

Page 182

1 Cogema, Stone and Webster. So the real intent,
2 as far as the employment levels, we're looking
3 at the longterm employment levels for the more
4 permanent employment at the Savannah River
5 Site.
6 In fact, there was -- on a routine
7 basis, we do demonstrate and show people, you
8 know, where we're doing environmental cleanup.
9 We are making quite a bit of progress in
10 cleaning up the sites and cleaning up waste and
11 taking waste that was in forms and placed into
12 the areas which were thought to be well planned
13 years ago. We're pulling some of those back,
14 vending drums, repackaging, checking. There's
15 cleanup of groundwater systems that's occurring
16 of plumes. There's closure of disposal sites
17 that are occurring. The defense waste
18 processing facility is operating and disposing
19 of high-level waste in a stable form. And the
20 canyons purpose at this point is to stabilize
21 nuclear materials.
22 MS. CARROLL: That's one of the
23 attractive things about the immobilization
24 option. I'd like to see it increase. I mean,
25 if we continue with our disarmament efforts,

Page 183

1 there's going to be a steady stream of
2 plutonium triggers that need to be dealt with,
3 and to increase the rate at which we're able to
4 take that stuff out of the deteriorating paints
5 and solidify it. That is a really attractive
6 idea, and we support it. We want to be
7 supportive of South Carolina in dealing with
8 this.
9 So thank you so much for having this
10 opportunity tonight.
11 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Thank you.
12 Joan King, and then Ed Arnold.
13 MS. KING: I found a penny. Do you
14 think it's lucky?
15 SENATOR LEVENTIS: I certainly hope
16 so.
17 MS. KING: There. I'll put that to
18 the DOE. I think they need it at this point.
19 I want to thank everybody here for
20 their patience and for their endurance. I'm
21 Joan King. I've worked on nuclear issues for a
22 number of organizations for many years now.
23 I'm also the spokesperson for WAND, which is
24 Women's Action for New Directions. And I will
25 try to be brief.

Page 184

1 I'm going to make some statements of
2 things -- assumptions from what I've heard, and
3 you can just say yes or no.
4 I am part of an activist community
5 working on nuclear issues, and I hear that
6 the -- on one hand, I hear that we're going to
7 do this because we have to do MOX because the
8 Russians want it. Am I hearing correctly?
9 Because I also heard the opposite, that we
10 suggested it to the Russians.
11 MR. NULTON: I think that this is a
12 result of the negotiations with the Russians,
13 where they wanted to do one thing, and we have
14 evolved to this point, that they wanted to use
15 it in breeder reactors.
16 MS. KING: Okay. Well, which
17 Russians? I mean, I'm part of the activist
18 community. They are -- my counterpoint has
19 come to this country, activists who are Russian
20 citizens, and they say, We don't want this.
21 MR. NULTON: Well, we negotiate with
22 the Ministry of Atomic Energy in Russia. It's
23 a government to government --
24 MS. KING: Uh-huh. So government to
25 government. But people to people, the people

Page 185

1 don't seem to want it.
2 We have talked about plutonium. Is
3 it true that the amount of commercially
4 produced plutonium, reprocessed plutonium, in
5 the world today is growing?
6 I have read that it is growing so
7 that it will soon exceed the amount of military
8 plutonium from the military reprocessing. Can
9 anybody answer that?
10 MR. STEVENSON: The first statement
11 that the amount of plutonium in the world as a
12 result of civilian reactor operations is
13 growing, yes.
14 MS. KING: Is growing.
15 MR. STEVENSON: That is correct.
16 Whether the amount that's military in
17 weapons-grade and the amount that's at civilian
18 grade, one versus the other, I do not know.
19 MS. KING: Well, I've seen
20 projections that if the amount of commercial --
21 well, I don't -- I've been working on how you
22 phrase it. We'll just say commercial plutonium
23 versus military plutonium. That the amount of
24 commercial plutonium is growing, and if it
25 continues the way it is, it will soon exceed

1 the amount of military plutonium in the world.
2 Does anybody dispute that, or can
3 they answer it?
4 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Yes. If you want
5 to talk to Dr. Makhijani later, he can supply
6 you with the numbers. I don't know that they
7 are --
8 MS. KING: I just wondered if it was
9 true or not. I don't really need the numbers.
10 The point I'm getting to is that I
11 think our problems come with plutonium. I
12 realize that a -- the weapons-grade is probably
13 more desirable on the terrorist market and for
14 Rogue nations. But we also have admitted that
15 we can make nuclear bombs, and that our country
16 has done it as a test from commercial
17 plutonium.
18 So I'm saying that I think the
19 plutonium itself is the problem, and that MOX
20 will not decrease the amount of plutonium in
21 the world. Even as it degrades some of it, it
22 will contribute to the general increase of
23 plutonium in the world. That is why I'm
24 worried, as a citizen and as a member of a
25 number of organizations.

1 Then I'm very concerned as a citizen
2 about the amount of money that's going into
3 this, and I would like to ask the DOE about a
4 rather local problem.
5 In Georgia, we're concerned about
6 the contamination of the groundwater from the
7 SRS. And they were doing some testing of the
8 wells, and we had -- apparently there was money
9 from it, and they found things that showed
10 there was tritium in it. I'm not sure about
11 what else they found in the groundwater. Then
12 all of a sudden, there was no money for the --
13 when I asked our department, EPD, they said,
14 the money -- we don't have the money to test
15 the wells anymore.
16 Now, I'm disturbed that -- I mean,
17 I'm a mother and a grandmother, and we have a
18 policy with my -- if you made a mess, you clean
19 it up before you start all over again. I just
20 think we need to clean up what we've got before
21 we begin on another major project that is going
22 to be very expensive and produce more waste.
23 So thank you very much for this
24 opportunity.
25 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Thank you,

1 Ms. King.
2 Mr. Ed Arnold, and then Mr. Harry
3 Rogers.
4 MS. CARROLL: If I could just give
5 you that figure. I know we're all dying to
6 know how many megawatts we're going to use to
7 make MOX. May I?
8 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Yes.
9 MS. CARROLL: 17,520 megawatt hours
10 a year. I don't know how that translates to a
11 1,000-megawatt plant.
12 SENATOR LEVENTIS: It sounds awful
13 high.
14 MR. NESBIT: There's a lot of hours
15 in a year.
16 MR. STEVENSON: Very low.
17 MS. CARROLL: It's low?
18 MR. NESBIT: It's not that much.
19 MS. CARROLL: There's the facts.
20 SENATOR LEVENTIS: The gentleman
21 from Cogema had said that it's not an
22 energy-intensive process.
23 MS. CARROLL: All right. I wanted a
24 figure. Now we know.
25 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Okay. We've got

1 several more people to hear from, and we will
2 hear from everyone. Please address questions,
3 if you can. And if you have statements, please
4 limit them as may be appropriate.
5 MR. ARNOLD: Senator, this has been
6 really great. Thank you so much.
7 My name is Ed Arnold. I'm the
8 executive director of Physicians for Social
9 Responsibility. Our office in Atlanta serves
10 Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Florida,
11 in terms of staffing in the southeast.
12 Our health professionals and
13 physicians are opposed to the MOX program.
14 They think the risks are too great. And I want
15 to know who are the health professionals and
16 physicians that contributed to the EIS and the
17 supplemental EIS?
18 MR. NULTON: We used the SIC
19 organization to do our environmental analysis,
20 and they have experts on this to do these
21 analyses.
22 MR. ARNOLD: Would it be possible
23 for our health professionals and physicians,
24 numbering over 10,000 across the country, a
25 representation of those, to sit down with your

1 health professionals and figure out what the
2 differences are, perhaps resolve our positions
3 of difference?

4 MR. NULTON: That's why we've had
5 over 90 public meetings up to this point.
6 That's why we have an Environmental Impact
7 Statement, to put that out, get the comments,
8 and resolve the comments. We do that in the
9 public meetings.

10 MR. ARNOLD: Have your health
11 professionals been onhand to try to resolve the
12 differences --

13 MR. NULTON: Yes. We've had experts
14 at our meetings to answer questions, yes.

15 MR. ARNOLD: So in your view, it
16 would be a repetition of the public events that
17 have already occurred?

18 MR. NULTON: Well, we've had these
19 people at these meetings, and we've had a
20 number of representatives from Physicians for
21 Social Responsibility in our meetings around
22 the country in the northwest and --

23 MR. ARNOLD: But we still have our
24 differences that aren't resolved.

25 Well, I'd like to make a statement

1 as much as possible.

2 And probably the more significant
3 thing you can contribute would be a way toward
4 that end, as opposed to this simple notion that
5 one option may be heavily risk weighted than
6 another, because the idea of simply storing
7 material has its risks, and the idea of
8 allowing the Russians to have no organized
9 disposition has its risks, as well.

10 So I would suggest that that's
11 probably where you need to be, because I don't
12 believe that the facts of your statement,
13 although I think they're true, would change the
14 direction of the department unless you can
15 offer some opportunities that they can
16 understand would reduce the risk. Is that a
17 reasonable statement?

18 MR. NULTON: I'm not sure if I
19 understood the whole statement. I think,
20 again, we accept any and all comments, and we
21 try to respond to each one. We do respond to
22 each one. I think up to this point, we've
23 responded to the comments we received in our
24 previous EIS's, and we'll respond to the ones
25 received in this EIS in our final document.

1 that PSR would be interested in pursuing the
2 issue so that we can -- certainly, the
3 immobilization program has its risks, not
4 burning -- not irradiating rods anymore has its
5 risks, because we might have to use more coal
6 in the interim until we -- (inaudible) --
7 energy sources.

8 I mean, there are risks with
9 everything that we do. I wish I were hearing
10 more about some acknowledgment that risks do
11 exist.

12 But PSR thinks that the risks
13 attendant with the MOX program are more serious
14 than if we went strictly with immobilization.

15 I wish we had the opportunity to sit
16 down with our professional people together to
17 see if we could resolve the differences. And
18 as I'm hearing it, you think that we've run our
19 course on it, and I'm sorry that's the case.

20 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Well, let me just
21 make a comment that what I have heard this
22 evening and what I've heard as I've researched
23 this, is, you may well be true that it's not an
24 absolutely risk-based decision, and that they
25 feel their responsibility is to reduce the risk

1 MR. ARNOLD: Senator, thank you very
2 much. This has been a wonderful meeting
3 tonight.

4 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Thank you for
5 coming.

6 Now we have Mr. Harry Rogers, and
7 after him is Mel Jenkins.

8 MR. ROGERS: I'm Harry Rogers,
9 outreach coordinator for Carolina Peace
10 Resource Center. I appreciate first steps.
11 Thank you, Senator Leventis.

12 I'm going to frame my question with
13 an op-ed piece, and not read the whole op-ed
14 piece.

15 First, from Brad Morris, was at a
16 DOE reorganizing hearing. It's a quote from
17 Warran Rudman, an ex-senator.

18 The focus here and in the Senate is
19 understandably on security. I want to be
20 clear. The security is only a system.
21 Mismanagement and arrogance are pervasive
22 everywhere at DOE.

23 I don't know that I agree completely
24 with what Senator Rudman has said, but I have
25 not felt a part of that public participation

1 process. I think that you should realize that
2 you're going to face significant opposition to
3 the decisions that you've made here that are
4 going to result in unnecessary costs, and I
5 think that you've been dismissive of those that
6 have been against MOX.

7 Mike Tuckman, executive
8 vice-president of Nuclear Generation with Duke
9 Power Company, says he has difficulty
10 understanding why anyone would have a problem
11 with the MOX, mixed-oxide, fuel option of
12 weapons-grade plutonium disposition.

13 This is an arrogant statement. Had
14 Mr. Tuckman attended either the legislative
15 briefing conducted by Senator Phil Leventis in
16 Columbia or the public hearing conducted by
17 local and national groups at the University of
18 South Carolina, he would have heard a panel of
19 six experts outline the economic,
20 environmental, security and health reasons
21 against MOX.

22 Subsequently, I made two telephone
23 calls, at least, to Duke Energy requesting that
24 Mr. Tuckman provide me with contact
25 information. That was two and a half months

1 prepared answers.

2 What is at issue here is not the
3 fact that you have the answers. It's what was
4 brought out earlier. It's that an aggressive
5 attempt to involve the public in such a
6 significant decision is absent, and we should
7 have had the opportunity to ask these
8 questions. And it's unfortunate that you've
9 placed us in an adversarial position where over
10 the next year and a half we probably will ask
11 these questions at a good deal of expense to
12 both of us. And I really feel that it's
13 unnecessary, and I would like for you to
14 address the technical questions that I've
15 asked.

16 MR. NESBIT: You cited Dr. Lyman's
17 statement that implied that Duke would cut
18 corners in a way that could seriously impact
19 safety, not intending to install additional
20 control rods or to place limits on irradiation
21 time of the plutonium fuel.

22 Dr. Lyman's statement is erroneous.
23 We never said that. As we've said today, we
24 are going to thoroughly study the impacts of
25 using mixed-oxide fuel on our plants and make

1 ago. To this date, they have not replied.

2 Briefly, through my work with the
3 Carolina Peace Resource Center, along with
4 other groups, we will be holding hearings
5 throughout South Carolina concerning nuclear
6 issues. We will hold ourselves answerable to
7 the public. Will you?

8 And last, I work at V.C. Summer
9 Nuclear Generating Station in Jenkinsville, a
10 plant made world-class by its employees. If
11 this were happening at my plant, I would oppose
12 the use of MOX fuel just as vigorously.

13 If I can go back. Dr. Lyman said
14 recently, While Duke Power claims that the use
15 of MOX in France is safe, it does not plan to
16 employ even the minimal safety adaptations used
17 in France. It does not intend to install
18 additional control rods in its reactors, or to
19 place limits on the irradiation time of the
20 plutonium fuel versus the uranium fuel, both of
21 which are done in France. Duke is cutting
22 corners here in a way that could seriously
23 impact safety.

24 Now, I know the representative from
25 Duke Energy is going to be able to give me some

1 whatever modifications are necessary to ensure
2 the safety of the workers and the public.

3 Because at this present time we do
4 not see the need to add control rods in order
5 to achieve reactivity control at our reactors
6 does not mean that we're cutting corners on
7 safety. If it turns out that for some reason
8 they are needed, we'll make those
9 modifications.

10 I'd also like to address another
11 point. Duke Power has been very open with the
12 public and the media about its involvement in
13 this program, going back to 1996, when we first
14 responded to the Department of Energy's request
15 for interest from commercial public utilities.

16 At that time, approximately 18
17 utilities responded to DOE's RFI. We made our
18 response public. We have been open every step
19 of the way about our involvement up to when we
20 submitted a proposal back last fall, and when
21 we received our contract this spring.

22 Furthermore, if the program goes
23 forward and we're going to use MOX fuel at our
24 plants, the NRC licensing process provides an
25 ample opportunity for public involvement in the

1 surrounding communities, and we look forward to
2 those opportunities.

3 MR. ROGERS: Thank you. Just in
4 closing, I don't find it comforting that we're
5 going to do all these studies about how we're
6 going to use this MOX fuel sometime after we've
7 spent a significant amount of money to build
8 the facility.

9 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Thank you.
10 Mr. Mel Jenkins, and after him is
11 Claude Gilbert.

12 MR. JENKINS: It is still evening.
13 Good evening. I'm Mel Jenkins. First of all,
14 thank you, Senator Leventis, for bringing this
15 about.

16 I'm here as a part of
17 Environmentalists, Incorporated, and as an
18 active participant in dealing with civic and
19 community process toward direct advocacy and
20 through the neighborhood project. In both of
21 those roles, I have several simple questions,
22 and you will be surprised that they are
23 questions.

24 Number one: I would like to repeat
25 Mr. Kawaguchi's question about International

1 dates and so forth or the exact number, but
2 we've had several meetings in North Aiken, I
3 guess -- in North Augusta, rather, Aiken.

4 MR. STEVENSON: I can name some of
5 them.

6 MR. NULTON: Go ahead.

7 MR. STEVENSON: To name some of
8 those meetings, one of the very first ones was
9 a planning and scoping meeting for our
10 programmatic -- in 1994 in North Augusta.

11 There was another meeting for the
12 draft of the PEIS in North Augusta. There was
13 one on highly enriched uranium disposition in
14 Augusta itself.

15 There was another one on the scoping
16 in the final of the HEU. There was a meeting
17 on the scope of this draft EIS. There was a
18 meeting on the draft of this EIS. There were
19 some other group meetings where the public was
20 invited between those meetings on specific
21 topics. I don't remember exactly what they
22 were, but that's the ones that I just remember
23 off of the top of my head.

24 MR. JENKINS: So all these meetings
25 were in the back yard of the Savannah River

1 Nuclear Services here in Columbia. Will there
2 be more contaminated materials coming to that
3 INS plant? Call this 1A. Since logic impels
4 the handling of this material will produce more
5 contaminated items as a result of handling MOX
6 materials, how much more will be coming here to
7 Columbia? That's a specific question, which,
8 of course, you can't answer tonight, but I
9 would appreciate some workup on that. That is
10 important to us here.

11 Number two -- again, I regret that
12 there's not an agenda, so I don't know the
13 names of the people participating here. So
14 I'll simply say, DOE said tonight there have
15 been over 90 public meetings on this issue. I
16 would appreciate a list of those, giving dates,
17 places and such, and that's a question. Will
18 you provide that?

19 Number two: What public meetings
20 have been held here in South Carolina?

21 Number three: What public meetings
22 have been held in Georgia? And you can answer
23 that tonight, I think.

24 MR. NULTON: I don't know the number
25 of meetings that we've -- I don't know the

1 Site, some of which I have heard characterized
2 as pep rallies, none of them held in Atlanta,
3 none of them held in Columbia; is that correct?

4 MR. STEVENSON: Yes, there was one
5 meeting held in Atlanta in this process. I
6 believe, it was in -- and I'll double-check
7 myself. It was in 1995 that we held the
8 meeting in Atlanta.

9 MR. JENKINS: And I would, of
10 course, be interested in the publicity that was
11 given to those meetings.

12 So given that it seems like there
13 was some decision made to limit public input on
14 this issue, I would be very interested to know
15 who arrived at the public input plan for this
16 process.

17 Again, I think we here in Columbia
18 certainly would feel that we have been excluded
19 from the process; and therefore, I would be
20 very curious as to who it was specifically, by
21 department and by names, that decided that
22 there would be a limited public input on this.

23 And three: Is this the new DOE
24 policy regarding public input?

25 Thank you.

1 SENATOR LEVENTIS: By the way, if
2 you have asked for a specific response --

3 MR. JENKINS: I don't expect it
4 tonight.

5 SENATOR LEVENTIS: -- please give
6 that person that you asked -- this applies to
7 anyone who asked -- your name and address so
8 that they may be able to access you.

9 MR. JENKINS: That's on the sign-in
10 form. Do I need to do that separately?

11 SENATOR LEVENTIS: No. You need to
12 do it in addition, because it's hard for us to
13 pull out each individual person that may have
14 made a request to any of these gentlemen on the
15 panel here.

16 MR. JENKINS: Thank you.

17 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Did anybody want
18 to address that?

19 MR. STEVENSON: Was the number of
20 them -- within the department as to who makes
21 the policy of what meetings we have, that is a
22 process as opposed to one individual.

23 But typically, it is the head of our
24 office, and it -- we've had several office
25 directors who make that. It's also done in

1 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Thank you.

2 MR. JENKINS: Thank you.

3 MR. ROGERS: Senator Leventis, I
4 just wanted to submit this for the record.

5 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Just bring it
6 around.

7 Next would be Mr. Claude Gilbert,
8 and after him is Mr. Bert Cutts.

9 MR. GILBERT: Thank you, Senator,
10 for this meeting tonight. I'll be very brief,
11 because I think we've touched on most
12 everything.

13 I would like to say for the record I
14 think that I would like more discussion on the
15 environmental record of Cogema. I think we let
16 him off mighty light tonight. There's a lot of
17 questions concerning what's going on in France,
18 and the contamination, and it's pretty
19 well-known. So I know there's some violations
20 there. I'm very much concerned with Cogema
21 working on this project.

22 I have a statement I would just like
23 to leave for the record, I think.

24 I have one question for Duke Power
25 concerning the fuel rods. I remember reading

1 consultation with our Office of General
2 Counsel, our lawyers, and with the Office of
3 Environmental Policy and Assistance. So that
4 it's reviewed by the people who are in charge
5 of the National Environmental Policy Act
6 Enforcement, our lawyers, and the people within
7 our office, as a minimum.

8 MR. JENKINS: Thank you. I realize
9 that you're saying it's difficult to arrive at
10 a person or a particular -- but I've worked
11 with the government myself and have dealt with
12 them enough to know that paperwork is the
13 essence of government, and that you have to
14 sign off on things like that.

15 So there is a paper trail that could
16 be arrived at.

17 MR. STEVENSON: That is correct,
18 because part of the requirement of the National
19 Environmental Policy Act is that you prepare
20 the administrative record, and that
21 administrative record contains that type of
22 information upon which those decisions are
23 arrived at.

24 MR. JENKINS: That will be
25 interesting.

1 before that I think you all have removed them
2 from reactor to another reactor.

3 Are you planning on doing that type
4 of thing with this MOX?

5 MR. NESBIT: No. You're referring
6 to transshipment, which occurred between Oconee
7 and McGuire, when we were running out of space
8 in the Oconee spent fuel pool. We've since
9 instituted on-site dry storage of the sites
10 that need it. We have no plans for doing that
11 with mixed-oxide fuel.

12 MR. GILBERT: Thank you. If I can
13 just submit this.

14 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Thank you. Just
15 bring it on around.

16 I think it's Mr. Bert Cutts,
17 C-u-t-t-s.

18 SPEAKER: He's already gone, sir.

19 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Brian Carnes and
20 then Mr. Michael Moore. Are they here? We've
21 outlasted. Okay.

22 Merison Niri, N-i-r-i? Shin Yun?
23 It seems Mr. Cutts signed up twice, and he's
24 not here once.

25 (Laughter.)

1 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Mr. Poe?
2 MR. POE: Thank you, Senator. I
3 appreciate the opportunity to be here tonight.
4 And Mr. Nulton, thank you for coming and
5 sharing with us.
6 Up front I'll tell you that I'm
7 pro-MOX. Okay? I'm just disappointed we don't
8 go further than one pass with it, but that's
9 not the question at hand tonight.
10 I will say that I am -- consider
11 myself to be informed, and I've been very
12 slightly tasked here tonight to be informed.
13 This is a complex subject that we're talking
14 about.
15 I've heard citizens on both sides of
16 the coin. I learned from both. I said I'm
17 pro-MOX. So I'm in favor of this activity.
18 The most compelling story that I've
19 heard tonight was the one that Mr. Chaput
20 talked to when he talked to the fact that by
21 denaturing this material we're moving in the
22 right direction. If we don't get all the way
23 there, we at least are moving in the right
24 direction.
25 I do have two points that I want to

1 make. They'll turn out to be questions, I
2 hope.
3 The first one is: You know, there's
4 been a lot of discussion about we don't
5 understand what all is going on here tonight.
6 They are questions which tells me, in my
7 limited knowledge, that we're not meeting often
8 enough.
9 So I would like to address you,
10 Mr. Nulton, and say what are we going to do
11 about that? You've got citizens of South
12 Carolina, citizens of Georgia that are
13 interested in your program. Some opposed to
14 it. Some for it. But nonetheless, there are
15 probably questions among all of us that don't
16 have the benefit of all the time and effort
17 that you guys have put at it to understand
18 that.
19 Let me just tell you that I spend
20 probably three or four days a week working to
21 understand the goings on at Savannah River.
22 I'll tell you that my judgment is that after
23 you work the problems well, you and they meet
24 in a meeting of the minds, and you understand
25 where each other is coming from and where

1 they're going. I haven't gotten to that point
2 with this program yet.
3 So what are we going to do about
4 that?
5 MR. NULTON: Part of our effort, now
6 that we have DCS under contract, is to develop
7 an outreach program. We're in the process of
8 doing that. I'm not sure what nature it will
9 take, but it is one of our activities that
10 we're undertaking.
11 MR. POE: Well, I would encourage
12 you to do that strenuously because there have
13 been an awful lot of people here who are
14 stakeholders of this activity that you're
15 planning for us here, and we don't understand,
16 and we have nagging concerns that continue with
17 us.
18 Now, the second question. Senator,
19 I guess I address this one to you. You were
20 nice enough to set up this meeting. And for
21 the first two hours, about 60 of us sat out
22 here and listened to you all talk back and
23 forth about things we didn't even know what you
24 were talking about, because there were pieces
25 of paper -- and I made a list of seven things

1 that you talked about in that two hours that we
2 don't have copies of. Now, if we're going to
3 be informed citizens, we need to have that
4 information.
5 The list that I ended up with were
6 the environmental synopsis somebody mentioned,
7 and I don't remember who that was; the cost
8 report; the contract, a copy of what the
9 contract looks like; the contract cost analysis
10 that someone referred to. In September, when
11 we get the U.S. Russian agreement, we need to
12 see that. Then so that we can remember all
13 these good things that you guys have talked
14 about, Senator, I would like to suggest that
15 this group of papers that have been talked
16 about here be mailed out to the people who came
17 here, along with a copy of the transcript of
18 the meeting so we can hear the questions and
19 read some of the information.
20 I'll tell you, for one, that I don't
21 like to read, but I do read an awful lot of
22 this kind of stuff to keep myself informed so
23 that I can become a reasonable stakeholder and
24 understand the process.
25 So can we arrange something like

1 that? I don't know whether it's you or whether
2 it's Mr. Nulton. Everybody had different
3 pieces of paper that most of us sitting out
4 here in the audience didn't have.
5 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Certainly it's a
6 valid criticism. We didn't know how many folks
7 to expect, and we will try to arrange the
8 results of this meeting and the transcript into
9 some logical fashion and see who among those
10 who are here would like it because -- and I see
11 one taker already -- because that's the purpose
12 of having the meeting.
13 So we'll try to get that together in
14 conjunction with the Department of Energy, who
15 was very supportive in our efforts to get the
16 meeting together.
17 In relation to one criticism that we
18 had earlier about a notice that the meeting was
19 going on, of course, we did publish it widely
20 in the public media. We did also mail to a
21 list provided to us by the department, and I
22 don't know precisely the origin of that list,
23 but -- how was it constructed?
24 MR. STEVENSON: I think I can answer
25 that and would like to offer my comments.

1 wish to get those by mail, they can also do
2 that.
3 One other new piece of information
4 also that I would add is that, since we entered
5 into a partnership with DCS, our website will
6 now include linkages to these partners that we
7 have so that you also can gain information from
8 their websites, so that you have an ability --
9 if you were interested in more of the Cogema
10 information, you could go directly to that site
11 and obtain what information that they have
12 there --
13 MR. POE: Thank you.
14 MR. STEVENSON: -- which also
15 includes mailing addresses, so that you aren't
16 fully dependent on the web for these documents.
17 MR. POE: Well, I, for one, received
18 my invitation in a white envelope. It didn't
19 look like a DOE envelope. Senator, I thought
20 you had mailed it to me. It was a plain white
21 wrapper. I saw in the Augusta paper yesterday
22 the announcement of the meeting. I had
23 received the announcement out of The State
24 several days earlier.
25 So I was aware of the meeting, and

1 The list -- over the past five years
2 that we have been a program, we have been
3 collecting a stakeholder database. That
4 stakeholder database is now up to 7,500
5 individuals of which 1,300 are South
6 Carolinians.
7 MR. POE: Good. I'm glad we're
8 represented.
9 MR. STEVENSON: Of the 1,300 South
10 Carolinians, they represent 100 individual
11 communities around the state who are on our
12 routine mailing list.
13 We try very hard to keep that
14 mailing list up to date, but people move, and
15 we only make mailings every so often. But we
16 really do try to make sure that everybody who
17 wants to receives copies of our information.
18 Further, Senator, I'd like to make a
19 suggestion that might help out here. When the
20 transcript is prepared and you're going to make
21 distribution, if you could, put a statement in
22 there that if people are interested, who have
23 access to the worldwide web, they could get all
24 of the documents that you mentioned from there,
25 or we have a mailing address where, if they

1 the Aiken/Augusta area stakeholders do
2 communicate with each other, and we talk a
3 whole lot. So that word gets around.
4 I want to thank you again for having
5 us here tonight and sharing this information
6 with us. It's a little bit frustrating to try
7 to understand and take it all in. So help us,
8 bear with us, and continue this sort of thing.
9 Thank you.
10 SENATOR LEVENTIS: I should point
11 out, of course, that the Department supplied us
12 with a large list of folks to mail to, and they
13 also supported us with the postage and whatnot
14 to make that mailing.
15 In relation to a comment you made,
16 when we do prepare the transcript, we will try
17 to prepare an index of the documents that we
18 used or were referenced so that you might be
19 able to go get them.
20 Mr. Poe, do you use the worldwide
21 web?
22 MR. POE: I'm a -- while my friends
23 up here -- let me just -- yes, I do a little
24 bit. I'm not terribly fluent. I got a copy of
25 a defense board thing sent to me this morning

Page 214

1 that I couldn't open and read, and I had to get
2 somebody else to come help me figure out what
3 was wrong with my web.
4 SENATOR LEVENTIS: But you do access
5 that?
6 MR. POE: Yes, sir, I do.
7 SENATOR LEVENTIS: That's fine.
8 Ms.--
9 MS. THOMAS: I wanted to correct an
10 oversight. I wanted to thank you, Senator
11 Leventis, and I wanted to speak to
12 Mr. Stevenson.
13 Even though I've been doing it all
14 these years, I'm still not comfortable standing
15 up and talking to people, but I think I do
16 better on the telephone one to one. So thank
17 you both.
18 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Is there anyone
19 else that I have not recognized that would like
20 to speak?
21 In fact, of course, I didn't get to
22 raise all the questions that I would like.
23 That may sound strange, but it's true. I have
24 passed some questions on to some of the
25 gentlemen here.

Page 215

1 But my main purpose, I think, has
2 been met, and that is to bring everyone
3 together and to create more of a record
4 available to these gentlemen, to us, as we
5 discuss these issues.
6 I would like to thank first and
7 foremost those people who supported this
8 meeting, Ms. Jeter, and the people from
9 security who have been here all day, because
10 I've been here with them. We appreciate you
11 being here a great deal, and those folks who
12 have come from out of town. I know a lot of
13 you have. From DOE, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Nulton,
14 Mr. Selby, and a lady whose name I did not get.
15 I'm sorry.
16 MR. NULTON: Pat Wherley.
17 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Ms. Wherley.
18 Those folks from Melox and Cogema, Mr. Ihde
19 from Duke, Cogema, Stone and Webster, and
20 Mr. Nesbit from Duke. All those folks who came
21 representing Representative Orrock from
22 Atlanta, and our Representative Clyburn,
23 Senator Courson, Dr. Makhijani, Mr. Brown.
24 We did what I intended to do. We
25 took about as much time as I thought we would

Page 216

1 to do it.
2 So with that, unless anyone else
3 would like to comment --
4 MR. NULTON: Senator, can I just
5 make one brief comment? Can we enter, for the
6 record, from Cogema some reports on their
7 facilities?
8 SENATOR LEVENTIS: Yes, please. We
9 would like that, and if we need any more, we
10 can certainly give you those.
11 MR. NULTON: And also, I would
12 suggest, if you want to enter for the record,
13 the question and answers that we sent to you in
14 there under the Cogema section of that document
15 are two websites that were identified that also
16 provides access to Cogema environmental data
17 that would perhaps help some folks.
18 SENATOR LEVENTIS: All right. We'll
19 do that. Anyone else? Thank you for your
20 great patience and all of your input and
21 participation.
22 (The proceedings concluded at about
23 11:22 p.m.)
24
25

Page 217

1
2 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
3 I, Lisa D. Jeter, Court Reporter and
4 Notary Public in and for the State of South
5 Carolina at Large, do hereby certify:
6 That the foregoing proceedings were taken
7 before me on the date and at the time and
8 location stated on Page 1 of this transcript
9 and was recorded stenographically by me and
10 were thereafter transcribed; that the foregoing
11 proceedings as typed is true, accurate and
12 complete record of the proceedings to the best
13 of my ability.
14
15 Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed
16 my official seal this 2nd day of September,
17 1999, at Columbia, Richland County, South
18 Carolina.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Lisa D. Jeter
Court Reporter, Notary Public
State of South Carolina at Large
My Commission expires
September 11, 2002