DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY PARTNERSHIP
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- - -

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING

- - -

Tuesday, December 2, 2008
7:00 p.m.
Vern Riffe Career Technology Center
175 Beaver Creek Road
Piketon, Ohio 45661

- - -

Reported by:

DENISE L. SHOEMAKER
RENO & ASSOCIATES
273 LITTLE THEATRE ROAD
WAVERLY, OHIO 45690
740.947.9001
FAX 740.941.4041

- - -

P R O C E E D I N G S

- - -

MR. BROWN: Good evening. Welcome to this public meeting on the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. The development of an Environmental Impact Statement for this project by the Department of Energy's Office of Nuclear Energy is required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

My name is Holmes Brown, and I will serve as facilitator for this hearing. My role is to ensure that the meeting runs on schedule and that everybody has an opportunity to speak. I'm not an employee of the Department of Energy, nor an advocate for any party or position.

At the registration table you should have received a participant's packet. If not, please raise your hand so that staff can bring you one. Everybody get that? Okay. I think we need a couple up front here. It contains important information on the presentation and is a convenient place to take notes during the briefing that will follow in a few minutes.

There are three purposes for tonight's meeting. First, to provide information on the content

of the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, or PEIS, and on the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, which governs the process. Second, to answer your questions on the PEIS and NEPA; and third, to receive and record your formal comments on the draft PEIS. The agenda for tonight's meeting reflects these purposes.

We will begin with a presentation by Mr. Andy Griffith regarding the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. Mr. Griffith is the acting director for Recycled Fuel working on DOE's GNEP program. To answer your questions, project staff will be available throughout the evening at the display tables and posters in the back of the room. They can discuss the draft PEIS, the contents of the printed materials that are available, and the contents of Mr. Griffith's presentation.

Following Mr. Griffith's presentation, we will recess so that the public may pursue further questions with available project staff.

Once we reconvene, the court reporter will be available to receive your comments and suggestions regarding the GNEP draft PEIS. All your comments will be transcribed and made part of the

public record.

I'm now pleased to introduce Mr. Andy Griffith, who is DOE's acting director for Recycled Fuel Development. He will discuss the background of the project and the purpose and basic elements of the draft PEIS.

MR. GRIFFITH: Thank you.

Good evening. My name is Andy Griffith. I am the acting director for Recycled Fuel Development working on the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership for the Department of Energy.

Our primary purpose today is to hear your comments regarding the Draft Programmatic Enviromental Impact Statement, or PEIS, which became available October 17, 2008. The GNEP PEIS provides an analysis of the potential environmental impacts associated with various alternatives for expanding nuclear power in the United States. My presentation may include some unfamiliar terms such as open or closed nuclear fuel cycle. I will try to explain these terms as I go along.

I want to thank you all for coming out tonight to this public hearing. Your participation will help DOE prepare a better document, which will

help us make better decisions on this important topic. I hope this portion of the hearing is valuable to you.

After my presentation, we will begin the formal public comment. We encourage you to provide written comments, but anyone wishing to provide oral comments will be given the opportunity. After all who wish to have spoken, we will adjourn.

My presentation will follow this general outline: First, I will briefly discuss the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA process. Next, I will discuss the GNEP PEIS, reviewing various aspects of the document, such as changes to the scope of the document as a result of the public scoping process, the purpose and need for agency action, the alternatives addressed, international GNEP initiatives, the environmental analyses, and key conclusions regarding the alternatives.

I want to point out an important distinction. This is a programmatic EIS. It is looking at impacts at a national level using generic sites, and therefore it does not enable any site specific decisions. A siting decision would require a future proposal, a future NEPA action, and there will be at that time an additional opportunity for public

comment.

I will also be discussing the record of decision and the process of how decisions based on the GNEP PEIS may be implemented.

Finally, and most importantly, I will address how you can help DOE make a better decision in the many ways in which you can provide comments on the draft GNEP PEIS.

The NEPA process is designed to ensure that federal agencies consider the potential environmental impacts of proposed actions and alternatives. A fundamental aspect of the NEPA process is public participation. To the right on the slide are the major steps in the process used for GNEP PEIS.

Under NEPA, an Enviromental Impact Statement, or EIS, is required for any action that may significantly affect the environment. A programmatic EIS is generally used to address broad programs such as GNEP.

It began with an advanced notice of intent, published March 2006. Following that, DOE published a notice of intent to prepare the GNEP PEIS in January 2007, which initiated the public scoping

period. A series of public scoping meetings were held, including a meeting that was held here on the 8th of March 2007. DOE received over 800 comments as a result of the advanced notice of intent and over 14,000 comments as a result of the public scoping process. As a result of this input, DOE made several significant changes to the scope of the GNEP PEIS.

I will describe these changes in a few moments. The notice of availability of the draft PEIS was published on October 17, 2008, opening the public comment period. Now we are conducting public hearings on the draft PEIS.

We have received requests to extend the public comment period and to hold public hearings at additional locations. The Department of Energy will extend the public comment period, but a specific date has not yet been set.

As I mentioned, DOE has revised the PEIS based on public input. In response to public comments and further analysis, DOE determined that decisions regarding any of the three originally proposed facilities would be premature. As a result, no project-specific or site-specific proposals are being made at this time.

Based on future decisions regarding GNEP, DOE or industry might propose new facilities which would be subject to appropriate NEPA review. Those siting recommendations have been removed from this PEIS. It was important to the department to return to the original locations of public scoping meetings and hold additional public hearings. While this PEIS will not include decisions on siting, these sites have not been ruled out for future consideration.

Four programmatic alternatives were added to the analysis. The first two are closed fuel cycle or recycling options. The last two are open fuel cycle alternatives that use fuels or reactor technologies that are different from the existing U.S. nuclear fuel cycle but do not recycle the nuclear fuel resources.

I will be discussing these alternatives in a few moments. For details about each alternative, I encourage you to visit the posters that are posted around the room and to talk to one of our technical expects here tonight.

The draft PEIS consists of a stand alone document approximately 75 pages and the main volume, which is about two inches thick. Chapters 1 and 2

present a background of the GNEP program, a brief history of spent nuclear fuel recycling in the U.S., proposed -- the purpose and need for DOE action, an overview of the PEIS, and a detailed description of each of the alternatives.

Chapter 3 provides information on the aspects of the environment that may be affected by the alternatives addressed in the GNEP PEIS.

Chapters 4 and 5 discuss the potential environmental impacts, including cumulative impacts, for each of the alternatives.

Chapter 6 includes laws, regulations, and other requirements that may affect implementation of any of the alternatives.

And Chapter 7 discusses international initiatives under GNEP.

There are several additional chapters and appendices that include supporting technical information and a summary of all the comments received and responses.

DOE's underlying purpose and need to support expansion of domestic and international nuclear energy production, while reducing the risks of nuclear proliferation, and reducing the impacts

associated with the disposal of spent nuclear fuel or other radioactive wastes, for example, by reducing the volume, thermal output, or radiotoxicity of waste requiring geologic disposal.

To meet its nonproliferation goals, DOE will consider only those recycling alternatives that do not separate pure plutonium or put it to use.

As part of the PEIS, we look at a number of alternatives. Some meet the purpose of need and some don't. For example, there has been a lot of talk about interim storage. At this time, DOE does not have legislative authority to accept any commercial spent nuclear fuel for interim storage.

Given that, DOE is not analyzing interim storage. However, this PEIS should not be misconstrued as DOE taking a position against interim storage. Interim storage alone does not meet the purpose and need and therefore is not a viable alternative being evaluated under this PEIS.

On the other hand, process storage at a recycling facility site, which provides inventory to support the recycling operations, is considered part of this PEIS.

In order to better understand the

alternatives, I wanted to briefly discuss the basics of nuclear power.

As pictured to the right, a typical commercial nuclear reactor generates electricity by fission, for example, the splitting of uranium atom, to produce heat. This heat in turn produces steam, which the steam then powers a turbine and the turbine then generates the electricity.

These nuclear reactors do not emit air pollutants, such as greenhouse gases, and provide 70 percent of the emission-free electricity generation. In fact, nuclear energy provides about 20 percent of the electricity in the United States.

After completing an operating cycle, which lasts between 18 and 24 months, some of the used fuel, which we refer to as spent, must be replaced with fresh fuel. There are two approaches to the management of the spent fuel.

The current approach is the open cycle, or a once-through cycle, that is referred to by the GNEP PEIS as the no action alternative. I will talk more about that in a moment.

The other approach is closing the fuel cycle, which would mean recycling the spent fuel for

additional use. In the next few slides I will discuss specific alternatives analyzed in GNEP PEIS.

The GNEP PEIS assesses alternatives that would reduce the volume, thermal output or heat, and radiotoxicity of spent nuclear fuel and wastes requiring geologic disposal. None of the alternatives addressed in the PEIS change the need or planning for Yucca Mountian.

In addition to any new alternatives, NEPA regulations require an assessment of continuing with the existing situation. As I have said, this is known as the no action alternative. For purposes of this PEIS, no action means to continue with the current open nuclear fuel cycle using light water reactors and uranium fuel. The existing US Nuclear reactor fleet consists of 104 commercial light water reactors.

Two additional open fuel cycle alternatives were explored in the PEIS. The first would use thorium as part of the fuel in light water reactors in a once-through fuel cycle. The second would use different reactor types than the current light water reactors, either heavy water reactors or high temperature gas-cooled reactors in a once-through fuel cycle.

Light water reactors, heavy water reactors, and high temperature gas-cooled reactors are all thermal reactors. Thermal reactors are so named because they use a moderator, such as water or graphite, to slow or thermalize the neutrons.

The PEIS examines three closed nuclear fuel cycle alternatives that include recycling used fuel in thermal reactors, fast reactors, and a combination of the two reactor types. Fast reactors use higher energy or fast neutrons that can consume transuranic elements while generating electricity.

Each of the alternatives are described in detail within the GNEP PEIS, and the basics of each alternative is available on the posters, as I said, around the room.

Currently, the U.S. uses an open fuel cycle. The open fuel cycle is a once-through process wherein uranium is mined, processed, enriched to increase the proportion of fissionable material, fabricated into fuel, and used in the commercial light water reactors.

Following use in a reactor, the fuel is characterized as spent. This spent fuel is stored in the reactor facilities pending disposal in a geologic

repository.

Under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, spent nuclear fuel and high level radioactive waste must be disposed of in a geological repository at Yucca Mountain in Nye County, Nevada. DOE has submitted a license application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the Yucca Mountain Repository that has been accepted and is under review.

Under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, congress established a statutory limit for the Yucca Mountain Repository as 70,000 metric tons. DOE estimates that the amount of spent nuclear fuel produced by commercial reactors will reach this legal limit by the year 2010.

As I mentioned, the U.S. currently uses what we term an open fuel cycle. I will be discussing some of the benefits of a closed nuclear fuel cycle soon, but I did want to take a moment to give an example of what a closed fuel cycle is.

There are several ways to close the fuel cycle, and the example pictured here is termed fast reactor recycle alternative. This is a continuous recycle of light water reactor spent fuel to produce fuel for use in fast reactors. We refer to this as

transmutation fuel because it may contain uranium, plutonium, and other transuranics like americium And curium that we wish to transmute or consume to improve the waste management benefits. Some residual waste will still go to the geologic repository.

Uranium from the separations process could also be re-enriched for regular uranium light water reactor fuel.

As I have mentioned, there are posters for each of these alternatives analyzed for your review and technical staff is available to answer any of your questions posted around the room.

At this time DOE's preference is to support closed nuclear fuel cycle, although a particular alternative or option has not yet been selected.

Closing the fuel cycle meets the purpose and need objectives. It would support sustainable expansion of nuclear energy and it would support U.S. nonproliferation objectives.

Recycling would improve waste management by reducing the volume, heat load, or radiotoxicity of nuclear waste, as well as better utilizing resources such as uranium.

Further, because nuclear power plants do not emit greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide, they would not contribute to the climate change.

In addition to the domestic programmatic alternatives, the GNEP PEIS discusses international initiatives that DOE could support in the future. At this time, no international initiative has risen to the level of a specific proposed action.

Under the Reliable Fuel Service Program, nations that agree to refrain to pursue uranium enrichment and reprocessing would be assured of the availability of nuclear fuel for their electric power generating reactors. The fuel would be provided by a fuel cycle GNEP partner. Spent fuel would be returned to the supplying nation or another GNEP fuel cycle partner nation for reprocessing, storage, or disposal.

Grid-appropriate reactors would be well suited to the capabilities and needs of developing countries, as well as for domestic applications. These reactors would be designed to achieve high standards of safety and security and could be used in countries with smaller and less developed power grids.

Coupled with the Reliable Fuel Service Program, these reactors would provide an attractive

energy solution and reduce the incentive for countries to develop the more sensitive fuel cycle technologies that could be misused, specifically, uranium enrichment and reprocessing.

The global partnership aspect of GNEP is a separate activity that has grown rapidly. It consists of 25 nations that signed a statement of principles that commits to safe, secure nuclear power.

The analysis of this -- of these initiatives in the PEIS is very general and not intended to support any particular decision. Currently we are only considering activities that could impact how we manage nuclear fuel in the United States. If, in the future, we were to propose significant international fuel cycle activities that could affect the U.S. public, we would address them in a separate NEPA action.

This slide includes resources and factors assessed under the GNEP PEIS. Because this is a programmatic level analysis, a number of these items are evaluated at a general level that does not provide significant discrimination between various alternatives.

If future project-specific actions are

proposed, a separate Environmental Impact Statement would provide a more detailed analysis of these factors and better differentiate between the alternatives. Of course, there would be additional opportunity for public comment at that time.

Spent nuclear fuel is hazardous and must be isolated and managed to protect the public and environment.

Although all of the alternatives addressed in the GENP PEIS would generate spent fuel and/or high level waste that would require disposal, the closed fuel cycle alternatives could significantly reduce future repository requirements.

The fast and thermal/fast recycling alternatives provide the greatest potential to reduce the radiotoxicity, thermal load, and volume of wastes requiring geologic disposal.

The closed fuel cycle alternatives allow for the recovery of energy-bearing materials such as uranium and transuranics, which can be made into nuclear fuel to generate more electricity, while these resources would just be thrown out with the trash under the open fuel cycle.

In general, the closed fuel cycle

alternatives would also require a greater number of shipments and miles traveled than the open fuel cycle alternatives.

Radiation exposure to workers and the public under any of the alternatives would be very low and well within all regulatory limits.

For the facilities considered in the PEIS, DOE modeled the potential radiation exposures for a variety of scenarios, including surrounding populations of more than eight million people.

For all scenarios, the analysis shows that the total dose to the surrounding population would be one-tenth as much as the dose required to cause one latent cancer fatality.

Estimated impacts from hypothetical accidents that would be addressed as part of the facility design and licensing process are also comparable between the alternatives.

Finally, land use would be comparable for all alternatives, since the total land use is primarily driven by the reactor sites and all alternatives include nuclear reactor sites.

At the conclusion of the GNEP PEIS process, DOE will make a decision to support one or

more of the domestic programmatic alternatives, including the no action alternative. The decision could be to support a single alternative or some combination of two or more alternatives.

The decision could influence future government research activities. Ultimately, any decision presumes that the U.S. utility industry will ultimately pursue similar nuclear fuel cycles for the generation of electricity.

DOE could influence the commercial utility sector by providing grants, contracts, or financial arrangements to implement approaches to support the DOE position.

In making its decision on which alternatives, or combination alternatives, to select, DOE will consider the potential environmental impacts along with other relevant information, such as the agency's mission, national objectives, technical feasibility, and cost.

DOE will publish in the Federal Register a detailed Record of Decision documenting any decisions based on the GNEP PEIS and the supporting rationale. The Record of Decision will be issued no sooner than 30 days following the publication of the

final GENP PEIS.

I mentioned earlier that I would address how you, the public, can help DOE make a better decision and the many ways in which you can provide input. Here's what you can do: First, you can provide comments on the PEIS and identify any issues that are significant and should be considered in the final PEIS, as well as any additional information that should be considered.

You can also continue to be involved and informed about the status of the GNEP PEIS and what DOE is doing. DOE has established a GNEP website, as noted here, which we will continue to update. You can also sign up to receive the final PEIS when it is issued.

And finally, here is how you can provide comments on the GNEP PEIS. All comments are considered equally. You may make oral or written comment at this or another public hearing. You may submit a written comment at this hearing using the comment sheets or your own stationery. You may submit your written comments to any DOE representative at this hearing or leave it in the basket by the reception area. You may also submit your written

comments through the Internet or by fax.

Please bear in mind that the current closing date for the comments is December 16th. But as I have mentioned earlier, DOE plans to extend this date for public comment period, although a revised date has not yet been announced.

This concludes my presentation. Thank you for your attention.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

At this time we're going to take a brief recess so that we can set up to take your comments and also to give you an opportunity to ask further questions of available staff about any of the materials that we've covered so far this evening. I will make an announcement when we're about to resume the formal portion of the meeting and begin taking oral comments.

If you would like to make an oral comment and have not yet signed up to do so, please go to the desk at the back of the building and add your name to the list.

So we'll again take a brief break now and we'll resume with public comment.

- - -

Recess taken.

- - -

MR. BROWN: Folks, let's get settled in again and we will get started on the formal comment period. It's now time to receive your formal comment on the draft PEIS. This is your opportunity to provide DOE with reactions, additions, and corrections to the draft document. The court reporter will transcribe your statements. Our reporter tonight is Denise Shoemaker.

Let me review a few ground rules for the formal comments.

Please step up to the microphone at that podium, introduce yourself, providing an organizational affiliation where appropriate. If you have a written version of your statement, please provide a copy to the court reporter after you have completed your remarks.

Also, please give the court reporter any additional attachment to your statement that you wish entered in the transcript. Each will be labeled and submitted for inclusion in the formal record.

I will call two names at a time. First of the speaker and the second of the person to follow.

In view of the number of people who have signed up and indicated an interest in speaking tonight, please confine your public statement to five minutes. The person sitting in front of the podium will hold up a sign indicating when you have one minute remaining. So at that point please summarize your remarks to allow all the other speakers who have signed up an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Griffith will be serving as the hearing officer for the Department of Energy this evening. He will not be responding to any questions or comments during this session.

So with that by way of introduction, let me call on our speakers. We will start with Lorry Swain, and she will be followed by Dr. Andrew Lee Feight, I believe.

MS. SWAIN: Thank you. I'm Lorry Swain, and I might be a glutton for punishment, but I actually read most of that draft PEIS, and I didn't find anything in there that would substantiate the claim that reprocessing would solve or reduce our spent fuel, our nuclear waste problem. In fact, reprocessing complicates the problem by generating new and difficult to manage radioactive waste streams more

than if we had not chopped open the spent fuel rods in the first place.

The PEIS makes it clear that GNEP is not even about dealing with the 50 years of radioactive, high-level radioactive waste that's already accumulating at the reactor site. It's not about dealing with Yucca Mountain at all and what's already accumulated. It's about dealing with something down the road in the future.

Even the PEIS states that the closed fuel cycle, which involves reprocessing, creates significantly higher environmental and health impacts than the open fuel cycle. But despite that admission, the document tries to sell us on the closed cycle.

There's nothing in the PEIS to substantiate the claim that reprocessing reduces the risk of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In fact, reprocessing increases the risk that plutonium can be diverted into making nuclear weapons because reprocessing separates plutonium.

Now, I know that in your remarks you mentioned that GNEP would only use new separation methods that don't separate out pure plutonium, but even the methods that have been mentioned do not offer

the safeguards that the IAEA would require.

The PEIS doesn't even try to back up their claims about proliferation, and in fact include nothing. In this document, they say that another agency or subagency will get back with us with a report, but so far that hasn't happened and we're having our hearing tonight.

All reprocessing technologies are far more proliferation prone than direct disposal. The closed fuel cycle necessitates a second step after reprocessing. That is, the commercialization of fast neutron reactors. There has been at least a hundred billion dollars spent worldwide on failed attempts to develop fast reactors of commercial size that will do what DOE claims will be done with GNEP.

The National Academy of Scientists says that even if this closed cycle plan were to work, it would cost up to seven hundred billion in today's dollars. And therefore, according to the academy, there's no economic justification for going forward with this program at anything approaching a commercial scale.

The PEIS doesn't even bother to deal with cost and with price tags, as though money were no

object for the DOE. But here where we're at right now money is the object. We live in the midst of four counties that have the highest poverty rate in the state, Athens, Scioto, Pike, and Lawrence, ranging from 20 percent up to 30 percent of the population living in poverty. Of all the 88 counties in Ohio, Pike County has the highest unemployment rate officially at 10.5 percent, but in reality even higher.

Yet recently the DOE eliminated funding for the weatherization program that helps low income families provide insulation for their homes. And when they zeroed out this program -- or before they zeroed it out, they referred to it as the most successful energy efficient program because it was cutting heating bills by more than 30 percent for those who used it.

Also, for the 2009 budget the DOE slashed funding for HEAP, a block grant that helps low income and elderly pay their heat bills. Despite promises about combatting global climate, the DOE has slashed funds for the solar energy program, funds for renewable energy production incentive programs, cut funds for hydro-powered programs, cut funds for Energy

Star programs. So here it's really hard to even think about, you know, this incredibly expensive GNEP, what I refer to as a pipe dream.

I want to go down on record as opposing it and all the alternatives, including the no action alternative, because the no action alternative provides for continuing to spend millions of dollars in research and development for what's called the advanced fuel cycle initiative.

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Next speaker is Dr. Feight. You may need to correct me pronunciation.

DR. FEIGHT: That's correct.

MR. BROWN: Joni Fearing will follow you.

DR. FEIGHT: Hi. My name is Dr. Andrew Lee Feight, and I live and work in Scioto County. I'm also a board member of the Site-Specific Advisory Board for the Portsmouth Atomic Reservation. But tonight I speak only for myself as a resident of the larger community of southern Ohio.

And from my reading of the draft PEIS and from the presentation tonight, there are three stated

goals of the GNEP program which amounts really to plutonium reprocessing. No. 1, resolve the existing problem of safe and secure disposal of spent nuclear fuel rods that are currently in storage on-site at U.S. nuclear reactors. And 2, encourage the expansion of the U.S. commercial nuclear energy industry. And 3, do all of the above in a way that reduces the dangers of nuclear weapons proliferation.

The problem with all the strategies that the GNEP draft PEIS considers is that none of them actually achieve any of these goals.

In consideration of the limited amount of time allotted for public comment this evening, I would like to focus my remarks on GNEP's failure to resolve the existing problem associated with the nuclear industry's production of spent nuclear fuel rods or SNF, spent nuclear fuel, as well as any future reprocessing of high level nuclear waste that comes as a result of reprocessing those rods.

All of the strategies under consideration do not actually close the nuclear fuel cycle in a way that solves the problem of highly radioactive waste disposal. All scenarios or strategies considered in the PEIS rely, according to the study, on two

different waste disposal cases. That's a quote. Both of which rely upon permanent storage of high-level nuclear waste in an underground repository known as Yucca Mountain in Nevada.

The current national stockpile of spent nuclear fuel in the United States will surpass the current proposed capacity of 70,000 tons of waste at Yucca Mountain by 2010. We heard that just a few minutes ago. 2010. In less than two years.

In order to store the SNF from all U.S. reactor sites that will be produced the remaining life spans of the existing commercial reactors, the DOE has concluded that a second or additional space at Yucca would have to be created nearly the same size as the currently planned repository at Yucca Mountain. Thus, enlarging the capacity to 130,000 tons, an expansion that would cost the U.S. taxpayers an additional tens of billions of dollars.

There's one major problem concerning Yucca Mountain. This proposed repository is increasingly looking like nothing more than a fantasy. Senator Harry Reid, the Senate Majority Leader, in an interview in a paper in Nevada just last week stated that he had had conversations with President-elect

Obama about Yucca Mountain, and Senator Reid declared Yucca Mountain was going to die a slow death. That it was not going to be a cite for a repository for spent nuclear fuel.

So if all the GNEP program scenarios are grounded in the use and expansion of Yucca Mountain, what would the impact on GNEP be if Yucca Mountain truly is dead? Where is the existing SNF waste and any future reprocessing waste going to go? How can the DOE write a draft PEIS that does not even consider a case where Yucca Mountain is not an option.

Without a permanent waste storage site in place, any reprocessing of SNF will require some sort of interim storage of SNF, whether where it currently exists at reactor sites or at some sort of centralized interstorage facility connected to a reprocessing facility. Indeed, that is exactly what the Portmouth-Piketon GNEP proposal that was submitted involved. The Portsmouth program specifically offered up our local atomic reservation for interim storage of SNF. The proposal even gave the DOE the option of storing the SNF inside the recently shuttered gaseous diffusion buildings, which are set for D and D, deconditioning and decontamination, or in the open air

on an unused 340-acre section of the reservation.

The draft PEIS includes no discussion of a case wherein SNF's and other high-level waste generated by reprocessing is placed in some sort of long-term interim storage. Yet that is exactly what has been proposed to the DOE for the Portsmouth-Piketon site.

People say that GNEP is dead. Yet, here we are discussing DOE's plans for reprocessing SNF at Portsmouth. And even though the DOE is currently considering the Portsmouth site application, which does specifically include the long-term interim storage of SNF, the DOE has failed to consider the GNEP-related impact of alternatives to permanent disposal of waste at Yucca Mountain. The whole document is based upon two scenarios of waste disposal both Yucca Mountain.

MR. BROWN: You are a bit over time.

DR. FEIGHT: I'll wrap it up.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Thanks.

DR. FEIGHT: The failure of GNEP to solve the problems associated with the disposal of SNF is directly related to GNEP's failure to encourage the expansion of U.S. commercial nuclear energy, a second

purpose. It fails to solve the number one problem facing the industry, which is a lack of private capital investment because of the unresolved problem and costs associated with the permanent, secure, and safe disposal of nuclear waste streams.

We stand at the entryway of a new era in human societies, a transition point from a civilization fueled primarily by nonrenewable fossil fuels to one that strives for long-term sustainability through renewable and greenhouse-free sources of energy. And nuclear energy is economically and environmentally unsustainable. How many Yucca Mountains are going to be needed in 50, 100, 500 years from now? How many billions of taxpayer dollars are going to be spent subsidizing commercial nuclear energy production?

The costs associated with any GNEP-style reprocessing energy program are unjustified, unsustainable, and ultimately unworkable.

The DOE needs to cut its or, shall I say, the taxpayers' losses, and shelve the whole reprocessing program and instead pour these billions of taxpayer dollars into technologies that derive energy from safer renewable sources that reduce our

production of greenhouse gasses and don't produce a massive radioactive waste stream.

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Joni Fearin is next, and she will be followed by Patricia Marida.

MS. FEARIN: Hello. My name is Joni Fearin. I live in Portsmouth. I'm one of the Scioto County unemployed at the moment.

I try to come at these issues from a theological point of view. And if we talk about the human environment, which cannot be separated from our natural environment, it's connected. The word actually in Hebrew ah-adam, the word Adam, first person in the Bible, for those of you who believe in that, comes from the word soil of the earth. If we think of yourselves as being of the earth, we can not put all these toxic waste, chemicals, radioactive materials into the environment without it affecting us.

As many of you know, my dad worked at the plant. He died of four different cancers. My mother had cancer, died young from washing his clothes for ten years, and all my sisters and I have health problems today. I know that's not part of -- well, it

is part. It's the main part of the environmental impact statement.

And the thing about the one latent cancer fatality that was mentioned earlier, having worked with some of the people that are being denied their EEOICPA benefits, that's the one that they will admit to. Okay. That's not just one. That's maybe one that they will say, yes, this did come from these toxins.

When I look at the map, there's a great map on Page 3-15 with all the different sites around the nation, I think I counted 90 stars or whatever those little symbols are. There are 10 to 12 on the Great Lakes, which, of course, Ohio is on Lake Erie. We're all -- but we are all affected by that because that's our biggest natural water resource. And the fact that we've got all those sites right on the Great Lakes Region is -- it's inexcusable.

It's really -- a lot of this is just insanity. Geoffrey didn't hear that. Insanity in regard to what we will do to our world in the -- under the guise of protecting all of us. In other words, we are destroying ourselves under the guise of trying to protect ourselves from nuclear war, if you will,

nuclear destruction. We are already destroying our world.

And back to that as well. This is not about nuclear energy, and we all know that. This is not about nuclear energy. It's about nuclear war and weaponry and proliferation. And until we can really come to that understanding, nothing is going to change, in my mind, nothing's going to change.

These countries are saying they're in agreement, our partner countries, that they will not use this for nuclear weaponry. Well, what's to stop them? What's to stop anybody? What's to stop -- our esteem scientist mentioned it takes 20 pounds of plutonium to make a bomb, and we've tons of -- I forget the numbers, but tons and tons all over the world.

We need alternatives. If we're going to say this is about energy, well, you know what, they've got methane pools now in the midwest, the real midwest, we're not really the midwest, we're part of the east coast, actually. We're in the eastern time zone. We've got methane gas pools that are actually being harnessed for energy right now.

This is not something that we can't do.

We have solar energy. We have wind energy. We have geothermal energy. These are things that we can use in greatly reducing and limiting the need for nuclear power.

Just look at my notes. I guess -- oh, the Apollo program. For those of you who haven't heard, our governor in Ohio, Governor Strickland, has introduced the Apollo program, which is a program of alternative energy that is coming out of Washington state. I would hope that all of you would write to your leadership and that we would all push for this Apollo program to come into Ohio. It will actually bring in a lot of jobs, and it's all based on alternative energy. So that's something that is important to do and something -- one minute. Okay.

There's something about Yucca Mountain that I read, and I can't remember, it was an e-mail or something, that a group of scientists is looking for a way to create a signage, a system of signs that they can place around Yucca Mountain, the big nuclear storage facility that they're proposing to put more there, that would be readable by any group of people that might come after us that would be understandable that this was something highly dangerous in any

understanding of what that might be, and to me this is again the insanity.

Radiation is radiation is radiation is radiation is radiation is radiation is radiation is radiation and it's not going to go away. It's not going to go away. All the stuff that we have now, why make more? It's not going to go away. Why separate these things out from what they're basically sort of locked into.

So that's what I wanted to share tonight in summary. No nukes. You turned it off

MR. BROWN: I didn't touch it.

MS. FEARING: There's no -- I got cut off. Anyway, this is my summary. Thank you very much. You don't need to hear it to see it.

MR. BROWN: It says "No Nukes" for the court reporter. Maybe the battery wore out. I don't know.

MS. FEARING: Just a coincidence.

MR. BROWN: We'll switch mics here. If you don't mind, the public can come over to this mic and I'll work on that one.

So Patricia Marida. Are you here?

MS. MARIDA: Yes.

MR. BROWN: You're next. Then Dr. Ivan Oelrich will follow.

MS. MARIDA: First, I have a housekeeping issue, which is, someone left this back in the room. Thank you.

I am Paricia Marida, and I'm chair of the Nuclear Committee of the Ohio Sierra Club. The Ohio Seirra Club has over 20,000 members in the State of Ohio, and the Sierra Club nationally has 1.3 million members.

I would like to thank the Department of Energy for extending the comment period on the Problemmatic Environmental Impact Statement. However, we have not been told how long it will be extended, and we are concerned that decisions may be made without proper review if the process is rushed to finish before the end of this administration. So we urge the Department of Energy to extend the deadline and postpone any decisions on the PEIS site specific or otherwise until the new administration has begun and new personnel are in place at the DOE.

The costs of reprocessing technology are huge. Japan's Rokkasho reprocessing facility has a price tag of around 20 billion dollars. It was

planned to cost 8 billion, and they are still having technicological issues and they are not up to full production at this time.

The Department of Energy and Areva are saying that commercial reprocessing or that reprocessing is commercially viable. Yet, industry benefits from the Price Anderson Act, which limits liability in case of accident. The industry is looking for government funds for research and development, loan guarantees and other giant subsidies. The New Energy Reform Act of 2008, the national energy bill, contained total subsidies for nuclear power between 88 billion and 167 billion dollars. Subsidies should be stopped and industry can then be allowed to show its interest in commercial viability.

What is happening here is that costs and losses are socialized, borne by the taxpayers, and the profits are privatized. So all of these nuclear plants, the profits are going to private sources. Taxpayers have paid substantial amounts to subsidize our present nuclear facilities and the industry is reaping the profits, a hundred percent of the profits. The exception is that industry wants the public to own

and pay for the cost of disposing of the waste. Nuclear waste will have to be guarded and isolated for longer than humans have been on earth. Areva and USEC won't be around that long.

Another issue with the cost is that we have a limited pie. If our money is diverted to nuclear power, it will be at the expense of research and development of sustainable and renewable energy sources such as wind and solar and geothermal and the most cost effective source of all which would be efficiency. There are great advantages to these decentralized energy sources. People can be employed where they are, insulating their homes, putting up solar panels. If a solar unit breaks down, there will not be a blackout affecting an entire region, and workers will not be exposed to deadly radiation.

Reprocessing would mean that tens of thousands of shipments of radioactive materials would occur by way of road and rail across the United States. Shipping accidents are common. Ohio is at the crossroads for these nuclear shipments with Interstate 70 and 71 intersecting in Columbus.

There is no totally safe place for a nuclear repository. The best choice is for hardened

on-site storage of spent nuclear fuel at the reactor sites. This would secure the wastes, eliminate immediate shipment, and give time for a more thorough decision and better know-how for the future of these dangerous long-lasting materials.

And last, I would like to talk about carbon -- about nuclear as a solution to global warming. It's not a solution. It doesn't reduce the carbon footprint.

We looked at the chart that the DOE had up here, the mining, the refining, the emissions, huge amounts of energy taken up there. The fabrication, the cost of building the plants with the enormous amount of cement. Cement is one of the most energy intensive materials that we have here, and then disposal and safeguarding of these wastes. What is the carbon footprint of this? It is tremendous.

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: I think your comments were so substantive you wore the batteries out. Also, there's a reporter who has a tape recorder. Let me bring that back over. It sits better here.

DR. OELRICH: I'm Ivan Oelrich. I can see I already have a problem because my book is just

between where the two lenses of my bifocals focus.

I'm Ivan Oelrich. I'm from the Federation of American Scientists. We're here to review an environmental impact statement, so we should be talking about the environmental consequences of this. But one of the purposes of an environmental impact statement is to compare the environment -- inevitable environmental cost with almost any human activity to the potential benefits to see -- to do that cost benefit analysis.

One of the things we have to keep track of here with the GNEP proposal, which is a proposal for reprocessing plutonium from spent commercial fuel, is that most of the benefits of reprocessing really come about if we reprocess and recycle. That means take the fuel and run it back through a nuclear reactor, and most of the benefits of recycling come about only if we recycle through a new type of nuclear reactor, as mentioned before in the technical discussion, a so-called fast neutron reactor.

It says up on the boards there that they've built 25 of them around the world, but we've spent, we being human beings on planet earth, several countries have tried this and spent a hundred billion

dollars in research and development, and no fast neutron reactor has ever been successfully commercialized. Not to say that it couldn't ever be in the future, but it hasn't been thus far. So we have to keep in mind this package deal.

From the environmental impact statement report from the DOE it basically lists four categories of benefit that will come. They're going to try to reduce the cost of producing electricity by nuclear power, they're going to try to stretch the energy supply, they will reduce the waste burden, and they will reduce the proliferation risks. And my thesis is that the GNEP as its proposed doesn't meet any of its own criteria. So therefore, any environmental cost is not worth paying.

It fails on cost analysis because the fuel plutonium is an intensely radioactive form when it comes out of the nuclear reactor. Everything has to be handled remotely by robots, and this is very extensive. Studies done by a group of scientists and engineers at MIT, Harvard, and the University of Maryland calculated the break-even point would be when uranium reaches $400 a kilogram, and it's now trading at one-fifth of that and no one sees those prices for

several decades into the future.

Moreover, to get the benefits, you need fast neutron reactors. These are inherently more expensive than thermal reactors. The estimates vary, but the most optimistic that I've seen is they'll be 50 percent more expensive since the cost of capital dominates the cost of development -- of producing electricity with nuclear power that means that electricity will be roughly 50 percent more expensive.

The energy supply, you will get more energy out of a given amount of uranium, but only a third more if you develop the reader reactors and without the reader -- I'm sorry, fast neutron reactors. Without the fast neutron reactors you'll extend the energy only by one-sixth. Something that we could easily do through conservation.

The waste reduction is the main theme of the GNEP program. And again, the waste reduction requires -- for the most benefit the waste reduction requires the fast neutron reactors. DOE specifically talks about reducing the heat load, which the limiting factor on putting a geological repository like Yucca Mountain or any other repository, they talk about reducing heat load by a factor of 230. This requires

a 99.9 percent efficiency in separating out plutonium, a 99.9 point efficiency in separating out the major fission products and in storing those fission products above ground for 300 years. And so if you can meet all those criteria, yes, you can reduce it by 230, effective 230, but no one has ever demonstrated that.

We also have to keep in mind the environmental damage, not just from the waste where it's stored, but also the process of reprocessing. France produces 80 percent of their electricity by nuclear power. So they're a much smaller country but they have almost as many reactors as we do. Most of the environmental contam -- radiological environmental contamination of France comes not from their 80 or so nuclear reactors, but from their one reprocessing plant.

Finally, talking about proliferation. The Department of Energy is misleading here in saying that they have processes that they say are proliferation resistant. And what they say when they say they're more proliferation resistant compared to what? What they mean is proliferation resistant compared to the worst thing we could do, which would be to use a process called PUREX, which was developed

in World War II, the Manhattan Project, specifically for the manufacture of nuclear bombs.

So, yes, the program -- the processes they're proposing are proliferation resistant compared to a nuclear bomb factory, but they're not proliferation resistant compared to what we actually do today, which is leave the plutonium locked up in intensely radioactive fuel rods.

So I think that GNEP does not meet its own stated criteria so that the environmental cost is not worth making.

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Sharon Courneen is next and Kathleen Boutis will follow.

MS. COURNEEN: Hello. I'm Reverend Sharon Courneen, and I am affiliated with the Board of Church and Society of the Western Ohio Conference of the United Methodist Church. And we are in Piketon, so I would like to know what exactly this has to do with Piketon? What the plans are for here if any of these facilities are intended to be here? And if that is -- I have also heard that GNEP is without money. I would like to know where the money would come from to build any of these or to process any of these or to do

the studies on any of these if GNEP would have anything to do with that? Is that clear? Maybe it's already been answered, but I didn't get it. And I sure didn't get exactly what this means to Piketon.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

Kathleen Boutis, is she here?

MS. BOUTIS: Yes.

MR. BROWN: She will be followed by Geoffrey Sea.

MS. BOUTIS: Hello. My name is Kathleen Boutis, and I'm with Southern Ohio Neighbors Group and Ohioians for Environmental Justice. There are three points that -- I'm just going to kind of hold onto this. It sits a little creepy.

There are three points that I would like to touch upon briefly. The first being environmental justice. If you'll turn in your copy of the PEIS to page 10-5 and 6 in Appendix J, you will see a very short paragraph talking about environmental justice. Environmental justice is a subject that's a lot broader than just unemployment statistics.

If you also look within that paragraph, you'll see that they used a 50-mile radius to talk about it, which anyone that studies environmental

justice knows that 50 miles becomes meaningless pretty rapidly. The numbers of unemployed and also the access to health and dental care, medical and dental care, which this region suffers disproportionally inadequate resources for. So my first issue is that the environmental justice section is grossly inadequate.

The second section, which is also one paragraph on that same page, is concerning the archeological resources of the area. Never in this small paragraph is it discussed that the Barnes Works are within and beyond the Department of Energy's site here, which are considered one of the oldest, rarest, and most astounding geometric earthworks in the Ohio Valley, including a 20-acre circular enclosure paired with a 17-acre square, they're separate but unique earthworks the size of a football field that lie buried alongside the entrance ramp to the DOE site. These are things that could be rebuilt and would be amazing archeological resources for this area if they weren't dismissed. They weren't even mentioned in the PEIS.

The third concern that I have is the relationship between USEC and the GNEP process here in

Piketon. We will be releasing a press release that we can put into the record that breaks down some of the individual points, but I'll just leave it in saying there are so many points that I couldn't cover it in my time here, but there is a tremendous amount of questions we need answered here in this area regarding the role of USEC in pushing through the entire process here.

In closing, I would like to enter into the record and respectfully demand that the Piketon site be removed from the GNEP site list so that this community and the land beneath it can heal. It is time for the land to be returned to the people of the area, cleaned up and decontaminated so that clean, renewable energy industry can flourish here so that the people of the region get the bright, safe economic future that they dearly deserve.

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Geoffrey Sea. He will be followed by Vina Colley.

MR. SEA: My name is Geoffrey Sea, Southern Ohio Neighbors Group, and I'm angry, and every person in this room should be angry. Two years ago more than 300 area residents came to this scoping

hearing for this process. We were all angry then. We made demands of DOE. They've had two years almost to satisfy those demands, and practically none of that has been done.

There's some very simple things. We asked then for a copy, an unredacted, unedited copy of the GNEP application that was submitted by Sonic for their site characterization study. That's not such a hard thing to provide. DOE has not provided it. After trying through the Freedom of Information Act and other channels, all we got was a highly redacted, highly edited copy of that document posted to the Sonic website.

We want a copy of the separate Sonic proposal to put a spent nuclear fuel facility at Piketon. We asked for this also two years ago.

Part of their GNEP application they said, quote, separate from this proposal, though integral to it, Sonic has proposed a spent nuclear fuel storage facility at Portsmouth. Where is that document? We have been told by DOE officials that document doesn't exist. If that document doesn't exist, why did you give $674,000 to liars? They asked for their money on the basis of their claim that they had submitted a

separate integral proposal to you. Where is that document?

We want a commitment from you tonight that we'll have both those documents, an unredacted, unedited copy of the application and that separate spent fuel storage proposal, in our hands by the first of the year. It's not too much to ask.

We want an investigation of the preselection of this site for spent fuel storage under fraudulent conditions. We told you two years ago that this 11 site competition was a fraud. It wasn't an 11 site competition. It never was.

DOE originally selected three sites: Piketon for spent fuel storage, Savannah River for reprocessing, and New Mexico for a research center. When DOE originally came to these communities, you took officials aside and you promised each one of those three communities five million dollars to do a site characterization study. I know that because whistle blowers came and told us. We threatened DOE with a lawsuit if you proceeded to make those three five million dollar awards. Your lawyers told you that we were right and that we would win our lawsuit.

You then postponed your site

characterization awards for more than a month while you went back to the drawing board and came up with 11 site competition. That's what happened two years ago. And your cancellation of the site process doesn't alter that history.

We want an investigation and revelation of exactly what happened during that whole process. We want to know why 52 percent of the Piketon site characterization award went to Areva, the National Nuclear Company of France, which then used those misappropriated funds to make a decision not to site their uranium enrichment plant at Piketon. Those were GNEP funds that went to Areva so that they could privately make a uranium enrichment siting decision unfavorable to this site. We want an investigation and the results of this published. Where is discussion of that in your draft EIS?

The site characterization study for Piketon, which you summarize, is a travesty. There is no discussion of the relevant archeological resources here. There's a totally mistaken description of the historic properties impacted. There's no discussion of protected species, and on that I will say that in the interim, between the time when you gave the award

and the time when the study was actually completed, Ohio E.P.A. came out with a water study which identified numerous protected and endangered species of fish and other animals in and around the creeks here.

Because Sonic didn't want to include that information because they wanted to do a booster, right, boost the site for GNEP, they neglected the Ohio E.P.A. study, even though it was available to them. And even though they had attended the meetings, the public meetings at which OEPA produced its results. So instead they just went back to an older document, which showed that -- which failed to define that there were those protected species. It was an absolute travesty.

We demand an investigation of the relationship between USEC and GNEP at this site. And as Kathleen said, we will submit detailed testimony about that.

And we want off, we want off of the GNEP site selection candidate list.

I spoke to Mr. Griffith before the meeting and he told me that when DOE gets around to it, you will get around to your site selection process

at some indefinite point in the future. Maybe in ten years, maybe in twenty years. At that point if Piketon is determined not to qualify, you'll take us off. Sorry. You are doing material harm to this community. This is a chronic unemployment, depressed area.

We have a wonderful site with infrastructure here that can be used to do what President-elect Obama has said should be done in Southern Ohio with solar cells and wind turbines and other renewable energy equipment and none of that can happen because you are sitting on this site and saying it should be reserved for a program that you can't -- don't even have the technology to implement and don't have the funding and don't have the wherewithal to even say when and if it will ever happen. Sorry. We're not part of this process.

If you want to engage in this little fiction, this little, you know, whatever it is you call it, this bureaucratic inertia that's carried over from two years ago, do it in your own home states where you live. Don't come to our community and say, we're going to take your best industrial facility and put it on a shelf and do nothing with it. We want off

the list. We don't want to be included as part of your discussion of alternatives. We want off the list. Piketon should never have been on the list. It was a corrupt process that got us on the list. Do the investigations and take us off.

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Is there Vina Colley? Edgar Jaewett you will be next.

MS. COLLEY: Hi. I'm Vina Colley. I'm president of Portsmouth-Piketon Residents for Environmental Safety and Security. I co-chaired the National Nuclear Workers for Justice. PRESS has broken every major story here at this site for the last 29-and-a-half years.

I'm one of those robots that Ivan talked about. We were put in this facility to clean up this facility, and they never protected us. Piketon recycled reactor fuel from West Valley, New York and today West Valley, New York is one of the worst contaminated sites. The workers there are dying like the workers at Piketon.

It's a tragedy story that this community is sick and that the workers are sick and the false hope of GNEP. We should have been talking about the

start up of a centrifuge. We're out here producing more of this waste, and we have no place to put it.

We're killing our own people and no one even cares. I don't think GNEP was ever honest on the scope. It was just put in there just so that all this depleted uranium that came in from Oak Ridge for us to convert, these cylinders are producing neutron exposures and we have over 25,000 more setting on this site. They are leaking, they're old, they're rusty. But no one seems to care about this community and these workers.

Because of PRESS, the workers are getting compensated for some of their illnesses, some of their cancers, but not fast enough because they are dying.

We have spoken out for 29-and-a-half years. We try to come to every meeting that we can come. Tonight is the first time that I was turned down by an environmental group called SONG. How can they be so concerned about how this community is affected when they won't even let the community come into their public meetings. I was basically manhandled by one of their SONG members. Don't laugh, Geoffrey.

For 29-and-a-half years, Geoffrey, I gave

you documents of everything that went on at this site, 29-and-a-half years. I put you up at my home. I thought you were in here to help the community, but I don't think that's what you're in here for.

The Piketon site reprocessed or recycled this reactor fuel from 1954 to something like 2000 and here we're talking with reprocessing again knowing our government knows that these workers are dying from these plants. I don't know where you come off coming into this community and even talking about a GNEP project. You need to be talking about cleanup. We have been pushing for clean up of this site for all these years. People are tired of coming to meetings. They want to see action, and we haven't seen hardly any action.

GNEP's calling for the reprocessing of plutonium and uranium into a mixed oxide fuel, considered fuel treatment; however, the technology has not been created. When are we going to stop spending so much money on something that's not going to work and something we already know. This is a criminal act. There's not been any successful reprocessing in over 30 years in this nation. Why are we even talking about this? Why are we spending money on something

that's worthless?

Three hundred and forty acres on the east side of this plant that is not down wind has plutonium and neptunium on it, and this organization here wants to turn this over to this community to put some type of industrial thing on the site. Is that where you want to store more waste? Is that where you had planned to store more waste here at Piketon? We want the site cleaned up. You know, you can't clean up a site and then continue to reprocess a criminal act that is killing workers and making community workers sick.

People in this community drank contaminated water from their wells, from their cisterns. They're sick, they're dying. We have the highest rate of cancer in the nation and no one even seems to care. They're more worried about the historical site than they are about the human life and the animals.

Let's just stop it. Somebody needs to do a full investigation about what you've done to us here. I was a robot. I'm sick, and the DOE recognizes that I'm sick, and they also compensated me because I'm sick. But it's not shutting me up. Not

until justice is done for what they have done to all of us.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Edgar Jaewett will be followed by Teresa Boggs.

MR. JAEWETT: I won't take up much time. I just got a couple things I would like to say.

One, I would like to see a cleanup. They haven't done a very good job of containment here, and I can't see bringing anything else in here for them to play with will help. The people in this area have suffered enough. If they say these containers are safe, then why not put it in Washington, D.C.? How about under your basement?

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Teresa Boggs followed by Terri Ann Smith.

MS. BOGGS: Hi. How you all the doing? I'm Teresa, Teresa Boggs. I'm a concerned citizen and a PRESS member and a cancer survivor.

I would like to tell you about my family. I grew up four miles from the A plant and we're all country folks. I'm a hillbilly, I admit it. And we all drank well water and bathed in it, gardened in it, hunt, fish, and most of my family members have cancer.

I had Hodgkin's disease. My aunt had four different types of cancer. My granddaddy died from brain cancer, and I lost my mom of kidney failure and massive heart attack at the young age of 52. And my uncles are sick of cancer, thyroid disease, and my little brother is fighting cancer right now two types. One so rare they can't even figure out what it is. So he's fighting it right at this moment as I talk.

I also drew up a little map of all the hollows we lived in, and in every house somebody was sick or they had a rare blood disorder or cancer, a disease, birth defects. I mean, in every house in three hollows around, three hills, three valleys. That doesn't include Miller's Run.

But, you know, they need to clean it up, not trash it up. I lost where I was at. But, anyways, you know, the people that lived around there, we all lived off the land, you know. Spring meant plowing, planting. You know, the first flowers that bloom in the summer meant planting fall crops and canning, pickling, fishing. Fall, hunting season, of course, and cutting hay. And then winter we gathered up the first snow and made ice cream. Everybody did that. We all gathered at the big bonfire and went

sleigh riding.

But everything around us we survived off of. Summer, fishing, of course. We ate the animals. We drank the water, we bathed in it. You know, we lived off the land, and it's killing us now.

I don't have very many family members for you all to take. There's not very many left.

That's all I got to say, just please clean it up. Don't bring anymore trash in.

Thanks.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Terri Ann Smith.

MS. SMITH: Hi. I am Terri Ann Smith, and I'm the assistant director for PRESS, Portsmouth-Piketon Residents for Environmental Safety and Security.

I want to agree with -- I want to first say that I agree and greatly appreciate all of the statements of opposition to GNEP, and I think that GNEP should be abolished and it should just go away. But I would like to take it even a step further and I'd like to see the DOE disappear. I mean, it's been a worthless agency from, what, since '77 whenever it was created or somewhere in there. Nothing good has

come out of the Department of Energy.

I also want to express the taxpayer issue a little bit more in depth. You know, everybody is not very happy about the taxpayers having to pay for the cleanup of the plant and pay to store the waste that's been generated from the nuclear operations there, and I would like to see a movement, you know, because I think this GNEP thing is pretty much going away anyway. I don't think it's going to fly. But I would like to see a movement to force these contractors that have profited billions off of turning Piketon into a literal, literal hell hole. They need to flip the bill for cleaning this place up. They need to pay for every penny of it, and they need to pay for any type of waste storage that needs to occur here.

And another comment I wanted to make about -- I did have a little bit of, I guess it's not disagreement, but I just have a question in my mind to another environmental group that's here that kept us out of their meeting. They didn't invite us, you know, our environmental group to their environmental group. But my question isn't even about that because I don't really care because their meeting was

probably -- wasn't even that good anyway. So I don't think we missed out on anything.

But my questions to them is: They're so adamant about keeping this GNEP idea out of here, where were they when the American Centrifuge popped up and where were they -- why do they support, only support, as Geoffrey Sea stated at a site specific advisory board meeting, he stated that SONG supports the depleted uranium conversion plant that is operating that just opened up. They support that, and I guess my question is why? Why would this environmental group support this, and then make this big deal about this GNEP idea that's not even here yet, but they're letting all these other things pop up on the plant not saying a word about it.

Still the GNEP idea is probably in theory and the Council on Foreign Relations doesn't even support it. So it's not even going to fly. I mean, congress isn't going to support it if the Council on Foreign Relation doesn't support it. So this whole meeting is just a waste of time anyway because it's never going to happen.

So anyway, I would like SONG to explain themselves about this depleted uranium conversion

plant. Calling themselves an environmental group, kicking another environmental group out of their meeting and supporting these nuclear operations there and pretending like they're an environmental group of Piketon. And Geoffrey did make some comments about the mounds, and the mounds are on his property that he just bought. So I think he has a little bit of financial interest in that comment, too.

I'm going to state for the record I think he's fake. That's my opinion. And I think everything nuclear should be shut down at that facility and it should go away forever.

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Let me ask if Melissa Heuber is here? I was told that there was a play that I think one of her children -- I was told she wanted to speak but had a prior commitment. Okay. So she's not here.

Let me ask then: Is there anyone who did not sign up to speak who would like to add any comments at this point? If so, step forward.

I think we are scheduled -- yes. Did you have something to add?

MS. COLLEY: I would like to make a

comment on a page here.

MR. BROWN: Vina Colley has a comment on, I guess, a specific page.

MS. COLLEY: Vina Colley of PRESS and National Nuclear Workers for Justice.

I didn't read the whole book that you had because I felt like it was useless. I went to one section, and it was about the impact on the community and the workers, and it says all domestic problematic alternatives could affect the health of the public.

Down below it says, on page S41, each of these could impact the public and the community. Why in the world would anyone want to impact a community or impact workers? You know, we need to look at alternative resources here at the site. That's the only page I went to, and I shut it back up because this thing is worthless and this cost thousands and thousands of dollars when I know people who don't have insurance and they're dying in this community.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

Anyone else? Geoffrey.

MR. SEA: Geoffrey Sea with Southern Ohio Neighbors Group.

I'm not going to address any of the

personal comments. I think they were violations of the ground rules. And if people have personal issues, take it personally.

But we were asked one direct question that I wanted to answer and that was why SONG supports the uranium deconversion plant on the site, and the simple answer is that SONG supports that facility because it's part of the site cleanup. It provides jobs. It's a good thing for the community. It may be could have been done in a different way. We didn't exist when that facility was planned. But since SONG has been founded and the facility is about to open or already has opened, I'm not sure exactly where it stands, we very much support it.

We need to get this site cleaned up, and facilities like the deconversion plant are the way to do it. And for people who don't understand that, you need to study it a little more.

But, you know, I will say that SONG is -- there's an attempt here to try to characterize SONG as me, and you keep hearing this reference from a certain quarter or a certain table that are all directed at me personally. Southern Ohio Neighbors Group is a broad-based organization. Kathleen Boutis is the

president. Many of our people testified tonight. Not everyone identified themselves as with SONG.

We are a very diverse group. We are open to people of all different persuasions. We are not anti-nuclear. We have pro-nuclear people who are members of SONG who think nuclear power is a good thing, but they just happen to think that this isn't the place for it. And we have people of all denominations and all political parties.

In fact, the biggest part of our initial founding group in Pike County were republicans, and they were republicans for a particular reason and that is that Pike County was controlled by democrats, who had -- many of the whom had gone along with GNEP but they are not here tonight. They have sort of floated away.

But originally, you know, it was the republicans in Pike County willing to come out and say what was in the best interest of the county because they weren't holding political office. So we're a very broad-based group. We include all people, and we invite everyone to join us and become part of it.

Thanks.

MR. BROWN: Thanks. Let me offer just

a few comments here.

I don't exercise a lot of editorial control and try not to interfere with comments of the people who have five minutes speak and generally they can say whatever they want to. Although, I think it's probably more effective addressing documents. I would ask people if you have personal disagreements, to take those outside of the hearing, especially if there is any sort of abuse.

I recall running a meeting years ago on the Yucca Mountain in San Bernardino, California. They were in the process of impeaching their city council. We spent probably an hour out of three hours talking about the city council. Again, it's folks' prerogative if they want to put those on the record. I'm not going to interfere. But again, we are trying to address this particular document. And again, if you have personal issues, we will adjourn and you will all have plenty of time to do that, so.

MS. SMITH: I have a technical comment.

MR. BROWN: We have a technical comment. Terri Ann.

MS. SMITH: Terri Ann Smith. I would

like to clarify a technical faux pas that Geoffrey Sea just made about the depleted uranium conversion plant. He characterized it as a way to clean up the plant. However, he's ignored the fact that this depleted uranium that is here on the plant just got here. It was just shipped here from Oak Ridge and Paducah. So that's in all -- it's in all the writers, associates, facts, you can look it up. It happened a couple years ago. I think in 2006 it was all shipped here to be -- to have depleted uranium converted into munitions for Iraq and various metals for recycling. For him to say that he -- a depleted uranium conversion plant is cleaning up the plant is disingenuous.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you. That is a marginally technical comment.

Is there anyone else who has a comment addressing this particular document? I think we are scheduled to stay in session a bit longer. I think -- I know Melissa Heuber is hoping to get back and comment. So what I would like to do is recess and if someone does have an additional comment, they can see me, and if Melissa shows up. So we will recess. Thanks very much.

- - -

Recess taken.

- - -

MR. BROWN: I'm going to briefly reconvene the meeting. I'll note that no other member of the public wishes to make a comment, and also noting that Melissa Heuber is not available to speak tonight. So with that, the meeting is adjourned. Thanks very much.

- - -

(The proceedings were concluded at 9:18 p.m.)

- - -

R E P O R T E R ' S C E R T I F I C A T E

I hereby certify that the transcript of the proceedings and evidence contained herein are a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes taken by me at the time and place of the within case; that the transcription was reduced to printing under my direction; and that this is a true and correct transcript of the same.

_____

DENISE L. SHOEMAKER, Notary Public
in and for the State of Ohio.

My commission expires: January 26, 2009.