

- - - - -

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
AFTERNOON SESSION

Before Andrea L. Gregory, Certified Court Reporter

At the North Augusta Community Center

495 Brookside Avenue

North Augusta, South Carolina

On Thursday, November 9, 2006, Commencing at 12:58 p.m.

- - - - -

|||||

AUGUSTA WEST-CULPEPPER REPORTING
Certified Court Reporters
505 Courthouse Lane
Augusta, Georgia 30901
(706) 722-3746 or (706) 863-3918
1-800-592-3376 (Depo)
INDEX TO MEETING

	Page
OPENING BY MR. BROWN	3
FORMAL COMMENTS.	4 through 79
EXHIBITS	80 through 169
CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER.	170

MR. BROWN: It's now time to receive your comments
for inclusion in the formal record. This session will
Page 1

DOE meeting

be transcribed by our court reporter, Andrea Gregory. We will first hear from state and national elected officials, who are representatives. After that I will call on speakers in the order in which they signed up. And I will compliment--some got here 2 hours early. They're near the top of the list. Please come to that podium over there and introduce yourself, providing an organizational affiliation where appropriate. If you haven't signed up and wish to speak please sign up at the desk right at the--behind the columns there. Also if you have a written version of your statement after you're done if you can provide me with a copy I'll hand that on to the court reporter to double-check your remarks. And if you have attachments that you're not reading but would like to submit for the record you can also give those to me and I'll mark them appropriately and have those submitted for the record. To ensure that everyone has an opportunity to make comments on the proposed draft EIS I'll ask that you limit your comments for this session to 4 minutes. We have a certain amount of allotted time; we have about forty speakers signed up. So if you can confine remarks to 4 minutes that'll allow everyone an opportunity. I will notify you when you have a moment--or a minute remaining, and at that point you can summarize your remaining comments and submit your complete statement. I will also call two names at a time, the person that is scheduled to speak currently and then the next person in line so that you can be ready. Ted Wyka will be serving as the hearing officer for the Department of Energy during this formal comment period. So with that by way of introduction, we will begin. I would like to call Rene Ann Tewkesbury, representing U.S. Senator Lindsey Graham. Welcome.

MS. TEWKESBURY: Well, thank you. It's good to be home. Ted, thank you for coming down and joining us. I can't think of a better place for you to start this process than the Central Savannah River Area.

My name is Rene Ann Tewkesbury. I work for Senator Lindsey Graham. And I'm proud to say that I was born and raised in Aiken County. I still consider myself an Aiken and home resident. Senator Graham is obviously very supportive of the Consolidated Plutonium Center being located at Savannah River Site. And he has written to Secretary Bodman stating such, and I have a copy of that letter that we'd like to have issued, please.

The Department of Energy's plan to embark on the Complex 2030 program is to be commended. This program will enhance the United States' ability to maintain its nuclear deterrence capabilities into the future in a cost-effective and secure manner. I also applaud your decision to consider the Savannah River Site for the location of the Consolidated Plutonium Center. I believe the characteristics of the Site make it the natural choice for the CPC.

As you evaluate SRS for this mission I encourage you to keep in the unique capabilities of SRS in mind. For over 50 years SRS has played a vital role in developing our nation's nuclear capabilities. The safety record at SRS is unsurpassed, its infrastructure is modern and especially suited for plutonium operations, the workers are skilled and productive, and

DOE meeting

the Savannah River National Laboratory has core competency in plutonium science and operations. Further, nearly 90 percent of the land at SRS is open and free of the encroachment issues common with other DOE sites.

Equally important is the broad and enthusiastic level of community support for DOE activities at Savannah River Site. The community is unwavering in its support for the work at SRS not only in South Carolina but also in Georgia. The communities surrounding the Site are some of the most knowledgeable and understanding of nuclear technology in the country. They are a resource to DOE that should be considered in the location of the CPC.

The combination of technical expertise, safety, open land, and community support simply cannot be matched by the other sites under consideration. SRS provides DOE with the best opportunity for the cost-effective and timely operation of the Consolidated Plutonium Center. I look forward to working with you to advance your Complex 2030 plan. Sincerely, Lindsey O. Graham, United States Senator. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Our next speaker is Jim Hussey, representing U.S. Senator Saxby Chambliss. He will be followed by State Senator Ed Tarver.

MR. HUSSEY: Good afternoon. I'm representing United States Senator Saxby Chambliss of Georgia who is on the Armed Forces and the Intelligence Committee in the Senate.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone for recognizing the important role of the Savannah River Site in America's future. I am extremely pleased that this public hearing on selecting the site of a major new Department of Energy mission is being held today.

The Department of Energy is streamlining its research and development and production facilities and plans to build a new Consolidated Plutonium Center to perform plutonium research and development and production. I know many of you here are working hard to see that this new mission can come to the Savannah River Site. I want to thank you for your efforts and echo my strong support of selecting the Savannah River Site as the location of the Consolidated Plutonium Center.

The Center will be a multi-billion dollar facility, employing over 2500 people. I know the Savannah River Site and the fine folks who work there have the capability and the capacity for this mission. As you all know, the Savannah River Site and this area of the country are crucial to the--to the outlook and security of the United States. I am confident the Department of Energy will find that the community support for Savannah River Site and this new DOE mission are unparalleled here in the Central Savannah River Area. Your presence here today shows how much you appreciate the importance of what the mission [sic] is trying to accomplish with this new mission. With its current infrastructure, expertise and support, selecting it as the location for this new mission is unarguably logical.

Thank you for your increased support and attention to the fundamental energy and military needs of our

DOE meeting

country. I look forward to staying in touch with all of you as we continue to work to bring this critical mission here to the Savannah River Site. Sincerely, Saxby Chambliss, United States Senator. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Senator Ed Tarver, to be followed by Representative Barry Fleming.

SENATOR TARVER: Good afternoon. I'm Senator Ed Tarver. I'm a member of the Georgia State General Assembly and I represent the 22nd District in Georgia. I have prepared a brief letter to Mr. Ted Wyka in support. I'll read it as follows: with the reality of global terrorism I would like to commend the National Nuclear Security Agency and the Department of Energy for beginning the steps to consolidate weapons plutonium research and development and pit production into one, super secure location to be called the Consolidated Plutonium Center. This approach has to be in the best interest of the taxpayers and our national security.

The CSRA community has emphatically supported the Savannah River Site since its inception and for over 50 years. We have fully supported its mission and programs through our confidence which is based on the safe and secure performance of its employees which they have demonstrated from day to day. The safety, security and environmental stewardship records of SRS are second to none in DOE complexes. Likewise, the strength of community support cannot be found at any other DOE site.

As you go through the decision-making process for locating the CPC, I ask that you fully recognize and weigh the performance of the current and past employees of SRS and the level of community support SRS has always received. If you do, I believe that the CPC will be at SRS. SRS and this community deserve that decision.

Thank you for this opportunity to input my support for the program and mission at SRS. I hope that you will call upon me if I can be of any help to you in the future.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Representative Fleming will be followed by Ronnie Young.

REPRESENTATIVE FLEMING: My name is Barry Fleming and I am the Majority Whip in the Georgia House of Representatives and I represent District 117, which includes three counties in the CSRA on the Georgia side, Columbia County, Lincoln County and Wilkes County. And on behalf of the entire delegation from Columbia County, Senator Jim Whitehead and Representative Ben Harbin, we want to say that we are fully in support of the project, the plutonium consolidation project at SRS. And to show bipartisan effort, Senator--my Democratic friend, Senator Tarver that just left, I doubt that anywhere in the nation you'll find a community, elected officials and citizens, more supportive of the benefits that SRS has brought to our community and would continue to do whatever we could on a governmental level, whether it be local government or state government, to assist in bringing this project here. In summary, rather than going through my prepared remarks, I'll simply hand those to you and tell you that we're 100-percent in support of the new project and ask you to let us help you in any way we can.

DOE meeting

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Ronnie Young is next. Let me make one comment before our next speaker. This portion of the meeting is being videotaped, and that's certainly the right of the public. But if anyone who is making a statement has any objection to being videotaped the person doing so has kindly indicated they would be happy to turn their camera off during that time. So that's just an announcement. So if you are speaking as--and have any objection just let us know. So--okay. I'm sorry. We have another person, Kathryn Wade. Is Kathryn Wade here? Good. All right. We'll call you next then and then Ronnie Young will follow you. That podium there. Thank you.

MS. WADE: Good afternoon. My name is Kathryn Wade and I represent Congressman Gresham Barrett from the Third Congressional District in South Carolina. And he is--Aiken/SRS is part of our district. And he is addressing Secretary Bodman about the Consolidated Plutonium Center. And I just want to say before I read the letter that the congressman is very--finds SRS extremely important to our nation and to our district and is very supportive of the missions and bringing new missions and opportunities to SRS.

Dear Secretary Bodman: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Complex 2030 initiative. This visionary plan to consolidate the Nuclear Weapons Complex into a smaller, more efficient, and fully effective nuclear infrastructure will undoubtedly help our country meet its long-term, national security needs.

The Consolidated Plutonium Center is a key component of the Complex 2030 plan, and I believe the Savannah River Site is the best choice for both the DOE and the nation. The Savannah River Site has contributed greatly to our nation's defense and energy programs for over 50 years and has an impressive record of safety, excellence, expertise and service, all of which are necessary to successfully accomplish this important DOE mission. Among the many desirable qualities that SRS can offer to the CPC mission are: a modern and flexible infrastructure which is uniquely suited to support plutonium operations. By utilizing existing services currently available at SRS, such as on-site engineering and construction support, emergency response services, and environmental protection and monitoring services, the costs of establishing the CPC would decrease without affecting the reliability of operations. An impeccable safety record and a history of responsible environmental protection. SRS has an open and professional relationship with its regulators, which is important for assuring public confidence. A well-trained security force which is capable of protecting operating facilities and the substantial quantities of nuclear materials that would be produced. This force, together with SRS's physical size, provide an excellent environment for protecting the vital CPC mission. And a large workforce of men and women with the necessary skills and expertise who have dedicated their lives to ensuring our nation is secure in uncertain times.

In addition to the most important--excuse me, the most complete array of physical and intellectual

DOE meeting

assets, SRS has a broad base of regional support for conducting DOE national missions. The surrounding community, including elected officials and civic leaders, has strongly supported DOE missions at SRS in the past and will help our nation achieve its Complex 2030 objectives for the future.

I have no doubt that the combination of technical expertise, safety, open land, and community support cannot be matched by the other sites under consideration. SRS provides DOE with the best opportunity for a cost-effective and timely operation of the Consolidated Plutonium Center. I look forward to working with you in the future to further the Complex 2030 initiative. Sincerely, J. Gresham Barrett, Member of Congress.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

MS. WADE: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Ronnie Young, who will be followed by Ted Brodek.

MR. YOUNG: Good afternoon. I am Ronnie Young. I am chairman of the Aiken County Council. I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome Mr. Wyka here to Aiken County and the CSRA.

Aiken County, home to 40 percent of the Savannah River Site and over one half of its employees, is pleased to support the Department of Energy's plans to consolidate and modernize its nuclear weapons complex. We believe your plans for a smaller, more responsive Complex 2030 will help the United States assure our long-term national security in a cost-effective manner.

We are especially pleased that the Department is considering location of the Consolidated Plutonium Center at the Savannah River Site and Aiken County Council endorses selection of SRS for this important mission. There are many factors which favor SRS including: a long and unparalleled history of experience and technical expertise in handling nuclear material. A skilled workforce and modern infrastructure with more large-scale plutonium expertise and experience than any other DOE location. These advantages will save DOE both time and money. A history of reliable production operation. SRS has never missed a production commitment to the DOE weapons production complex. A large land mass and exceptional security systems to effectively protect activities important to national security. A national laboratory with core competency in plutonium research and development, engineering development and production support. A knowledgeable, engaged and supportive local community with long-term track record of supporting DOE national security missions.

We believe that the Savannah River Site has all the right characteristics for DOE to be successful as it transitions to Complex 2030.

We note with interest that one of Complex 2030's objectives is to increase security and save costs by consolidating weapons-related special nuclear materials at fewer DOE sites. We support this objective and will work with the Department of Energy to assure that transfer of additional plutonium assets to SRS is made on a schedule consistent with establishment of new Complex 2030 facilities and capabilities. Similarly, expectation is that our current disagreement concerning

DOE meeting

plutonium shipments and the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility will be satisfactorily resolved prior to plutonium shipments to SRS associated with the CPC program.

Aiken County is proud of our 50 years plus mutually beneficial relationship with the Department's national security programs. Our vision for the future includes a continued vibrant and capable SRS contributing to meeting DOE national security missions. We believe that SRS has significant and unique advantages as the location of the Consolidated Plutonium Complex and we recommend that the Savannah River Site be chosen as the preferred alternative in your draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement to be issued next year. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Ted Brodek is next, to be followed by Bill Bassham.

MR. BRODEK: Thank you for holding these hearings. My name is Ted Brodek. I live in Atlanta, Georgia. I never write my comments because I can't read my handwriting. So let me just speak generally about what to me is a fundamental question here, and that is: what is the definition of a deterrence and how does this program fit within that? That's maybe not the responsibility of NNSA, but it is the responsibility of us as citizens to consider. In my view, in fact, we are not talking here about deterrence. We are talking here about the development of new weapons of aggression. And I mean this specifically in relationship to President Bush's recent declaration approximately two months ago that the United States intends to make the entire space as our backyard for weapons control. We want to be the only armed power in outer space. That's what he has stated. This follows up previous declarations of his overall aggressive view of the world, namely, the idea of preemptive war, the war in Iraq, all the other policies that we're pursuing which do not make us safer. They have just imbalanced the world and created a greater stress for everyone to survive. The development of newer, better weapons is part of that program. This concept that we are facing here today on the level of environmental impact really has a much, much broader environmental impact than the one just around this base or in this area. It has an impact upon the survival of the human species on this planet. And this administration, this government, its thrust, its concept of deterrence is the surest path to its ultimate destruction.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Bill Bassham. He will be followed by Joe Whetstone.

MR. BASSHAM: Mr. Wyka, thank you for being here. I'm Bill Bassham. I'm president of the North Augusta Chamber of Commerce and I'm here representing the business community of the North Augusta area. It's a pleasure for the Greater North Augusta Chamber of Commerce to offer our support for locating the Consolidated Plutonium Center at the Savannah River Site. We believe that it's the most logical choice for a number of reasons. SRS is the superior choice when one uses infrastructure as the criteria. It offers adequate power, water and steam for the process. Little infrastructure change will need be made, which will be a cost savings for the American taxpayers.

DOE meeting

Personnel at SRS has been working with plutonium for over a half century. They can provide the needed labor force with the highly developed skills, high-end training facilities and a proven management team. They already have emergency response systems in place, security services, on-site engineering and support, laboratory services, research and development, medical and industrial hygiene services, and full-scale environmental protection and monitoring services supporting SRS's already ongoing functions. None of these would need to be started anew nor significantly increased. This will lead to less environmental impact. The SRS history of safety, excellence, expertise and service is second to none in the industry. Finally, as SRS is prepared to accept new missions, we in North Augusta and the Central Savannah River Area are also prepared for these new missions. We have adequate housing and infrastructure to handle an increased number of workers to the Site. The community in this area have long been supporters of the Site. The workers are our friends and our neighbors and we have confidence in their ability to do the job with quality and safety. For these reasons we feel that the best choice for the CPC is the Savannah River Site. Its selection is a win-win for DOE, the American taxpayer and our local area. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Joe Whetstone. And Sam Booker will be next.

MR. WHETSTONE: Good afternoon. My name is Joe Whetstone. Janet Wedlock and I live in Bluffton, South Carolina, which is in Beaufort County. We are here representing ourselves and the South Carolina Chapter of the Sierra Club.

The water supply for those of us who depend on the Lower Savannah is already contaminated with nuclear waste. Many children and adults living in Beaufort County and Jasper County are consuming tritium daily as a result of previous Savannah River Site nuclear weapons programs. Resurrecting the nuclear arms race and adding new weapons facilities at SRS will further endanger the Savannah River and the citizens depending upon it. Salt water intrusion of the Floridan Aquifer is forcing more citizens of the Lower Savannah area to turn to the river as their primary source of drinking water as our population continues to grow.

The levels of tritium being consumed by area citizens may already be too high. Currently the EPA--US EPA maximum contamination level for tritium in drinking water is 20,000 picocuries per liter, but in March of 2006 the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment established a public health goal of 400 picocuries per liter in drinking water. This goal was set using the EPA document "Cancer Risk Coefficients for Environmental Exposure to Radionuclides: Federal Guidance Report 13." And that's available on the California health website.

In 2005 the Beaufort Jasper Water and Sewer Authority reported the average level of tritium was 547 picocuries per liter. The level of tritium being consumed by those of us drinking water from the Lower Savannah is already higher than the California Public Health Goal of 400 picocuries per liter. Adding new weapons programs at SRS will further endanger the

DOE meeting

health and citizens of--health and safety of citizens in our area. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Sam Booker. And Scott MacGregor will be next.

MR. BOOHER: My name is Sam Booher. I live in Augusta, Georgia. Thank you all for coming here today and giving us this opportunity to share our thoughts.

Having the current buffer zone in functional national environmental research park here around SRS makes the public feel a lot safer about our existing cleanup and any future actions you're going to be taking at SRS. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Louis Zeller will follow Scott MacGregor.

MR. MACGREGOR: Good afternoon. I'm Scott MacGregor with the Augusta Metro Chamber of Commerce. We're here to deliver a statement on behalf of the Augusta Metro Chamber of Commerce.

The Augusta Metro Chamber of Commerce is glad to be able to take part in the process of planning the Department of Energy's future complex and how Savannah River Site fits into that future. The Chamber believes the development of a Consolidated Plutonium Center and its location at Savannah River Site is in the best interest of our nation. The proposal will create enhanced efficiency and security for the United States' nuclear arsenal. Locating the facility at SRS, given the existing capabilities of the site, makes sense.

The Savannah River Site is a unique combination of physical infrastructure and human talent. SRS has the land mass and security infrastructure to provide the level of protection that the Consolidated Plutonium Center will require. The area also provides a unique pool of employees to build and operate such a facility. In addition, infrastructure for handling waste and associated weapons facilities are already on site.

The Savannah River Site has enjoyed over 50 years of community support. This sense of pride in doing our part for our nation continues today. That is why the Augusta Metro Chamber of Commerce is pleased to express its position in favor of locating a Consolidated Plutonium Center at the Savannah River Site. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Louis Zeller. And he will be followed by Glenn Carroll.

MR. ZELLER: Thank you. My name is Lou Zeller and I'm here today representing the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, a organization which has been in existence for 22 years and now has offices as far south as Augusta, Georgia, and through the Carolinas.

I rise today to speak in opposition to Complex 2030. The proposal, which I have read about, fails on every level: as economic development, as scientific advancement, as community development, and as justifiable policy for the United States of America in the twenty-first century. Simply stated, construction of new atomic weapons manufacturing facilities contravenes federal law and international law. We see a petty dictator being brought before the docket for crimes committed. It is crime to move forward with the construction of new nuclear weapons facility in the United States. The United States in the Nixon

DOE meeting

administration signed and ratified a non-proliferation treaty, which calls for an end, in no uncertain terms, of not only nuclear weapons but all weapons of mass destruction.

With regards to the immediate proposal which is the notice of intent to prepare a Supplement to the Stockpile Stewardship and Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, Complex 2030, I would submit into the record this document which was published by the Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League in 2002. It is entitled "Does America Need a New Atomic Bomb Plant?" The answer is no. Let me read just one paragraph. As nuclear weapons advocates justify new pit production--plutonium pit production--on urgent national security needs, it is important to remember that the very concept of national security is not scientifically derived. The concept is burdened with moral judgments and is not limited to national borders. U.S. national security policy extends well beyond homeland defense and involves projections of military power and what is referred to as full spectrum dominance. Simply stated, the United States--it is incumbent upon the United States to move forward with the abolition of these weapons. That is the alternative which I would propose today and which our organization advocates, that by 2030 there be no nuclear weapons usable within the United States of America, no new manufacturing plants, no upgrades, no modifications, no reliably replaceable warheads and all such jargon which is designed to cover up and put a fig leaf over the desire to spend vast new amounts of money on weapons which should not be built in the twenty-first century and which we should lead the world in eliminating. And we cannot do that from the moral high ground while we are producing those weapons. Thank you. This is the document. I appreciate the opportunity to come.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Glenn Carroll, to be followed by Susan Winsor.

MS. CARROLL: My name is Glenn Carroll. I represent Nuclear Watch South. We were founded almost 30 years ago as Georgians Against Nuclear Energy. We've been working on the Savannah River Site since our inception. I was a new member following Chernobyl when we shut down all the factories to make the bombs. And so I came in on an environmental impulse and we were beginning to face in this nation the extremely difficult challenge that still lies ahead of us to develop the technology and the will to deal with our nuclear waste legacy. This is where our national and global security lies.

We've been here--I have been here--this is my third time I've come out to face the bomb. In 1991 we conducted an Environmental Impact Statement on Complex 21. In 2003 we talked about the Modern Pit Facility. And now we're here again. It's time to think beyond the bomb. I've been thinking so hard what to say. And I come in here and I feel this gap, you know, this just disconnect between the people who have stated clearly--and we're here for the third time to state clearly again we aren't into the bomb. We don't feel protected by the bomb. We feel threatened by the bomb. I didn't want to consider the bomb. I have faith in

DOE meeting

human beings. I knew we were bristling with bombs. So far so good. I thought we're not stupid enough to use them. But now I'm a leader of an environmental group that has 200 members. And they want me to come in here and they want me to say something that hooks up to the process. And they want us to be able to somehow or another shape this situation. And I personally don't have faith in this process. I'm afraid the conclusion is foregone. And I think about the people, the people that come in here and spend their time and contemplate the bomb and how lovely each individual I've met here has been. I came in and I thought there was an enemy. When I was a new activist I thought there was an enemy, and it was a man from Westinghouse who was friendly to me and I was all--I was a jerk. And I had to, you know, think about that later. I was a jerk. You know, the guy I thought was the enemy was the one who was nice to me. And I realized he loved his children and his wife. And I think that's where my thoughts kept going, to all the individuals in this room and what can I say. Lord help me, what can I say that we can start to bridge this gap and not think about this in ways that just don't connect but to connect. And I thought of singing "What a Wonderful World." I see trees of green and red roses, too. And my peeps talked me out of it because they wanted me to be professional and they wanted me to express the collective knowledge in our group, that we do know a lot about the Environmental Impact Statement and we know a lot about the environmental concerns that need to be addressed and we know a lot about the bomb. We know how many there are and it's ridiculous.

And so now I will say some things that I think fit the Environmental Impact Statement.

MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. You're getting close to 4 minutes, so--

MS. CARROLL: Thank you. Nuclear bombs destroy everything. That needs to be in the Environmental Impact Statement, that the product that we're discussing today destroys the environment. The argument that we need nuclear weapons is specious. Kings Bay, Georgia, which is one of two bases in the United States that has the Trident submarine, is the third largest superpower on earth, this one base. This weapons system is new. Its shelf life has not expired. We do not need bombs. And I submit our informational pamphlet into the brochure.

The alternative--what do you call this, alternative--the alternative. Zero nuclear weapons by 2030. We are genius. We invented the bomb and nuclear power. And now we just need to put our minds to nuclear waste. And we all need to work together to make sure the resources are here, to have the jobs and the technology and the safety culture to do this here. There's a article back on the paper that was in the Washington Post last week about Hanford's economic--

MR. BROWN: Can you just wrap things up now?

MS. CARROLL: Uh-huh.

MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. But we've got thirty speakers left.

MS. CARROLL: That's right. And so I will speak more again tonight and I would like to submit our simple fact sheet which does attempt to hook up with

DOE meeting

this system. And thank you all for being here and for your good will in seeking the middle ground and how to proceed from here.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Susan Winsor and Leslie Minerdis to follow.

MS. WINSOR: Good afternoon. I'm Dr. Susan Winsor, president of Aiken Technical College. And I appreciate the opportunity to comment today on the scope of the proposed Environmental Impact Statement related to Complex 2030. A smaller, more responsive nuclear deterrent is critical to our nation and this community is ready to do our part to meet that objective.

The Savannah River Site has performed admirably over the last 50-plus years and continues that tradition today. The communities surrounding SRS are highly supportive and trusting of the work that occurs there because of the outstanding safety record. We know that SRS will compete favorably in regard to infrastructure and technology, but we want to emphasize the importance of a safe mission performance and that this is the reason why we are comfortable with this site being the best choice.

Effective nuclear facility operation is rooted in the technical ability of workers to understand the process that they are controlling. Aiken Technical College has a long history of assuring that citizens in our region are trained and qualified to perform critical tasks in a demanding work environment. We are fully prepared to continue that tradition and emphasize that we are a willing partner with the Department of Energy in providing the skilled workforce needed to staff the Consolidated Plutonium Center. We have the training capacity necessary to meet SRS needs and have a good performance record in meeting both targeted and general training requirements of site employees.

Aiken Technical College and the educational systems throughout this region are up to the task of staffing these important nuclear security facilities. We fully support the goals of Complex 2030 and strongly urge you to site the CPC at the Savannah River Site. Thank you. And I'll submit this for the record.

MR. BROWN: Leslie Minerdis and Melanie Knight will be next.

MS. MINERDIS: Hi. My name is Leslie Minerdis and I am a member of Environmentalist, Inc., founded in 1972 and located in Columbia, South Carolina. And thanks for having us here today.

The DOE is, as usual, promoting this new plan as a jobs program here in South Carolina. There are DOE--DOE jobs--I'm nervous. There are DOE jobs to be had other than producing weapons of mass destruction. In the recent past up to 70 percent of DOE's budget has been earmarked for cleanup, and we applaud that. Now it appears that the DOE wants to slash cleanup funding and instead focus its money on weapons of mass destruction. This was made evident last night in Aiken at the DHEC Saltstone Disposal Facility permit hearing. The DOE wants to take shortcuts by mixing liquid radioactive waste with grout and treating it as landfill material. The only reason they can do this is because, in an effort to cut cleanup costs, the federal government, via Lindsey Graham, enacted legislation

DOE meeting

that allows DOE to reclassify high-level radioactive waste as incidental waste at their discretion. If the DOE really cares about the workers at SRS and the people of South Carolina why would they burden us with such unfair legislation, which, incidentally, applies only to South Carolina and Idaho? What makes us so expendable?

Oh, yes. While on the subject of jobs, how many jobs nationwide would be lost when DOE consolidates? Will it be similar to consolidations at Ford and at GM? Complex 2030 is sounding like not only a cut in cleanup but a cut in the number of DOE employees nationwide, especially for sites not anointed as or termed essential. It seems that what DOE really cares about is the defense contractors who are the ones that will really benefit from new weapons production. It's time for this nation to stop the corporate welfare program. United States is going broke. It's not too extreme to suggest that we are going the way of Rome or the Soviet Union, two empires that funneled so much of their own people's blood and money into their war machine that they both eventually collapsed from the burden. Think about that. We say yes to jobs that clean up the 50-plus years of accumulation of nuclear waste and no to jobs that break the back of this nation and turn us into the enemy of even more nations.

There's another thing I want to say. DOE--we have really good workers here at SRS, but unfortunately the site is not suitable. We are on a fault line. There are earthquakes in South Carolina. These fault lines are not inaccurate. This is the fault line that was responsible for the Charleston earthquake of 1868, the highest reported earthquake east of the Mississippi ever.

MR. BROWN: You've got 1 minute left.

MS. MINERD: Okay. Well, I'm finished.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MINERD: Oh, yeah. And the drinking water.

We're on top an aquifer right next to Savannah River. It's--you know, if we were in the desert it would be a great place to doing a cleanup. But we definitely need to be cleaning up here. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Melanie Knight and Ernie Chaput is next. You're up. I'm sorry. He will follow you. Melanie Knight.

MS. KNIGHT: I want my--now look at them bomb boys. That's the way you do it. You move the waste around the DOE. That ain't workin'. That's the way you do it. Money for nothin' and chicks for free. Now, that ain't workin'. That's the way you do it. Let me tell you that idea is dumb. Maybe get a tumor on your little brain. Maybe get a tumor on your tongue. They wanna install atom bomb factories, toxic waste dumps for you and me. They gotta move their plutonium pits. They gotta pay for their plasma TVs. See the giant contractor with his big mitt in the till. Yeah, buddy, that's corporate welfare. That little liar got his own jet airplane. That little thief, he's a trillionaire. We have to live on the dregs they leave us. They've got us down on our knees. We've gotta feed and educate our kids. We gotta pay for their plasma TVs. I shoulda learned to be oblivious. I shoulda learned to not give a sheet. Look at that

DOE meeting

mama. Can't feed her baby. While you suck on taxpayer teet. And you up there, what's that? More atom bombs? Stealin' all our money like a low-down thief. That ain't workin'. That's the way you do it. Get your money for nothin' and gettin' off scot-free. We gotta give all our taxes for this crap. We ain't gettin' our human needs. We gotta eat their nuclear waste and pay for their plasma TVs. That ain't workin', not the way they do it. All they're makin' is enemies. That ain't workin', not the way they do it. They're gettin' their money for nothing and gettin' off scot-free. What on earth are they talkin' about? That shelf life ain't about to expire. 15 years and tanks leakin' faster. Restartin' the arms race, in debt we'll mire. You gotta speak up for the economy and workers. But you gotta care about safety and health. Give the next generation an opportunity to live. You don't need to give CEOs more wealth.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. I'm sure Dire Straits would be flattered. Okay. Ernie. Is it Ernie Chaput? I don't know if I pronounced that correctly. And Bobbie Paul will follow.

MR. CHAPUT: Yes. My name is Ernie Chaput. I have been asked to read two letters for you and I will be brief and summarize them. First letter is from the South Carolina Department of Commerce from Joe Taylor, Secretary. It's addressed to the Honorable Linton Brooks.

The South Carolina Department of Commerce is pleased to support the Savannah River Site as the best location for the proposed Consolidated Plutonium Center. SRS has the technical expertise and facilities which make CPC a success and provide the National Nuclear Safety Administration with the best opportunity to support our nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. Many technical factors recommend SRS for the CPC mission, and I summarize: safety records, modern facilities, security, highly trained dedicated workforce, a national laboratory, and reliable production.

In addition to technical excellence SRS has one other important and unique advantage, strong and active regional support for DOE national security missions. CPC is welcomed by elected officials, regional civic and business leaders, and individual citizens. The community's vision for SRS includes continued and long-term DOE activities as part of a diversified socioeconomic base. The citizens of South Carolina understand SRS's unique characteristics and the site's ability to help DOE meet important national missions. Signed, Joe Taylor.

The second letter is from the Three Rivers Solid Waste Authority. It's signed by Colin Covington, General Manager.

Dear Ambassador Brooks: Three Rivers Solid Waste Authority is a political subdivision of the state of South Carolina, established in 1992 to provide regional management of non-hazardous solid waste for nine counties and 5,000 square miles of south central South Carolina. The purpose of this letter--and I'll--I'm going to just abbreviate the letter. The purpose of this letter is to convey our unqualified support for locating the Consolidated Plutonium Center on the

DOE meeting

Savannah River Site.

I will note that the Three Rivers location is on Savannah River Site so they see CPC as a good neighbor to their activity.

Savannah River Site conducts its activities with high regard to public safety and environmental protection. We know the extensive training, attention to detail, and safety culture. Talks about the many facilities designed to handle plutonium. It talks about the skill and training of the workers. Equally important, it notes the broad base of support in the region.

All these reasons argue strongly for locating Consolidated Plutonium Center at the Savannah River Site. And we thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on your important initiative. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Bobbie Paul, and she will be followed by Richard Lindsay.

MS. PAUL: Don't worry. I'm not going to sing. Hello everybody. Thank you for this opportunity very much. My name is Bobbie Paul and I'm the executive director of WAND, Women's Action for New Directions. We were founded as Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament in 1980. And I represent the Georgia chapter of WAND. We have twelve chapters in the country. Our main office is in Boston, and we also have a Washington, D.C. office. And we're around the country.

I'm here to speak out about Complex 2030. And as the head of Women's Action for New Directions I'd like to say that we think that this is going in the wrong direction. We do believe that we should be cleaning up, not building up. And we think that future generations depend on us. Children do ask the world of us and we must respond.

We've got to say no. We've got to stop making new warheads, new bombs, no matter what the term is. How can we tell the rest of the world not to do this and here we are making more bombs?

What do we tell our children? What do we tell them about supporting treaties, supporting the NPT, the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty that was a signatory to? How do we--do we have to disguise this?

The people have spoken before about this. This is old wine in new bottles. As other people have mentioned, there was the Complex whatever, and there was the Modern Pit Facility that we were here. That--the people spoke, said no, no, no, in 2003. Last year or the year before--I don't know; the years are running together so fast--it was the Reliable Nuclear Earth Penetrator. And if you didn't like that psychosexual language then we could call it the Bunker Buster. The people said no, and it was not funded in Congress. The people have spoken. But do we stop? No. Here we are again, as I said, old wine in new bottles. We are back here looking at more weapons. Reliable replacement warhead? Come on. There are new bombs.

So what we would say is bombs away. Let's clean up and not build up. And in closing I just want to say that a lot of people are asking what is our firepower. How much tritium are in new warheads? What is it? And so I'd like to do a little demonstration if Diane would

DOE meeting

help us--help me here. And I would like to--if you'll just stand over there, Diane. I would like to demonstrate--and this is a representation of how many nuclear warheads the U.S. actually has. First of all, Diane, would you just drop one BB into the bucket? That BB represents 15 Hiroshima-size bombs. Okay. Now, six BBs. That is enough nuclear weapons to blow up all of Russia. And now, with Diane's help, we'd like to demonstrate the strength of the total U.S. nuclear arsenal. That is the equivalent of 150,000 Hiroshima-size bombs. It costs our country about 17.6 billion dollars to maintain those weapons and their delivery systems currently. And if you'd like some of this information you can go to truemajority.org. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thanks. Okay. Richard Lindsay and Diane Valentin will be next.

MR. LINDSAY: Hello. My name is Richard Lindsay. I'm here representing--as the spokesperson for my family and to honor the legacy and memory of my father. My father was employed at the Savannah River Site in Aiken from 1952 to 1964. He was diagnosed with adenocarcinoma of the stomach with metastasis to the liver, lung, and lymph nodes. He passed away in July of 1964. He was 53 years of age. He began working there at the age of 41. In the year 2000 Congress signed into law legislation known as the EEOICPA or Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act. In 2002 my brother, Attorney Allen Lindsay, filed a claim on behalf of my mother for a federal payment of compensation for the death of my father for developing an occupational illness as a result of his employment and his exposure to radiation. My father worked under the perceived acceptable level--under a perceived acceptable level of radiation exposure. He was a very well-respected member of the community. At the time my father went to work at Savannah River Site it was considered a real privilege to work there. He went through background checks, extensive background checks, and was chosen. There was high level of secrecy at the time that my father worked at the bomb plant. And that's what it was commonly called at that time. He was a breadwinner and he was willing to sacrifice his life. He knew he was--he knew it was serious, the work that he was doing. However, he knew that this was a high-paying occupation, and he wanted to take care of his family. And that proved to be his ultimate sacrifice. All of my father's siblings lived to be a ripe old age, some in their late 80s and 90s. He even had a sister who was 104 years of age. My father died at an early age of 53. And just as he had been the youngest of thirteen, I am the youngest of ten. My father paid the ultimate sacrifice. And I'm going to try not to be emotional, but I want to implore you to cherish the sanctity of life. I see people here, and I'm listening to people say and talk about the efficacy of resuming the operation of this plant. And I think about your fathers, your brothers, your nephews. You're someone's son. And I was robbed of that opportunity. I was only 8 years old when my father passed. Lives are going to be sacrificed if this happens. There's no safe standard. You can use lab rats; you can use guinea pigs. But that's only in

DOE meeting

theory. When you think about it, I loved my father. I miss him terribly. I thank you for the opportunity.

MR. BROWN: Thanks, Richard. Diane Valentin.

MS. VALENTIN: Well, that's not good 'cause I guess I'm a crybaby anyway. But the point I wanted to make--and I'm not really sure if a lot of people consider it--is that nuclear weapons are a dinosaur, and we really need to start looking forward. And I respect the fact that you sit here and listen to everything that we have to say because I noticed that a lot of our representatives made their statements in support of this effort and they left before a lot of the public comment was being made. So they're not hearing what a lot of the people are saying. They're gone. They've already left the room. If any of you are still out there I respect the fact that you stayed and are listening.

But we need to inspire our young scientists and engineers to look beyond instead of finding ways to fix what's old. We have always tried to be on the leading edge of technology and thoughts and processes. And we really need to stop looking backwards on this nuclear weapons issue. We're too intelligent for that. We have to stop. We have to go forward. The whole process is dirty. It's not safe. We don't talk much about the waste and the waste is what's killing us. And we really need to find a way to contain the waste, deal with it, but we also need to be looking forward at new technologies. We have the capacity; we have the people. And when we inspire our young people to know that we would support them in the Department of Energy and NRC, anyplace to be looking beyond this dinosaur that we're dealing with, then I think it would spark a movement forward. We have to stop looking back at this old stuff. We're kind of tired of it. It doesn't make any sense. So listen to what the people are saying. We know that it's dirty, and we know that you know that it's dirty. So we really need to stop wasting our time and our energy on the same old stuff. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Janet Wedlock is next. I didn't give you too much notice. Janet will be followed by Natasha McFarley.

MS. WEDLOCK: My name is Janet Wedlock. I'm a resident of Bluffton, South Carolina. I'm a leader of my local Sierra Club and therefore a member of the National Sierra Club, which I would remind you is the largest environmental organization in the country.

In brief, the Sierra Club opposes the DOE/NNSA proposal to build new facilities to manufacture plutonium warheads or to conduct nuclear weapons research and development, period. For contact information I have, for the record, the Conservation Chair of our local group and also the Chair, Linda Modica, for the Sierra Club National Radiation Committee. Thank you for your consideration.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Natasha McFarley, and Anthony Grant will follow.

MS. MCFARLEY: Good afternoon. My name is Natasha McFarley. I am the administrative assistant here representing Mayor Deke Copenhaver, Mayor of Augusta-Richmond County. He has a letter addressed to Mr. Ted Wyka.

As Mayor of the City of Augusta, I am sending this

DOE meeting

Letter in support of DOE's streamlining its R&D production facilities which will result in the building of a new Consolidated Plutonium Center to perform plutonium research, development and production manufacturing activities.

As you know, the Augusta Commission demonstrated its commitment to this product--project--I'm sorry--by adopting a resolution in 2003 which supported locating the Modern Pit Facility at the SRS and will no doubt reaffirm that support for the Consolidated Plutonium Center, a multi-billion dollar facility, stimulating significant job growth in our community at our next regularly scheduled Commission meeting Thursday, November 9th, 2006, at two o'clock p.m.

We realize that this is a much more attractive mission for SRS with greater economic impact for the surrounding communities as with its extensive expertise, experience, and well-trained workforce. Savannah River Site is well-suited for this mission and should be a leading contender for this initiative.

The CPC fits well with Augusta's community vision for the future of Savannah River Site and, as Mayor of the City of Augusta, I wholeheartedly support locating this mission at the Savannah River Site. By copy of this communication I am asking the Clerk of Commission to forward you a copy of the resolution supporting this mission once it is approved. Very truly yours, Deke Copenhaver, Mayor.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Anthony Grant, and Ann Mauncy will follow.

MR. GRANT: My name is Anthony Grant and I'm representing the Office of the President for South Carolina State University. I have a letter here addressed to Mr. Wyka. It reads: South Carolina State University would like to go on record as supporting the Savannah River Site as the site of choice for the Consolidated Plutonium Center. A smaller, more responsive, yet fully effective nuclear deterrent is certainly in the best interests of the nation. There should be no doubt that the Savannah River Site is an ideal location for the missions associated with the Consolidated Plutonium Center and the portion of that plan.

Whether we look at the safety record at SRS, the range of technical expertise and the experience with difficult materials, or the total area available for the new missions, there are clear advantages to making effective use of this resource for the Consolidated Plutonium Center. There are few industries at all, much less within the nuclear field, that can compete with the day-to-day safety record of the current contractor at the Savannah River Site. History proves that the workforce working there have managed to meet production and management objectives without diminishing their concern for the environment and the surrounding communities'. Finally, the size of the Savannah River Site and the success at the diminishing legacy buildings and programs make it ideal for consideration for new missions such as this one.

The Savannah River National Lab certainly would enhance this opportunity with the facility and its scientists have accumulating years of expertise in working with materials that require the highest level

DOE meeting

of care. They are very well-versed in solving knotty, field-based application problems safely for over a half century. That experience is an invaluable component in the sort of work that is proposed.

Finally, there are few, if any, sites in the DOE complex that enjoy the level of community support that is present for the Savannah River Site. That is the direct result of engagement with the community, a high regard for safety and effectiveness, and a fantastic record of performance over the years. I am confident that you will not find a community more supportive of this mission than the Central Savannah River Area. Sincerely, Dr. Andrew Hugine, Jr., President of South Carolina State University. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thanks. Ann--is it Muncy or Mauncy?

MS. MAUNEY: Mauncy.

MR. BROWN: Mauncy. Okay. Fred Humes will be next.

MS. MAUNEY: Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Ann Mauncy. I came today to learn more about this new proposal and to voice my opinion and my view of reality. Reality number one: dangers of nuclear bomb production to health and human life of workers and area residents have been made clear for generations. Reality number two: nuclear weapons make us and the world less, rather than more, secure. Advancing an agenda of new nuclear weapons production can take place only by creating an alternative reality based on fear and secrecy. Fear continues to be used to build support for military solutions to national security needs. Today's world events are teaching us, yet again, that only economic and political developments can make us move toward real security. Secrecy keeps the true cost from public view when the deaths and threats to human health have also been documented for generations. I join millions of Americans who, first, believe that U.S. military aggression makes us less, not more, secure; and, two, who want the billions of dollars to go to establishing good education, health care for all, and well-paying and healthful jobs that serve human needs. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Fred Humes. Roger LeDuc will be next.

MR. HUMES: Thank you. I am Fred Humes and I am the director of Economic Development Partnership. My organization represents manufacturing and industrial development in Aiken and Edgefield Counties. We also work very closely to incorporate and to integrate the missions of the Savannah River Site into our local community through support of appropriate new missions and also through technology transfer. And I am here today to say that Savannah River Site is a valued neighbor and also well suited for Complex 2030's new Consolidated Plutonium Center. And I might add that we do not consider this as a jobs program. It is rather a matter of national security and that is the basis of our support.

We follow the NNSA's efforts to modernize our nuclear--our nation's nuclear weapons complex and to correct deficiencies which have created troubling gaps in the nation's ability to maintain a reliable nuclear stockpile. We applaud your efforts for a smaller, responsive and cost-efficient Complex 2030. We believe

DOE meeting

you have prepared an excellent blueprint for maintaining our country's nuclear deterrence in an uncertain and troubling world.

You've heard it said many--by many people up here about the attributes of Savannah River Site and I will not go into any detail on that. But just to reiterate, SRS has a strong program of worker and public safety and environmental protection which consistently puts SRS as a leader among the DOE sites. We have a skilled workforce with hands-on--and I think that's important--with hands-on experience in large-scale plutonium operations. We have a superb national laboratory which has core competency in actinide chemistry. We have a modern infrastructure which can meet most of the CPC requirements. And many of our existing infrastructure capabilities are designed to meet production-scale plutonium requirements which should result in significant savings. The SRS security posture is excellent. We have a successful history of working with the design laboratories in tritium research and development, and this same model can be used with CPC as it relates to specific plutonium R&D and surveillance activities. And I think, importantly, we have a customer-oriented outlook from the Savannah River Site with a flawless record of on-time deliveries.

Our citizens are proud of our past contributions to the security of this nation, and we want to continue to play a major role in meeting energy security and defense needs.

Finally, I have a recommendation and that is that good public policy should preclude the establishment of a new plutonium site. DOE is currently struggling with decontamination and decommissioning at several closure sites and individual buildings which have been involved in past plutonium activities. And rather than create new plutonium legacies prudence would dictate that new plutonium activities be placed in locations which currently have facilities with a history of safe plutonium operations.

I think that all of these factors I've mentioned and all of those that you have heard from those that support the CPC identify SRS as ideally suited for this mission. And we suggest that DOE identify SRS as the preferred alternative for location of the Complex in your draft Environmental Impact Statement.

I would also like to submit to the record letters from Mayor Ken Durham from the Town of Edgefield in support of this initiative and also from Monroe Kneece, Chairman of Edgefield County Council along with my comments. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Thanks, Fred. Roger LeDuc.

MR. LEDUC: I'm Roger LeDuc. I'm the City Manager for the City of Aiken. And you asked today for us to give comments as to why and what should be considered as far as elements in selecting sites for the CPC. As we look at this as the City of Aiken, which is the--probably the largest closest community to the site--we serve over 75,000 individuals in our area--and we have been supporting the site since the early '50s when it came to this area. And we feel that safety is one of the major reasons that you should look at this area. The workforce that we have, the security needs

DOE meeting

that are in the area, the expertise that's available from our community, the reliability that is provided at this particular location, and the support--and most of all the local support that you have from all the communities and all the elected officials from this area. With that in mind, our mayor is out of the country, but he asked me to read this letter which is addressed to Ambassador Brooks. I am pleased to support the Savannah River Site as the best location for the proposed Consolidated Plutonium Center. SRS has the technical expertise and facilities which will make CPC a success and provide NNSA with the best opportunity to support our nation's nuclear weapons stockpile.

Many technical factors recommend SRS for the CPC mission: 1) DOE's best long-term safety record; 2) modern facilities especially designed for plutonium activities; 3) excellent security with proven capability to safeguard large quantities of plutonium; 4) highly trained and dedicated workforce, many with plutonium experience; 5) the Savannah River National Laboratory with core competency in plutonium; 6) proven history of reliable production support to the nuclear stockpile.

In addition to technical excellence, SRS has one other important and unique advantage, strong and active regional support for DOE national security programs. CPC is welcomed by elected officials, regional civic and business leaders and individual citizens. The community's vision for SRS includes continued and long-term DOE activities as part of a diversified socioeconomic base. The citizens of Aiken understand SRS's unique characteristics and the site's ability to help DOE meet important national missions. We are equally enthusiastic about a long-term effective partnership between DOE and our community. And we look forward to supporting NNSA and DOE as the host site for the CPC. Sincerely, Fred Cavanaugh, Mayor.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Gary Perez. And Milton Widener will be after you, Gary.

MR. PEREZ: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Gary Perez. I currently work in the EEO Diversity Office at Washington Savannah River Company. And I'm here today to read a letter to the--addressed to the Honorable Samuel Bodman, Secretary of Energy, from the Washington Savannah River Company Diversity Board of Directors, expressing their support for the Complex 2030 Consolidated Plutonium Center.

Dear Senator [sic] Bodman: The Washington Savannah River Company Diversity Board of Directors is writing in support of locating the Complex 2030 Consolidated Plutonium Center here at Savannah River Site.

The Washington--there are several reasons we feel SRS would be an excellent location for the CPC. They include: demonstrating a strong commitment to diversity and teamwork; cultivating a large, diverse, experienced workforce with a notable safety and security record; exhibiting over 50-plus years experience with safe handling of plutonium and other isotopes; providing cutting edge technology solutions, both at SRS and abroad at Savannah River National Laboratory; demonstrating a strong commitment to

DOE meeting

educational and community outreach in the seven-county area surrounding SRS; and having the privilege of tremendous community support for current and new missions.

WSRC recognizes diversity and teamwork as crucial components of the organization's strategic business outlook and as such the WSRC Diversity Board of Directors, or DBOD, was created in 1997 to ensure that we continue to maximize the potential of all of our human resources at the SRS. The WSRC Company president sponsors our mission and routinely removes barriers as needed in support of actions the DBOD deems necessary. We certainly believe that this commitment to the people that make up the SRS gives us the competitive edge and sustainable competitive advantage.

At WSRC, we recognize that our people are our most valuable resource, and the WSRC Board of Directors fully supports and endorses the Savannah River Site as the location for the new Consolidated Plutonium Center.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Milton Widener, and he will be followed by David Jameson.

MR. WIDENER: Thank you very much. And I'd like to start off with saying just thank you to DOE/NNSA for the opportunity in letting the Town of Williston and surrounding communities in voicing our opinions as to the possibility of new missions for Savannah River. There again, my name is Milton Widener. I'm Mayor Pro Tem. Mayor Rivers regrets that he could not be here today, but he sends his words in the letter that follows.

The Town of Williston is in support of the Consolidated Plutonium Center, the CPC, being placed at the Savannah River Site for plutonium R&D and production manufacturing activities.

Our community has a long history of supporting the site and all of the missions that have been assigned to it over the years. We believe that the Savannah River Site located in South Carolina should receive favorable review for this extremely important mission. The fact that our region's unique community of scientific and technological experience in the safe use and management of nuclear materials should make the Savannah River Site the preferred site. The site's capabilities are well suited for this mission and the CPC fits within our vision of the future for SRS.

The Williston Town Council fully supports and encourages the evaluation and assessment for the Consolidated Plutonium Center to be located at the Savannah River. Sincerely, Mayor Thomas R. Rivers. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. David Jameson. Debra Atkinson will follow.

MR. JAMESON: My name is David Jameson. I'm the president of Greater Aiken Chamber of Commerce. I will be reading a comment from the Aiken Chamber and also a comment from the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce.

The Greater Aiken Chamber of Commerce supports the selection of the Savannah River Site as the preferred location for building the new Consolidated Plutonium Center.

The Chamber represents 856 individual businesses and more than 30,000 employees within the CSRA.

I am proud that our community has the opportunity

DOE meeting

to contribute to the Department of Energy Complex 2030 vision and its extremely important national mission. The Savannah River Site and our local community have a long history of working together to achieve positive results. With the largest and most qualified workforce prepared to take on a monumental mission from this Consolidated Plutonium Center, the site has extensive experience in handling plutonium as well as an outstanding safety, security and environmental record.

With the strong existing infrastructure at the Savannah River Site and the supportive political climate within the CSRA, the Greater Aiken Chamber of Commerce fully supports and endorses building the new Consolidated Plutonium Center at the Savannah River Site.

Now, this is the message from Howard Hunter, Jr., President and CEO of the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce. This serves as a formal expression of support by the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce for designating the Savannah River Site as the location for the Department of Energy's initiative to streamline plutonium R&D and production facilities and to build a new Consolidated Plutonium Center. Because this facility will be critical to our national security the South Carolina Chamber wholeheartedly supports DOE's initiative.

Recent events around the world demonstrate that the imperative for new--for a nuclear deterrent remain compelling. It is critical that adequate and dependable nuclear weapons stockpiles be maintained.

In light of Savannah River Site's outstanding industrial safety record, staffing expertise, cost-cutting facilities and enviable community support the South Carolina Chamber fully endorses SRS as the most viable location for the planned Consolidated Plutonium Center.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Debra Atkinson, and Ed Templeton will be next.

MS. ATKINSON: Good afternoon. I'm Debra Atkinson with Midland Valley Chamber of Commerce. The Midland Valley Area Chamber of Commerce believes that as long as a nuclear deterrent remains part of an established national policy it is imperative that it be maintained in a workable manner.

The Midland Valley Area has long supported the mission and programs at the Savannah River Site. Our community would be--more than welcome the positive economic impact this facility would create. The educational institutions in our community already work with the site and are more than willing to provide any additional training that may be needed.

The Complex 2030 should be placed at a location that has the proven expertise to support the mission. That location without question is the Savannah River Site. The infrastructure is firmly in place at the site to perform this task and provide the necessary monitoring to ensure our environment is protected.

We feel like--that this objective must be accomplished in the safest and most economical facility with the least amount of impact to our environment. The Midland Valley Area Chamber of Commerce believes that the Savannah River Site is uniquely qualified to handle this mission. Thank you.

DOE meeting

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Ed Templeton, and Rick Ford will be next.

MR. TEMPLETON: Good afternoon. Thank you. I'm Ed Templeton. I'm president of SRP Federal Credit Union, but more importantly, I'm a citizen of the CSRA. First let me say that I support the maintenance of a strong U.S. defense. I think it's critical for the future that so many people have talked about today. I'm encouraged when I hear words like cost-effectiveness and more encouraged when I hear words like consolidation. In the corporate world we refer to that as leverage, doing more with what you have rather than putting more on the table. So I'm encouraged when I hear comments like those.

As I grow older I become more concerned with the environment. I think everybody has to do things individually to protect the environment. But I also know and I believe that we have to look to people who are trained and have the experience and skills to guide us in that protection, and I think SRS is rich with those people. They've spent years perfecting, learning, and plying the trades.

Many people talk about community support for SRS. But I think more important than support is community comfort with SRS. It's one thing to support something, but it's much different when you're comfortable with the activities. And SRS has earned that comfort level through years and years of safety and through being a place that we all are not afraid of but we rather have grown to know.

In summary, I'd like to say that this project is the right thing to do, the consolidation effort. And more importantly I'd like to say that SRS is the right place to do it. Thank you. I have a written comment that I'll give to you.

MR. BROWN: All right. Thank you. Rick Ford, and James Hendrix is next on the list.

MR. FORD: Good afternoon. My name is Rick Ford. To eliminate any confusion amongst some of my friends here today who don't know this, I'm a retired DOE spokesman, and I'm here to represent the Southeast Environmental Management Association. Our president will submit a background letter and these remarks as well this evening. I've been authorized to speak for our entire membership, which encompasses most of the small and large companies in the southeast and, for all intents and purposes, those from across the country who have successfully enabled the accomplishment of DOE programs including all of those involving plutonium management.

SEMA fully endorses the Department of Energy's plans for Complex 2030 and the CPC and in particular its location at the SRS. SRS is current in plant infrastructure and demonstrated experience with plutonium and SEMA members' direct participation in those successful programs gives SEMA the highest confidence that SRS will fill--most logically fill the mission that is anticipated under this program.

SRS and the Central Savannah River Area have a 50-year record of supporting our country's national defense activities. SRS has safely processed and stored various nuclear materials over this entire time frame. Its experience in handling all forms of

DOE meeting

plutonium on a large scale is unexcelled in the DOE complex. Over the years SRS has processed or recovered about 40 tons of plutonium with an unequalled industrial and radiological safety record.

There are several specific reasons that SEMA believes give credence to locating the CPC at SRS. SRS already has related specialized plutonium facilities for the most streamlined integration with the infrastructure necessary to support the deployment of the CPC in the most efficient and cost-effective manner. SRS has a trained operations and management core team who have firsthand experience over many years to afford the best opportunity for successful startup and operation of the CPC. These existing capabilities are unique and will help assure project success and save money. SRS workers have consistently demonstrated their ability to do the job safely. And finally, the Central Savannah River Area has been, and will continue to be, a strong supporter for DOE programs at SRS. SRS is a good neighbor and a valued part of our two-state regional base. Again, no other location in the country can compare to SRS in capabilities, safety and environmental performance, and community support. We believe these advantages argue uniquely for locating the CPC at SRS.

In summary, the SEMA member companies strongly support the CPC proposal and unanimously recommend that it be located at the Savannah River Site. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Thanks. James Hendrix, and Roscoe Williams will follow.

MR. HENDRIX: Good afternoon. I'm James Hendrix. I'm the executive director of the SRS Community Reuse Organization. We provide the following input letter to Mr. Wyka.

The SRS Community Reuse Organization is pleased to provide input on the scope of the proposed Environmental Impact Statement related to Complex 2030. We support your plan to develop a smaller and fully responsive nuclear weapons complex and strongly endorse the Savannah River Site as an ideal location to implement these national security programs.

Our organization was formed by Congress to represent the interests of communities adjacent to and impacted by the Savannah River Site. We represent five counties located in Georgia and South Carolina. Our mission is to foster economic development associated with SRS technology and human capital and to serve as a unified voice for the regional community. The SRSCRO Board of Directors includes twenty-two community leaders representing business, academia, economic development groups, County Councils, and Congressional delegation appointees. Our Board is diverse and well informed on matters pertaining to SRS and its role in shaping the future of our community.

As you seek weapons complex integration and efficiency, we point to the record of success at SRS. In its tritium mission, SRS continues to demonstrate an ability to integrate R&D activities with production scale operation. They continue to improve the efficiency of the Defense Waste Processing Facility, saving taxpayer dollars while cleaning up the environment faster than originally planned. Because of

DOE meeting

SRS' expertise, DOE is already using the site to store and process excess plutonium to meet non-proliferation goals. These are but a few examples which demonstrate SRS is uniquely qualified to integrate the plutonium missions related to Complex 2030.

Our region has answered the call for over 50 years when the nation asked that we produce nuclear defense materials. The SRSCRO states with confidence that we are ready to continue that tradition. We urge you to consider the breadth and the depth of our community support as you choose the best location for the Complex 2030 Consolidated Plutonium Center.

We have attached also to the letter a list of our board of directors. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Roscoe Williams, and Art Williams will follow.

MR. ROSCOE WILLIAMS: Good afternoon. I appear on behalf of our president at Paine College, Dr. Shirley A. R. Lewis, who gives her unqualified support to SRC's improving its response capabilities and improving its infrastructure. I would like to read a letter on her behalf, if I may, please. It's directed to Mr. Wyka.

Thanks for the opportunity for comment on the scope of the proposed Environmental Impact Statement for the Complex 2030 Consolidated Plutonium Center. I believe that Savannah River Site should be selected as the site of choice for the Consolidated Plutonium Center, CPC. As you may know, SRS has exhibited well over the last 50 years of experience with the safe handling of plutonium as well as providing cutting edge technology solutions both at SRS and abroad at Savannah River National Laboratory.

SRS capabilities are well sited for this mission and the CPC fits the community's vision for the SRSC [sic]--SRS' future. The site's emergency response services, security force, engineering expertise, laboratory services, and research and development capabilities are world class within the DOE complex.

SRS continues to be a good neighbor as well as the employees at the site. The site demonstrates a strong commitment to education and community outreach in the Central Savannah River Area.

Therefore, I fully support the selection of SRS for this important mission. And I congratulate you on your concept of a smaller, yet effective nuclear deterrent for our country. Sincerely, Dr. Shirley A. R. Lewis, President.

MR. BROWN: Art Williams, and Marty Martin will follow.

MR. ART WILLIAMS: Good afternoon. My name is Art Williams. I'm the County Administrator for Allendale County. I bring you greetings on behalf of Allendale County Council and the citizens of Allendale.

Dear Secretary Bodman: Your Department has begun consideration of site selection for components of Complex 2030, the visionary streamlining and consolidation of the nuclear weapons complex into a smaller, cost-efficient and responsive infrastructure which can meet our country's long-term needs for nuclear weapons into an uncertain future. I believe that locating the Consolidation [sic] Plutonium Center at the Savannah River Site is the best choice for DOE and the nation.

DOE meeting

SRS has been our neighbor for over five decades and the site has demonstrated an enviable record of safety and environmental protection, dependability and scientific skill which is necessary to successfully accomplish the important CPC mission. Some of these attributes are: a modern and flexible infrastructure which is uniquely suited to large-scale plutonium operation. By utilizing existing assets and talent, DOE will reduce the cost of establishing the CPC and increase reliability of operation protection. SRS has an open and professional relationship with its regulators which is important for assuring public confidence and increasing operational performance. The Savannah River National Laboratory has core competency in plutonium activities and a strong heritage in directly supporting plutonium operational activities. A highly capable security force which is trained to protect large quantities of special nuclear materials operating facilities. This force, together with SRS's large size, provide an excellent environment for protecting the CPC vital national mission.

In addition to the most complete array of physical and intellectual assets, SRS has a broad base of regional support for conducting DOE missions. Community support for DOE missions at SRS is legendary, and includes elected officials and civic leaders at the local, regional and state level. A supportive community can help DOE achieve its Complex 2030 objectives in a timely and cost-effective manner.

The Savannah River Site offers DOE many advantages for location of the Consolidated Plutonium Center. I support CPC at SRS and recommend its selection in your recently initiated Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement process.

And I also bring you letters of support from the Allendale Development Board, represented by Robert Thomas as its chairman. And I bring you a letter of support from the University of South Carolina Salkehatchie with letters from Mr. Pat Ciez, Director of the Center for Business Development. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Marty Martin, and Keith Sloan will be next.

MR. MARTIN: Good afternoon. My name is Marty Martin. I'm the executive director for the Barnwell County Economic Development Commission. As many before me have stated, the reasons why the SRS--the new mission at SRS is right for Savannah River Site I will concur with that without going into a great amount of detail. As Ronnie Young earlier stated, and very proudly so, that 40 percent of the DOE site is in Aiken County. We in Barnwell County and our neighbor of Allendale County are also very proud that over 60 percent or the 60 remaining percent of that is located in our two counties. We are very proud to have Savannah River Site as our neighbor. And we wholeheartedly endorse this effort. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Keith Sloan, and Jeanette Brooks will follow Keith.

MR. SLOAN: Hello. My name is Keith Sloan. I'm the current Vice-Chairman and incoming Chairman of the Barnwell County Council. I have a couple of remarks I'd like to make and then a letter I'd like to read from Barnwell County Council. I also have a letter of

DOE meeting

support from the Southern Carolina Alliance from its Chairman, Mr. Carl Gooding and a letter from Bamberg County in support of the CPC from Isaih Odom, its Chairman.

As Mr. Martin mentioned, Barnwell County has contributed approximately 60 percent of the land to Savannah River Site. In addition to the commitment and support for DOE and the DOD missions at the site, we have continued over the years to express our support for DOD, DOE and commercial nuclear activities. In the late 1960s/early 1970s we were the chosen site for the only commercial nuclear fuel reprocessing facility in the country. Unfortunately that facility was never operational due a change in federal policy. We also are the site for the Chem-Nuclear low-level waste site, which supports the educational and medical industries as well as commercial clients through the disposal opportunities available there.

I'd like to now read the letter from Barnwell County. It's submitted by Richard L. Huggins, Chairman. I appreciate the chance to comment on the scope of the proposed Environmental Impact Statement and I wish to congratulate the Department for its foresight, creativity and initiative in devising your vision of Complex 2030. Your concept of a smaller, more responsive, yet fully effective nuclear deterrent is one that deserves to be implemented.

Your decision on the location of the Consolidated Plutonium Facility [sic], CPC, perhaps the centerpiece of the whole concept, will surely take into account the numerous advantages of the Savannah River Site. I am confident that analysis of the environmental impacts, as well as the broader managerial, scientific, financial and infrastructure factors, will lead to the selection of the Savannah River Site for this essential project. The socioeconomic environment must also be taken into account and I feel comfortable in assuring you that the communities of Barnwell County fully support the selection of SRS for this important mission.

As you are well aware, for example, SRS has abundant applicable infrastructure for a project such as the Consolidated Plutonium Center. There are emergency response services, security services, on-site engineering and construction support, laboratory services, research and development, medical and industrial hygiene services and full-scale environmental protection and monitoring services supporting SRS' ongoing functions. None of this would have to be established anew or appreciably increased with the location of the CPC at SRS. Therefore, the incremental impact on the environment would be much less than might otherwise be expected at a different location. SRS' history of safety, excellence, expertise and service are also second to none.

Barnwell County Council fully supports the creation of the Consolidated Plutonium Center for the benefit of the nation's defense and fully supports its siting at the Savannah River Site. Very truly yours,
Richard L. Huggins, Chairman, Barnwell County Council.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Jeanette Brooks. Michael Hunt will be next.

MS. BROOKS: Good afternoon. My name is Jeanette

DOE meeting

Brooks. I'm the president of the Savannah River Site Chapter of the National Management Association. I have a letter here that I want to read addressed to Mr. Ted Wyka.

It is an honor that the local chapter of the National Management Association takes this opportunity to express how pleased we are that the Savannah River Site is considered suitable for the Consolidated Plutonium Center. The members of the Savannah River National Chapter 773 believe that the Savannah River Site would be a majestic location to service the plutonium interest of the nation due to several key considerations, to include: the volume of experienced R&D, research and development, workforce with production waste handling capabilities; the comprehensive R&D support infrastructure; the large nuclear knowledge base in the CSRA; the unparalleled security services; the world-class safety record at SRS; and the tremendous community support for the missions at the Savannah River.

The creation of a Consolidated Plutonium Center is necessary to fulfill the mission for the streamlined plutonium R&D facilities. A key component of this initiative is the ability to maintain the nation's environmental stewardship. Consolidation and operation of the research and development facilities nationally is an effective process to put in place.

We in the SRS National Management Association Chapter believe it is imperative that the nation should continue to develop plans for the plutonium research and development and we strongly believe the Savannah River Site is the best location for the construction and operation of the proposed Consolidated Plutonium Center. Sincerely, Jeanette Brooks, President of Savannah River National Chapter.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Michael Hunt. Is Michael here? Terry Elam? Donald Orth? Donald is here. Donald will be followed by Brendolyn Jenkins.

MR. ORTH: Yes. I am Donald Orth. I represent no organization except some of us who spent 40-plus years out in operations at the plant. There's various factors that have not been raised, a couple of them, that I think should influence the location of the Complex. The conclusion is that, yes, it should be at Savannah River.

There's the factors that aren't generally conceived of involved: the environmental, technological and social factors. Now, we've had the technological factors mentioned by various people. But the environmental one is not generally raised. The ecology and the environment should be considered from the standpoint of knowing enough about it so that if there are changes as a result of locating your complex here you can find it. You will notice it and then you have a chance to correct whatever misoperations might have occurred. We have on one hand the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory, which virtually since startup has been characterizing the site, determining the growth, second growth, and third growth, as the case may be; what has happened to the animals; what is happening in the sites that have seen radioactivity. Another study that was recently concluded by the Centers for Disease Control involving the SRS Health Effects Subcommittee,

DOE meeting

which finally came to the conclusion after ten years that exposures, radioactive doses and exposures were too low to warrant any further detailed epidemiological studies, which is a nice conclusion. But, again, it also says that any changes due to a complex shall be easily detected.

Technology background should be a characterization and people have said how well we have done. The facilities can be built on the concepts of containment, maintenance and safety that were incorporated 50 years ago into the second, that it amounts to, plutonium production lines. The principles that were included gave this site no fires, explosions, criticalities or accidents of note in any of the plutonium operations. Of course, new facilities wouldn't be built on the basis of what we did 50 years ago. But the lessons learned from that--and there were lessons learned--that if we ever did get a chance to build another one we could do even a better job. And, of course, from the standpoint of people, there does remain a large retiree pool who could be selected if any new facilities were coming in and existing personnel were lacking.

Finally, the Aiken-Augusta area is a desirable place to live in terms of climate, amenities, regional attractions and access to the sea and mountains. Such factors aid in attracting and keeping personnel. In the particular case of the complex, personnel with needed experience in particular plutonium operations who were at sites that were not given the complex would find no hardship in relocating to the CRSA and even might welcome the change.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay. Brendolyn Jenkins.

MS. JENKINS: Good afternoon. I'm Reverend Brendolyn Jenkins, pastor in the Aiken community. I'm the executive director of the AMANI Group and the president of the Aiken Branch NAACP. I'm a former member and Co-Chair of Citizens Advisory Board as well as the Savannah River Site Diversity Board of Directors.

It is a firm belief of mine that we should be called to be--we should be called to be peacemakers and not peacekeepers. Peacekeepers maintain status quo which requires biggest and most powerful. But a peacemaker encourages changes in behavior toward peace through a demonstrative display. We can't talk about dismantling warheads and making warheads available at the same time. In the climate we live in today that seems very much to be double-speak. That being said though, we must recognize that we cannot make a decision simply to support this recommendation based on dollars and cents. There are many assessments that must and are being considered. However, in this development we must consider those that are underserved and the community that this would impact in a socioeconomic way. We would pray that in the creation of this process and this development that it would help create within our schools, secondary through higher education, opportunities for an entire community to learn this technology in a safe way that protects the health and safety of the workers as well as the community. There are businesses in our communities that are closing, industries that are closing, so this does create jobs and job creation. It is vitally

DOE meeting

important. We will continue to study this proposal and hopefully choose and--and inform our various stakeholder communities of the pros and cons of this proposal. As an environmental justice advocate and as a former Co-Chair of the Citizens Advisory Board, I am well aware that Savannah River Site has the expertise and competence and the brain trust to build this Consolidated Plutonium Center. The Savannah River Site has been a good neighbor, a good corporate neighbor. We would hope that you would choose the alternative that would be toward not only creation. We look forward to a continued relationship with NNSA as well as the Department of Energy and the Washington Savannah River Site. We hope that you would maintain open dialogue with all stakeholders in all communities as you seek to realize the process and the existence of Consolidated Plutonium Center. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Peter Brodie.

MR. BRODIE: Good afternoon. And thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Pete Brodie. I am President and CEO of the University Health Care Foundation, which is an affiliate of University Health Care System. I'm also a member of the Development Authority of Columbia County, Georgia, and a former chairman and member of the Board of Commissioners of Columbia County. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the critical issue of siting a new Consolidated Plutonium Center and recognize the importance of early planning for such a complex facility. September the 11th, Al-Qaeda, Hamas, the PLO, Iraq, Syria, Iran, North Korea. With deep respect for those people who have an opposing view, my reality in today's world is that our country needs long-term assurance of a credible nuclear deterrent.

At least partly because of SRS' decades of experience with plutonium, DOE has chosen SRS to take surplus pits apart, convert them to fuel feedstock, and manufacture nuclear fuel from them. In the past years SRS has made plutonium for the defense program and for deep space probes. It has arranged shipments to other sites without incident. It therefore just makes good common sense to take full advantage of all this knowledge and experience and put it to further use to perform plutonium research and development and production manufacturing.

It should not come as a surprise--it's certainly no secret--that our business community would embrace the potential addition of new permanent jobs in our community and the added commercial opportunities that would come from such a high-technology facility. However, the best argument for siting this facility at SRS is that such an addition can be made without adverse impact to the environment or to local facilities and it can be made safely.

In short, I support--we--my board supports the pursuit of the new Consolidated Plutonium Center and believe that it should be built at the Savannah River Site. Thank you, sir.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. That was the last person who signed up to speak. We are within about 3 minutes of adjourning. I know you've got a long ride home, don't you? Okay. If no one else has any comments to add I'd like to conclude by thanking our court

DOE meeting

reporter, thanking our federal staff for their presentations, both the slide show and in the lobby, and finally to thank all of you who turned out for this hearing. There have been extremely valuable comments. I would also like to compliment everybody on the civility that was displayed. There are certainly varying views on this project here, but I think everybody was heard with respect and I greatly appreciate that. Just a reminder, we will have a similar program this evening, again beginning with the presentations in the lobby at six o'clock and then the slide show and public comment beginning at 7:00. Again, thanks for your participation and tell your neighbors we have a similar program this evening. We are adjourned.

[Afternoon session adjourns at 3:00 p.m.]

//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript consisting of pages numbered 3 through 169 is a true and correct transcript of the proceeding held before me; that said hearing was reported by the method of Stenomask.

I further certify that I am not kin or counsel to the parties in the case, am not in the regular employ of counsel or said parties, nor am I otherwise interested in the result of said case.

This the 1st day of December, 2006.

ANDREA L. GREGORY, CCR
CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER
GEORGIA CERTIFICATE # B-1720