in Omaha that, in fact, until recently was
4 headed by an admiral, strangely enough, in Omaha. So I
5 think that the joint forces on the DOD side, first from an
6 organizational standpoint, is starting to deal with the
7 end of the Cold War.
8 From a program planning standpoint I think
9 there's two major activities that have occurred. First of
10 all, the joint chiefs of staff did an extensive analysis
11 in the nuclear posture review that was published about 18
12 months ago and endorsed by the President on what would be
13 the role of nuclear weapons and the Department of Defense
14 policy in a post Cold War environment. Now, that has
15 served as a basic policy guidance for us at DOE.
16 We've also, beginning about a year ago, began an
17 extensive set of programmatic discussions and meetings
18 with the strategic command people in Omaha, including
19 Admiral Childs who at the time was the -- who was the head
20 or the commander or STRAT COM. We met with him at least
21 monthly for the last year in terms of making sure that the
22 Department of Energy plans relative to support of future
23 stockpile are consistent with the Department of Defense
24 strategic command plans for their forestructure. So I
25 think we went probably too long, three or four years after

1 the end of the Cold War, without a good planning base for
2 a nuclear weapons program between the two departments.
3 I think over the last year that's come together
4 pretty well. And it's continuing -- there's still some
5 loose ends, but it's continuing to work. And I feel
6 pretty good about that.
7 MR. LAWSON: Follow up?
8 PUBLIC CITIZEN: You took it to one point and I
9 want to go on a little further, and that is, they have
10 skills which includes assembly and disassembly. They have
11 skills in terms of compliance, treaty, test entry
12 monitoring, et cetera. And then we have our stockpiles
13 pretty much assessed. And we keep thinking, or at least I
14 keep hearing from the politicians that we're going to
15 absorb some of the other people's nuclear weapons
16 material. And that worries me when they say, how do they
17 break that in, how do we integrate that into what we do in
18 terms of our own compliance and what we're capable of
19 reprocessing or capsulating and storing.
20 MR. WHITEMAN: I'll defer to Andre regarding the
21 disposition of that material. But we have been able to
22 work the -- there was some material -- let's see, that was
23 from Kazackastan, I believe, it was sapphire material that
24 did come in. We were able to work that. And we sent
25 teams over there to package the material, flew it into the

1 country, we met it with our own transportation system to
2 take it safely and securely to Oak Ridge. It's now going
3 to a commercial processing facility to be handled.
4 I think -- if that is an example, I think that
5 we've demonstrated the ability to deal with those things
6 which are both very sensitive government to government,
7 but also very sensitive from a technology standpoint.
8 I would defer to Andre as far as any other plans
9 that might be going on. I would suspect though that any
10 such activity would probably be kept as close hold as that
11 one was until after it had been successful.
12 MR. CYGELMAN: Well, in order to answer your
13 question I think we need to separate the two. One is
14 highly-enriched uranium and plutonium. As you probably
15 know, we have been able to negotiate the sale of highly-
16 enriched uranium with the Russians. Plutonium is another
17 matter. There's another sensitivity associated with
18 plutonium vis a vis highly-enriched uranium. In the area
19 or plutonium we have ongoing a joint U.S.-Russian study.
20 Under that study we're looking at a number of alternatives
21 that both the United States and Russia could implement or
22 Russia could implement and we could implement different
23 alternatives. But the idea is to move forward with
24 converting weapons-usable material into a form that's less
25 weapons-usable.

1 With regards to the working groups that have
2 been established, another joint study we have -- in fact,
3 a reactor alternative, we have immobilization, we have the
4 borehole. We also have sharing the way to do economics,
5 which is important, and safeguard and security and
6 stabilization. So we are looking at working together in
7 terms of disposing this material.
8 Your question is have we done anything with
9 regard to bringing Russian plutonium into this country to
10 dispose of it in this country? And currently there are no
11 plans to do that, okay. What Greg Rudy mentioned is an
12 offer where a neutral country, a nonweapons country,
13 Canada, has offered to use their reactors to not only
14 dispose of Russian but also U.S. But again, the Canadian
15 government hasn't really agreed to it. It's just an
16 alternative to evaluate.
17 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** In the introduction of the
18 meeting tonight you said one of the reasons for bringing
19 these three EISs into one meeting was to show the
20 interrelationships and commonality. But I have to say
21 after being here tonight I see that it's Savannah River
22 and only Savannah River. But the Department's track
23 record of planning and -- integrated planning across the
24 program offices has not been good. Is there any plan to
25 formally try and roll up these three programs and look for

1 the combined and most effective integrated program in
2 terms of costs, environmental impacts and all this? If
3 there's not a formal plan to do that my comment is there
4 probably should be.
5 **MR. CYGELMAN:** Greg? The man closest to the
6 secretary.
7 **MR. RUDY:** My office is moving shortly, though.
8 I'm on the seventh floor, but we're relocating in about
9 two weeks, so. But the good news is we'll all be together
10 finally in the building in one area. There is a very real
11 appreciation on the part I know of the secretary and of
12 the under secretary and the deputy, Tom Breamling and
13 Charlie Curtis understand -- in fact, that's why you see
14 these three meetings here together. They understand the
15 tritium decision, the site wide, the storage and the
16 disposition. They see how those things are coming to
17 closure now at the end of the Cold War. As Earl
18 mentioned, it took about three years to shake out the
19 cobwebs and begin to chart a course on this. And this is
20 known among all parties, to see how these pieces can fit
21 together in a most operable manner.
22 **PUBLIC CITIZEN:** Would you like us to give you a
23 chart that shows how that can all [unintelligible] --
24 **MR. RUDY:** If you want to submit it for the
25 record that would be just fine.

1 **MR. LAWSON:** Okay. Excellent comments and
2 questions. Any others that you would like to make?
3 Okay. We thank you very much. And I thank you
4 all. Before you leave let me just make a couple of
5 comments. One is to remind you that the comment period
6 for both Material Disposition and Stockpile Stewardship
7 ends on May 7th, which is next week. The comment period
8 for Pantex extends until July 12. I think you will find
9 materials in your package which will give you a form in
10 which to submit written comments. Should you chose to do
11 so before the close of the respective dates, we encourage
12 you to do that.
13 Also as I mentioned earlier, there are 800
14 numbers, there are fax numbers, electronic bulletin board,
15 there's all kinds of ways. You can use the method that is
16 the most convenient, easiest for you to use. Also there
17 is a feedback form that I would encourage you to fill out
18 for the Department before you leave.
19 Now, according to my watch it's a little after
20 8:30. I believe that there will be a core group of people
21 on the staff who will be staying in case there are some
22 folks who come a little later who would like to speak.
23 All of you are invited to stay in informal discussion and
24 stick around in case there are other people would like to
25 come in and ask questions or make comments. If you chose

1 to do so I will announce if somebody comes to me and says
2 they would like to have something formally introduced into
3 the record.
4 If you chose not to stay, we appreciate your
5 taking the time this evening, and some of you, I know,
6 were here this morning. We very much appreciate the time
7 that you've taken to learn more about the programs and to
8 contribute to the comments for the various EISs.
9 Again, I can't formally adjourn at this point
10 but I certainly can recess and I will do so. And I thank
11 you very much and have a pleasant evening. Thank you.
12 [Off the record momentarily]
13 **MR. LAWSON:** Excuse me just a second. It is now
14 nearly nine o'clock. I have not had anyone else who has
15 approached about making a comment or question. Let me
16 just make one last survey. Is there anybody in the room
17 here who would like to make a comment before I adjourn the
18 meeting?
19 Not seeing any, then, I once again thank
20 everybody for participating, the DOE folks for being as
21 cooperative and accurate in their presentations. And I
22 also want to thank the notetakers and the court reporters
23 for a fine job today. This meeting is now adjourned.
24
25