

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: American Centrifuge Plant
Public Scoping Meeting

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Piketon, Ohio

Date: Tuesday, January 18, 2005

Work Order No.: NRC-175

Pages 1-84

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

Before the
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Public Scoping Meeting on the
USEC Inc. Proposed American Centrifuge Plant

Tuesday, January 18, 2005

Zahn's Corner Middle School
2379 Schuster Road
Piketon, Ohio

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 7:02 p.m.

3 MR. CAMERON: Good evening everyone. My
4 name is Chip Cameron and I'm the special counsel for
5 public liaison at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the
6 NRC. And I wanted to welcome all of you to our public
7 meeting tonight.

8 And our subject tonight is the
9 environmental review that the NRC is going to conduct as
10 one part of its evaluation of whether to approve the
11 license application that we received from the United
12 States Enrichment Corporation, Inc. to construct and
13 operate a uranium enrichment facility on the DOE
14 reservation in Piketon.

15 And I think that this facility is referred
16 to as the American Centrifuge Plant, the one that we
17 received the license application for.

18 And it's my pleasure to serve as your
19 facilitator for tonight's meeting. And in that role I'll
20 try to make sure that all of you have a productive meeting
21 tonight.

22 I just wanted to cover a few items about
23 the meeting process before we get to the substance of the
24 discussion. I'd like to talk about the format for the
25 meeting, some very simple ground rules for the meeting and

1 to introduce some NRC speakers tonight.

2 In terms of the format, it's going to be a
3 two part meeting. And the first part of the meeting, we
4 want to try to provide you some clear information on the
5 NRC license review process, particularly the environmental
6 review that we do. And we want to make sure that you
7 understand the process and we'll go out to you for
8 questions after the NRC presentations to make sure that
9 there's no ambiguities there.

10 The second part of the meeting is an
11 opportunity for us to listen to all of you, to listen to
12 your comments, your concerns, your recommendations on the
13 information and alternatives that the NRC should
14 investigate in preparing the environmental impact
15 statement.

16 We're taking comments on the same issues
17 and the NRC staff will be telling you how to submit
18 comments and when those comments are due. But we wanted
19 to be with you in person tonight. And any comments that
20 you give us tonight will carry the same weight as written
21 comments that are submitted.

22 In terms of ground rules, when we go to
23 the question period after the NRC presentations, if you
24 have a question, please signal me and I'll bring you this
25 cordless microphone and if you could introduce yourselves

1 to us and any affiliation, if appropriate. We'll try to
2 answer your question. I would ask that only one person
3 speak at a time.

4 Most importantly so that we can give our
5 full attention to whomever has the floor at the moment,
6 but also so that we can have a clean transcript. We have
7 Gary Baldwin with us tonight who is transcribing the
8 meeting. That will be a written document. It's our
9 record of the meeting that we can use to evaluate comments
10 but it also will be publicly available to any of you who
11 would like a copy of the transcript.

12 I would also ask that everybody try to be
13 concise. It's difficult I know sometimes to do that when
14 we have issues of concern and importance like this. But I
15 want to make sure that everybody has a chance to ask their
16 questions and to make their comments tonight.

17 So I would ask you to be concise and, in
18 fact, when we get to the public comment part of the
19 meeting, the second part, I'm going to ask you to follow a
20 guideline of five minutes for your presentation. And we
21 found that five minutes is sufficient amount of time to
22 summarize major points that people might have. And it
23 accomplishes two important things for us.

24 One, it alerts us to issues of concern
25 that we have to begin to evaluate. And also issues that

1 we can talk to you about after the meeting is over.

2 And, secondly, it alerts all of you in the
3 audience to concerns that other people in the community,
4 in the region, might have about this license application.

5 If you want to elaborate, as I mentioned,
6 there's an opportunity to submit written comments. If you
7 have a prepared statement tonight, we'll attach that to
8 the transcript.

9 So I just want to thank you, we want to
10 thank you for your assistance in helping us to make this
11 important decision tonight. This meeting is one point in
12 time and the NRC staff will be giving you some contact
13 information. So we'd like to maintain some continuity
14 with you if you have questions, concerns, please feel free
15 to contact the NRC staff about them.

16 There is a blue card sign-in process at
17 the back table. You don't have to sign in but if you want
18 to receive material, future material that we produce, if
19 you give us your name and address we'll be able to get it
20 to you, including notification of future meetings.

21 With that, I want to introduce the NRC
22 staff who are going to be talking with you tonight. And
23 first of all we're going to go to Jennifer Davis, who's
24 right here, to give us an overview of the NRC roles and
25 responsibilities, generally. And Jennifer is the Chief of

the Environmental and Low Level Waste Section within the
Division of Waste Management and Environmental Protection
at the NRC.

4 She's been with the NRC for 14 years. And
5 before she assumed her management responsibilities, she's
6 been involved in low level waste, high level waste and
7 nuclear fuel cycle issues. Before she came to the NRC she
8 worked at the Naval Shipyard in Charleston, South
9 Carolina. She has a bachelor's degree in materials
10 engineering from Virginia Tech and a master's also in
11 materials engineering from the University of Maryland.

12 After Jennifer gives us the roles and
13 responsibilities, we're going to go to Mr. Matt Blevins,
14 who is right here. Matt is in Jennifer's section and he
15 is the project manager for the environmental review on the
16 USEC, Inc. license application. And Matt's been with the
17 NRC for five years, focusing on environmental review
18 issues. He was a private consultant addressing nuclear
19 issues before that.

He has a bachelor's in chemistry from West Virginia University and he has a master's in environmental engineering from Clemson U.

23 And with that, I will ask Jennifer to lead
24 off for us.

25 MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Chip. Hello

1 everyone. My name is Jennifer Davis and I want to thank
2 you all for coming here tonight. And on behalf of the NRC
3 staff I want to welcome you. I want to let you know how
4 important it is for us to hear your input. That's why
5 we're here. We have a whole process developed to hearing
6 what you have to say. So I'm really excited to see so
7 many people here tonight.

8 So, of course, as Chip said, we're here to
9 talk about the proposed American Centrifuge Plant. We do
10 have copies of the handouts at the back of the room if you
11 want to make sure to pick one up.

12 I also want to point out we have a list of
13 the NRC staff in the back. And my phone number on this is
14 actually incorrect. So if you want to make a note, my
15 extension is not 5874, it is 7264. So I wanted to make
16 sure that you all had the right information.

17 I'm also in the -- NRC has a web page and
18 we do have a staff phone directory, so you can find me
19 that way. Although, there are two Jennifer Davis's at the
20 NRC. But if you leave a message on her voice mail, she'll
21 forward it to mine, so I'll still get it. We have to have
22 a system.

23 So I want to really kind of put things in
24 context. So, as Chip said, I'm kind of going to go over
25 the general process, the general licensing process, I'm

1 going to talk some about the NRC's role, the NRC's
2 mission.

3 I want to start out though, our primary
4 goal, as I said, is we want to hear what you have to say.
5 So if you look at the meeting agenda, you'll notice that
6 the bulk of the time on the agenda is for us to hear your
7 comments. So I want to point that out. Matt and I will
8 only be talking very briefly.

9 So I'm going to talk in general about the
10 review process. Matt's going to go into just a little bit
11 more detail on the environmental review and a little bit
12 about the application. But neither one of us is going to
13 get into too much detail because we do want to hear what
14 you have to say. Just to put it in context.

15 Now, we're going to have a little bit of
16 time for questions. Matt and I will be here to answer
17 questions. We also have a representative from our legal
18 staff, our office of General Counsel, to answer questions.
19 And we have the project manager for the safety review of
20 the USEC facility and he'll be available to answer
21 questions as well.

22 So I hope that between us we can answer
23 any questions you have. If not, we'll be happy to follow
24 up with you later on and try to get those answered.

25 And I want to point out, too, this is not

1 the only time you'll have to be able to give us public
2 comments. We do have forms at the back, you can submit
3 those. We'll go through the transcript later on and pull
4 out the public comments from there as well. In addition
5 to, as Chip said, what you have to say in the actual
6 comment period. If any of the questions sound like
7 comments to us, too, we'll look at those.

8 In addition, we'll take comments through
9 the end of the scoping period and Matthew will tell you
10 how to submit those when he goes through his presentation
11 and will provide the contact information. And he's going
12 to tell you some more about other opportunities we have
13 for public comments later on in the environmental review
14 process.

15 So, as I said, I kind of want to give you
16 an idea of who we are and what we do. We are an
17 independent regulatory agency. We report directly to
18 Congress. We are not part of the Department of Energy in
19 any way. They are an entirely separate agency.

20 We have regulatory responsibility for a
21 variety of facilities. Obviously the commercial nuclear
22 power plant. We also regulate medical uses of nuclear
23 materials such as radiation therapy. We regulate
24 commercial uses of nuclear materials like manufacture of
25 smoke detectors. We regulate industrial uses. We also do

1 the fuel facilities, which is one of the reasons that
2 we're here tonight.

3 And I want to point out our mission, which
4 we take very seriously, is to protect the public health
5 and safety and the environment. And so we do all of these
6 reviews as a part of our licensing review process.

7 So our role is really to regulate the safe
8 and secure use of nuclear materials. And I want to kind
9 of go through our general licensing process and then I'm
10 going to tell you how we are applying that process to the
11 proposed American Centrifuge facility.

12 We start out by developing regulations.
13 The first thing we do is develop regulations. And then
14 when we get a license application in, we look at that
15 license application to see if it meets our regulation.
16 And we do a safety review, we do a security review, we do
17 an environmental review.

18 If we grant the proposed facility a
19 license, then we continue our oversight of the facility.
20 We have inspection authority and inspection
21 responsibilities. We do frequent periodic inspections.
22 We also, when we issue a license, we can put additional
23 specific conditions on a license that the licensee would
24 be required to meet.

25 So if we find during our inspections that

1 a licensee is not meeting our regulations, they are not
2 meeting commitments that they made in their license
3 application or they are not meeting the conditions that
4 are listed in the license, we can issue an enforcement
5 action. And that's generally in the neighborhood of large
6 fines, large sums of money. So we have a continued role
7 even after we license a facility.

8 So specifically for the USEC application,
9 the proposed American Centrifuge facility, USEC submitted
10 an application to us in August of 2004. And that
11 application contained both the license application and an
12 environmental report. And so the first part of our review
13 -- these are all ongoing at that same time, but in the
14 order they are in the slide. The first part is our safety
15 review. And the safety review is based on the license
16 application. And that summarized in a safety evaluation
17 report. We also do a security review. The security
18 review is also primarily based on the license application.
19 It is also summarized in the safety evaluation report.

20 Finally, we do an environmental review,
21 which is what we're here for tonight, and that's based on
22 the environmental report that is submitted with a license
23 application. And it's summarized in environmental impact
24 statement documents. A draft EIS and a final EIS.

25 And the basis for our decision on whether

1 or not to issue a license is those two documents, the
2 safety evaluation report that we do and our environmental
3 impact statement.

4 Finally, I want to point out again there
5 are a number of opportunities for public involvement. We
6 do have the scoping comment period that we're in right
7 now. We will also have a comment period when we issue our
8 draft environmental impact statement. Matthew's going to
9 go into a little more detail on those.

10 Of course we have the public meetings like
11 we're having now. And I want to make a point that what
12 you have to say really does impact our review. When we
13 did our environmental review for the mixed oxide fuel
14 fabrication facility, I don't know if any of you are
15 familiar with that one, our analysis of alternatives, our
16 choice of alternatives was greatly influenced by what we
17 heard in scoping.

18 So we really want to hear what you have to
19 say, it's why we're here. So in addition to the public
20 meetings and the public comment period, we do have a
21 hearing that is associated with the licensing process and
22 that covers both the safety and environmental issues.

23 One more thing before I finish up. In
24 addition to the public comment forms we have in the back,
25 we also have something called a meeting feedback form.

1 And if you have any comments on the meeting format tonight
2 or anything we could do to make this better in the future,
3 if you could go ahead and fill out one of those so we can
4 improve our process, we would certainly appreciate it.

5 So I want to say thank you again for
6 coming. I really look forward to hearing your comments
7 and I'm going to turn it over to Matthew Blevins.

8 MR. BLEVINS: Thank you. I just want to
9 say good evening, thank you all for coming. I need to use
10 the microphone, I forgot.

11 I want to thank you all for coming out
12 this evening. I think it's important for us to be here
13 and I'm interested to hear what each of you have to say
14 this evening.

15 Now, as Jennifer mentioned, the reason
16 we're here this evening is to take your comments. But
17 before we do that, I want to talk to you about three
18 things this evening.

19 First, I want to talk to you briefly about
20 what USEC is proposing to do and then secondly, give you a
21 little bit of information on the NRC's environmental
22 review.

23 And then finally I want to talk to you a
24 little bit about how to communicate with the NRC and then
25 give you some various addresses and contact information.

1 So moving on to the next slide, we're
2 going to talk briefly about USEC's proposed action. USEC
3 is proposing to build a uranium enrichment facility. It
4 would be known as the American Centrifuge Plant.

5 Now, in this facility they would enrich
6 uranium using a gas centrifuge process. A gas centrifuge,
7 it's a machine, and that's located here on this slide.
8 It's a machine that's used to enrich uranium.

9 Basically the rotors can turn at such high
10 speeds that it's able to separate the naturally occurring
11 isotopes of uranium into different fractions. And the
12 useful fraction is the uranium 235, which can be used for
13 commercial and nuclear fuel.

14 The uranium 235 is taken from its natural
15 concentration, from about .7 percent, enriched to a
16 concentration of between 3 and 5 percent.

17 Now, USEC has indicated that there's the
18 possibility that they may eventually build a seven million
19 separative work unit facility. The NRC's environmental
20 review regulations require us to look at this potential.

21 The difference is, I want to point out
22 that they've only applied for a three and a half million
23 separative work unit license. So you might see some
24 difference in terms of the environmental reviews going to
25 look at what the impacts for a seven million unit facility

1 are, as opposed to the license, if it's issued, would only
2 be for a three and a half million unit facility.

3 Now, the proposed facility would be
4 located within the existing Department of Energy
5 reservation. USEC proposes to make use of some of the
6 existing facilities, some of the existing structures. For
7 example, there's two large process buildings which are
8 capable of holding the centrifuges for the three and a
9 half million unit facility.

10 Now, they're going to have to build other
11 facilities and structures. We're going to move on and in
12 the next series of slides we're going to talk about the
13 NRC's environmental review process. And this next slide
14 has a lot of information, so I'll give you just a second
15 to look at it.

16 So, as Jennifer mentioned, USEC submitted
17 a license application back in August of 2004. The NRC did
18 an acceptance review through most of September and then in
19 October we made a formal announcement that we were going
20 to begin our detailed technical review. And we do that in
21 what's called a Notice of Intent.

22 In that Notice of Intent, we also talked
23 about starting the scoping process. And this meeting
24 tonight is part of this formal scoping process.

25 The scoping period is going to end on

1 February 1st, that's when we request that you submit your
2 comments. Now, after the scoping period ends, we're going
3 to take these scoping comments and we're going to publish
4 what we -- we're going to prepare what we call an
5 environmental impact statement.

6 And specifically, it's going to be a draft
7 environmental impact statement. And the reason that's
8 important is we're going to come back to Piketon after we
9 publish that draft environmental impact statement and ask
10 you for your comments on the NRC's environmental review.
11 So there's going to be another meeting just like this one
12 this coming summer. And then after we take those comments
13 into account, we'll publish what we call a final .
14 environmental impact statement.

15 Now, we're going to talk about the
16 environmental impact statement in just a second, but I
17 want to move on and give you some details on scoping
18 specifically.

19 The scoping process is a forum to solicit
20 public input. More specifically, it helps the NRC staff
21 and our contractors focus our environmental review on the
22 issues of concern. Hopefully, the result of all this is a
23 better informed decision.

24 Now, we have several goals in the scoping
25 process. First and foremost, we want to ensure that the

1 environmental concerns are identified early so that they
2 can be properly studied.

3 Secondly, we want to request any
4 information that you have about other alternatives or
5 other information that you think is important for us to
6 know. That's the type of information that will help us in
7 the scoping phase. It will help us focus our
8 environmental review on the things that are important.

9 Now, you may not have any comments this
10 evening and that's okay. You may hear something though
11 that makes you do some research or something comes to you
12 after the meeting. And that's why we're accepting written
13 comments until February 1st.

14 It's important that you understand that we
15 do consider all comments. As Jennifer mentioned, that's
16 the reason we're here. We want to hear what you have to
17 say.

18 Now, once we get these scoping comments,
19 we're going to prepare what we call a scoping summary
20 report. And that's sort of a document that will address
21 how we're going to handle your comments in the
22 environmental review. And then we'll use that scoping
23 report to sort of guide us through the rest of the
24 environmental review process and then eventually, when we
25 prepare the environmental impact statement.

1 So we talked about scoping a little. Now
2 I want to just give you a brief overview of what the
3 environmental impact statement is so you know what to
4 expect this summer.

5 The environmental impact statement,
6 basically it serves as the NRC's documentation of the
7 environmental review. The EIS has many topics. I've
8 listed the most important ones here on the slide. First
9 and foremost, the purpose and need for the proposed
10 facility. Then we talk about alternatives to the proposed
11 facility. We move on to the effected environment, and
12 then most importantly probably we talk about what the
13 environmental impacts for the proposed facility and any of
14 the alternatives, what those impacts might be.

15 And of course the EIS has many other
16 things, but for example, we have consultations. Any
17 consultations we perform, we'll include those in the EIS
18 or the environmental impact statement as well.

19 The EIS, it's prepared from many different
20 sources. In addition to your scoping comments this
21 evening, we're also going to consult with various federal,
22 state and local agencies. We're going to perform a site
23 visit. And then most importantly we're going to do a
24 detailed review of USEC's environmental report.

25 After we've completed all this information

1 gathering, we're going to publish this draft environmental
2 impact statement. And as I mentioned, that's when we're
3 going to come back out to Piketon this summer and have
4 another meeting and request your comments and feedback on
5 the NRC's environmental review.

6 So moving on to the last topic this
7 evening, I want to talk to you about how to communicate
8 with the NRC. The first thing probably is how to submit
9 scoping comments. The most important thing is, if you
10 submit the comments by mail, just please note the docket
11 number so we make sure those get to the right people and
12 we get those in the system.

13 I've listed the mail address and I've
14 listed an e-mail address, whatever is most convenient for
15 you. Now, Jennifer also mentioned we have some scoping
16 comment forms here in the back of the room. You can write
17 your comments this evening and simply drop them off with
18 Linda here in the back of the room before you leave or any
19 of the NRC staff you see and we'll make sure those get
20 into the record.

21 Now, on this slide we have two wed
22 addresses. Don't try to copy these down, we have those on
23 the slide, if you can pick up a copy of the slides. The
24 first one is sort of a USEC specific web site. It just
25 has some overview information. It's a good place maybe to

1 start your review if you don't know a lot about the
2 facility. It won't contain all the documents related to
3 this facility or this licensing action.

4 The second web site is where the NRC keeps
5 all of its publicly available documents. It's called the
6 electronic reading room. So you should be able to find
7 all the documents associated with this licensing action in
8 that public electronic reading room. But if you're having
9 problems finding information there, what I want you to do
10 is contact our public document room. I've listed the
11 1-800 number and I've listed an e-mail address. There are
12 NRC staff that work there and it's their job to help you
13 find these documents electronically or point you to where
14 they are on the web site.

15 Now they have one other function and their
16 job also is to provide you hard copies. But I don't want
17 you to be surprised, hard copies, there's a small copying
18 charge. But all of the other assistance is free. So
19 please make use of the public document room if you need
20 help finding a document.

21 Now, in terms of NRC staff, you can
22 contact myself, Matt Blevins, for any of these
23 environmental review questions. Timelines, schedules,
24 things of that nature related to the environmental review.

25 Now, Yawar Faraz, he's right here in the

1 front row, he's going to come up and answer some questions
2 in a little bit with us. He's the overall licensing
3 project manager. He's also in charge of the safety and
4 the security reviews. So those type of questions will
5 probably be best pointed in his direction because he's
6 going to know the most information about those.

7 So that's it for my presentation and I
8 think we're going to go to the question and answer session
9 and we're going to bring some staff up here.

10 MR. CAMERON: Sure, let's go for
11 questions. But before we do that, Matthew, could you just
12 give people information about the hard copies of the
13 reports that are in the library?

14 MR. BLEVINS: Yes. It's my understanding
15 that there is now a hard copy of the environmental report
16 and the license application in the Waverly Library and in
17 the Piketon Library. So if you want to see an actual,
18 physical copy you can go to either of those libraries and
19 those should be available tomorrow morning.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Let's see
21 if we have some questions. As Jennifer already pointed
22 out, sometimes there's an impact comment in a question and
23 we'll make sure that we note that comment. But we really
24 want to use this time, as much as we can, to answer
25 questions about the process for you.

1 MS. DAVIS: Excuse me, Chip. Can we go
2 ahead and bring Yawar and Steve up?

3 MR. CAMERON: Sure. Okay, this Yawar
4 Faraz and we're bringing Mr. Stephen Lewis who is from our
5 Office of General Counsel up. All right.

6 Okay, you heard -- and Jay.

7 And just let me introduce Jay Henson, who
8 is from our Region 2 Office in Atlanta and he and his
9 staff are responsible for the inspection activities at
10 this facility and other similar facilities.

11 Are there questions about -- you heard the
12 process, how to submit comments; are there any questions
13 we can answer at this point? Let's go and please
14 introduce yourself to us.

15 MR. JOHANSON: My name is Ted Johanson.
16 Does the environmental impact statement also deal with the
17 effect of the facility on human beings or is it just the
18 environmental?

19 MR. BLEVINS: Yes, the answer is the
20 environmental impact statement certainly looks at impacts
21 to humans. They're part of what we call the affected
22 environment.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Elisa, do you have a
24 question?

25 MS. YOUNG: My name is Elisa Young and one

1 question that I had from what was just presented is how
2 much time will we have from the time that the draft EIS
3 studies to review it before the deadline is for our
4 comments on it? I know we didn't have very long with the
5 application from the time it was finally made available.

6 MR. BLEVINS: The regulations require a 45
7 day public comment period. Typically we'll give two to
8 three weeks to review the environmental impact statement
9 before we come out and then there will be a couple weeks
10 afterwards.

11 Now, there are also provisions in the
12 regulations that all you have to do is request extensions.
13 And so there's provisions in our regulations for two 15-
14 day extensions.

15 MS. YOUNG: Okay, I had requested an
16 extension in the amount of time that we would have to
17 submit comments for the scoping process and I didn't
18 receive an answer back on that. Is there any possibility
19 of extending the amount of time that you'll receive
20 written comments?

21 MR. BLEVINS: We're still talking to -- I
22 passed along your request and we're still talking about
23 that. Again, the focus of the scoping meeting is sort of
24 to set the tone or the scope of the environmental review,
25 not necessarily to perform the environmental review. So

1 we're trying to set the stage and then go forward with the
2 environmental review. But it's certainly something we're
3 considering.

4 MS. YOUNG: Two weeks just seemed like not
5 very much time. Some other meetings that we've had when
6 we've asked for information from some of the other
7 organizations involved, I know we had a meeting two months
8 ago, I'm still waiting for answers on. And so two weeks
9 is kind of a short amount of time to gather your
10 information, to submit your questions and comments.

11 MR. CAMERON: And can you clarify what the
12 -- in summary, the request is still in play, I gather from
13 what you said, Matthew. And, Jennifer, did you want to
14 talk about the total time involved for comments on
15 scoping?

16 MS. DAVIS: Actually, what I wanted to add
17 is, even if we are able to extend the scoping comment
18 period, if we do receive comments after the deadline we
19 will still try to consider them.

20 MS. YOUNG: But it's not guaranteed.

21 MS. DAVIS: It's not guaranteed, but I
22 mean if we get them, we're going to look at them.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay, and just in terms of
24 for people to know what to expect when in terms of the
25 draft environmental impact statement, that's going to be

1 approximately -- when will that be issued for comment,
2 approximately?

3 MR. BLEVINS: July, of this summer.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay, so that will be issued
5 in July and people can expect, at a minimum --

6 MR. BLEVINS: A minimum of 45 days.

7 MR. CAMERON: -- a 45 day comment period.

8 And the meeting occurs sometime, you know, in the middle
9 of that period. So that it may appear that there's only a
10 couple of weeks for comment after the meeting, but when
11 you look at it from the very beginning, it's a longer
12 comment period. Although, we realize that one function
13 that we have out here with a meeting is to give the
14 information so that you can more intelligently comment on
15 it.

16 Okay, yes. Vina.

17 MS. COLLEY: Hi. I'm Vina Colley of
18 PRESS, Portsmouth/Piketon Residents for Environmental
19 Safety and Security, and National Nuclear Workers for
20 Justice. And I was wondering, is there a way we can get a
21 waiver to get the hard copy documents? Because I've never
22 had to pay for a document yet.

23 MR. CAMERON: Matthew?

24 MR. BLEVINS: Well, I know the -- only
25 from talking to Chip this evening, I know there's a waiver

1 in the regulations. I don't know the specifics. Steve
2 Lewis, do you know that --

3 MR. CAMERON: And just to clarify, and it
4 may not be -- I think Vina's question may be broader, but
5 we're asking Steve is if someone asks the PDR for the
6 document, is there any sort of an exception for certain
7 types of organizations from the copying, per page copying
8 charge?

9 MR. LEWIS: I believe the answer is yes,
10 based upon the analogy to what we do under the Freedom of
11 Information Act where certain small little groups without
12 significant funding or individuals in that situation, can
13 get fee waivers. So I think the same process would be
14 available.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Steve. But
16 can we get -- not right now, can we get a definite for
17 Vina so that she knows about that?

18 All right, thank you. Other comments?
19 Yes.

20 MS. MATTSON: Hi, I'm Vicky Mattson,
21 Sierra Club. I was wondering why this site was selected
22 and why it's being moved from Paducah, Kentucky to here.

23 MR. CAMERON: Is there any information
24 that you could provide on that? It sounds like the type
25 of -- a question that the answer may be more fully within

1 USEC, Inc. But do you have any information on that?

2 MR. BLEVINS: Sure. The environmental --
3 they're required to look at alternatives. We don't choose
4 where any facility is sited, that's up to applicants to
5 decide. What we do are look at the impacts from where
6 they decide to locate it and then we look at other
7 reasonable alternatives. So if there's a reasonable
8 alternative, we're going to look at that in the
9 environmental review process.

10 And USEC, in their environmental report,
11 they did look at Paducah as an alternative location. So
12 we'll be looking at that in our environmental review.

13 MR. CAMERON: And I guess I would just ask
14 that -- one of the functions that these meetings serve is
15 when we're not in the meeting itself but we're off line,
16 so to speak, either before or after, there can be informal
17 exchanges. I guess I would just ask for any of the people
18 from USEC, perhaps after the meeting, to get some
19 information to Ms. Young on that. All right?

20 Other questions? Okay, Ted, let me go
21 over here and then we'll come back to you. And I believe
22 this is Nathan.

23 And that was Vicky. Sorry. Vicky
24 Mattson.

25 MR. BLOSS: In the scoping process it

1 mentions public comments. As far as public, you know,
2 considering Pike County where the facility will be
3 located, how much impact do outsiders from outside our
4 county have on this? I mean they're speaking on a
5 generality of public, not the actual residents or citizens
6 of this county. You know, how much impact do they have on
7 this?

8 MR. CAMERON: Matthew?

9 MR. BLEVINS: Well, generally what we do
10 is, it's not really where a person's from so much as we
11 look at the content or what the information provides in
12 their scoping comment. So we look at everyone's comments
13 and try to, you know, look at what information is actually
14 within that comment.

15 MR. CAMERON: And I understand what your
16 concern is, Nathan, but many times these types of
17 facilities have, you know, impacts, regional impacts,
18 national impacts. And someone might, for example, have
19 knowledge of an endangered species or whatever that they
20 would bring up. So we consider the comment wherever it's
21 from. Jennifer?

22 MS. DAVIS: I wanted to add, too, that one
23 of the things we do do is make an effort to have the
24 meetings that concern the facility in the locality of the
25 proposed facility. And so that's really an effort to make

1 sure we do hear from the local population.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Ted, did you -- you
3 had something.

4 MR. JOHANSON: Can this comment form be
5 faxed or e-mailed, instead of just mailed?

6 MR. BLEVINS: If you can scan it,
7 certainly you can e-mail it. Do we have a fax number?

8 MS. DAVIS: 5398 I think.

9 MR. BLEVINS: You can fax it to -- if
10 you're ready. Area code 301, 415-5398. And note the
11 docket number and also put it to my attention.

12 MR. JOHANSON: Okay, thank you.

13 MR. CAMERON: And, Elisa?

14 MS. YOUNG: I just wanted to say that as
15 someone who is physically located outside of Pike County,
16 that I have concerns as a taxpayer. At the last
17 Department of Energy meeting they said that in 2004 almost
18 \$300 million in taxpayer money was spent on cleanup in
19 that year alone. And in 2005 the same amount is
20 projected.

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay. I think we're ready
22 to go to public comment. Vina, do you have another
23 question before we go on?

24 MS. COLLEY: It's very important that we
25 consider the outside community that's not living right

1 here because once this stuff starts up, we'll be shipping
2 out to their communities and some of the waste might go to
3 different communities. So it's important to open it up to
4 all communities, not just this local community.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And I think that,
6 Matthew, you may want to clarify this, but I believe that
7 if you took a look at our draft environmental impact
8 statements for other types of facilities, that they do
9 consider impacts that are broader than just local
10 community. Although local community impacts, not just
11 physical impacts but socio-economic impacts are extremely
12 important. Matthew?

13 MR. BLEVINS: That's true. We're looking
14 at the impacts wherever the impacts occur. We're not
15 limiting it to any particular area.

16 The earlier question was do we consider
17 the comments from just the local citizens or other maybe
18 more removed citizens, and we consider all the comments.
19 It's like I said, we're looking at what the substance of
20 those comments are.

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Anybody
22 else have a question before we go on?

23 Okay. And I would ask you, you can come
24 up here to address us or I can bring you the cordless
25 microphone. But we're going to go to comments from a

1 number of you right now and first of all we're going to go
2 to Mr. Jim Brushart, Pike County Commissioner, and then
3 we're going to go to Thomas Reiser, Scioto County
4 Commission. And this is Mr. Brushart.

5 MR. BRUSHART: Thank you. I want to thank
6 the NRC for holding this meeting tonight. This is a great
7 opportunity to discuss the issues that concern us here in
8 this county and this region. I think an important issue
9 here is trust. And I trust that the NRC is conducting a
10 fair and open process to determine whether to license this
11 technology.

12 I trust that USEC is being open and
13 forthright. It's application is not a secret. You can
14 view it on line on the NRC web site.

15 I also trust that everyone's concerns and
16 comments are being heard. I know a lot of people are
17 asking will the American Centrifuge be safe. I feel
18 confident that it will be safe. We're talking about
19 skilled, highly trained employees running this plant. And
20 I understand USEC has strong employee safety programs that
21 meet NRC guideline.

22 The likelihood of an accident that could
23 affect the public is extremely low. Additionally,
24 numerous formalized programs are in place to mitigate
25 potential impacts in the event of emergencies.

1 USEC has a good safety record. The
2 Nuclear Regulatory Commission is known as a tough
3 regulator. It has given USEC high marks for safety. And
4 USEC has personnel whose jobs it is to monitor safety and
5 respond to these safety issues.

6 There are well trained emergency crews on
7 site to respond in the event of a problem. They regularly
8 perform drills and exercises, the NRC participates.

9 Bottom line, I feel safe with this plant
10 being constructed here in our county. This region needs
11 good high paying jobs. USEC is making a long term jobs
12 commitment to our region. And I say our region, not just
13 to our county, Pike County, but this entire region.

14 Hundreds of construction jobs. Up to 500
15 permanent jobs at the American Centrifuge Plant. Up to 50
16 jobs associated with the demonstration beginning this
17 year, 2005. And many of these will be high tech jobs.

18 This plant represents an investment in the
19 future of Southern Ohio. Having a new \$1.5 billion plant
20 in our back yard will help the local economy immensely.

21 The plant will require vendors, suppliers,
22 contractors and many will be from our region. Jobs means
23 people come here, they buy homes and they buy cars, TV's
24 and groceries and everything. And consumers drive the
25 local economy. This will be good for the region.

1 USEC has made a commitment to this
2 community over the years. They're a good corporate
3 citizen. They've been a major donor to many local
4 charities and organizations in our county such as the
5 Village of Piketon and adjoining counties of Jackson, the
6 Food Pantry, Local Hospice, the YMCA here in Waverly and
7 the Boy Scouts and I could go on with many others that
8 they've assisted us in.

9 They promote economic growth. And they're
10 putting their money where their mouth is. Their employees
11 are leaders in our community.

12 USEC supports this region and we should
13 support this plant. At the end of this process when all
14 the facts are in, I'm confident that the right decision
15 will be made. I'm confident that decision will be to
16 issue a license to USEC to build the American Centrifuge
17 Plant.

18 In closing, I'd just like to say that we,
19 the Pike County Board of Commissioners, look forward to a
20 longlasting working relationship with the USEC Centrifuge
21 team in the years to come. Thank you.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you,
23 Commissioner Brushart. We're going to go next to
24 Commissioner Reiser. And then we're going to go to
25 Marjean Kennedy, Craig Butler and then Ted Johanson.

1 Commissioner? Do you want to use this?

2 MR. REISER: I'm not going to attempt to
3 try to top Jim Brushart's presentation there. I'm just
4 here on behalf of the Scioto County Commissioners to tell
5 you that we are interested in having a safe, secure and
6 environmentally safe plant here in Pike County, our
7 neighbor to the north. I would echo most of the comments
8 that Jim makes and say that this is a very, very important
9 project for this region of the country for the reasons
10 that Jim mentioned. And the Scioto County Commissioners
11 are fully in support. We have a lot of trust in NRC and
12 in USEC and we look forward to working with both of you
13 for an extended period of time. Thank you.

14 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much,
15 Commissioner. Marjean?

16 MS. KENNEDY: Thank you. My name is
17 Marjean Kennedy and I'm Governor Taft's Regional Economic
18 Development Representative for Southern Ohio.

19 The State of Ohio and the Department of
20 Development support the United States Enrichment
21 Corporation's license application to the United States
22 Nuclear Regulatory Commission requesting approval to build
23 and operate an American Centrifuge facility in Piketon,
24 Ohio.

25 We all agree, as Commissioner Brushart

1 said earlier, that Southern Ohio needs good, high wage job
2 opportunities. USEC, Incorporated is bringing
3 approximately 500 permanent job opportunities with the
4 American Centrifuge commercial plant. Approximately 50
5 job opportunities with the demonstrate plant beginning
6 later this year and hundreds of construction jobs.

7 We are aware of the comprehensive efforts
8 that USEC is taking to continue their relationship as a
9 good corporate citizen to the area and to ensure that the
10 American Centrifuge project is successful.

11 In turn, Southern Ohio has supported the
12 uranium enrichment industry for more than 50 years. The
13 region has overwhelming embraced USEC, Inc.'s plans to
14 build this American Centrifuge facility, as evidenced by
15 the over 8,000 letters of community support submitted to
16 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission regarding this
17 significant economic opportunity.

18 Understanding that risks are involved, we
19 are confident that USEC, Incorporated will continue to
20 coordinate with the Ohio EPA and the NRC and will continue
21 to utilize the most sophisticated tools available to
22 assure the safety of its workers and the community.

23 The State of Ohio and the Department of
24 Development recognizes the importance of and is proud Ohio
25 has been chosen as home to the United States Enrichment

1 Corporation's \$1.5 billion facility.

2 It is my hope that the NRC will support
3 and approve USEC, Incorporated's license application to
4 construct and operate a commercial plant using American
5 Centrifuge technology. Thank you.

6 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very
7 much, Marjean. Mr. Butler, Craig Butler, with Ohio
8 Environmental Protection Agency, correct? Thank you.

9 MR. BUTLER: Good evening, I'm Craig
10 Butler. I'm the Assistant District Chief for the
11 Southeast District of Ohio EPA. And I will be very brief.
12 I just wanted to also let you know that we are in the
13 process of reviewing environmental permits associated with
14 this facility. We are looking forward to working with NRC
15 as that fits into their process.

16 And much like this scoping meeting
17 tonight, we welcome to come to our public hearing process
18 that we'll be having on various air permits for this
19 facility. You should be seeing public notices in the
20 paper very soon, if you haven't already for these, and we
21 welcome any comments that you have.

22 We've also met with USEC on various other
23 issues in terms of environmental management for the
24 facility. You can contact myself and I will be available
25 and we have other folks in the agency and in our district.

1 If you have an interest in finding out more about those,
2 we'd be glad to talk with you. Thank you.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks very much, Mr.
4 Butler. Next we're going to go to Mr. Ted Johanson. Ted?

5 MR. JOHANSON: My name is Ted Johanson.
6 I'm a Cincinnatian and traveled west -- or east this
7 evening to come here and hear about this plant and
8 understand better what's going on. I'm involved with a
9 small group in Cincinnati and I have a statement that I'd
10 like to read from one person of that group and then also
11 I'd like to make a few comments myself. And I've got four
12 and a half minutes.

13 This is from Gail Miller who lives in
14 Cincinnati. I consider myself a stakeholder in the
15 possible licensing of the American Centrifuge Plant. My
16 environment could potentially be affected.

17 At the Port site there are now stored
18 thousands of cylinders of radioactive waste in the form of
19 depleted uranium hexoflouride. The conversion of this
20 legacy waste to solid uranium oxide will not be complete
21 until at least 2008. In the meantime, those cylinders
22 present a higher risk of radiation contamination to the
23 environment.

24 The local environment is at first risk.
25 In the future, it seems the risk will rise and spread

1 geographically. The factors which increase the risk of
2 contamination include quantities of radioactive waste,
3 time, human error and geography.

4 The American Centrifuge Plant would add to
5 the existing quantities of nuclear waste now deemed
6 important to remove. Only one percent of the uranium
7 source material would be useful as enriched uranium,
8 whether for energy or weapons. Ninety-nine percent would
9 be radioactive waste, needing to be converted or disposed
10 of.

11 The time factor involves U-238's nature.
12 It's half life would require supervision of waste for
13 generations of human kind, over thousands upon thousands
14 of years.

15 Supervision of the waste is subject to
16 human error. Leaks have occurred. Some examples are,
17 one, a depleted uranium hexoflouride cylinder rupture in
18 1978 and, two, a chemical leak into Little Beaver Creek.

19 What quantities leaked over time would
20 adversely effect fish and water down stream in the Scioto
21 and Ohio Rivers?

22 The transport of radioactive waste
23 cylinders to Utah by rail during the many years of the
24 cleanup process expands the geographic risk factor. It
25 could put uranium hexoflouride a few miles away from my

1 home in Cincinnati. Rail accidents do happen. Two such
2 just occurred this past week.

3 Yes, our world is getting smaller all the
4 time. I care about possible dangers of plant operations
5 at American Centrifuge to its nearby residents and to my
6 environment. Submitted by Gail Miller.

7 My comments, knowing very little about
8 this whole process, are simply that in terms of all the
9 factors that are addressed by all of us present, the
10 public who is concerned citizens who live nearby, who live
11 down river like I do in Cincinnati, people at NRC, people
12 of USEC, and all the other agencies, that we look beyond
13 just building this plant right now, we look beyond \$1.5
14 billion, I think which was stated as the cost of building
15 the facility, we look to our children. And not only our
16 children but our children's children and their children
17 and their children and their children. And think about
18 what we are creating for them to deal with when we are all
19 gone and all the money's been spent and distributed and
20 something has been created here that they will have to
21 live us, not us. They will have to live with.

22 And I just ask that we all keep that very
23 much in mind in this whole process of licensing a nuclear
24 facility, which is scary stuff. Particularly to people
25 that don't know a lot about it.

1 And we need to look at ways that we can do
2 this, if we are going to do it, in an extremely safe way
3 that we're not leaving a legacy to our children like the
4 legacy waste at the facility right now. Thank you.

5 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Ted.

6 Next two speakers are Mr. Nathan Bloss and then we're
7 going to go to Mr. Blaine Beekman. Nathan?

8 MR. BLOSS: My name is Nathan Bloss. I'm
9 28 years old from Waverly, Ohio. This is the first
10 meeting I've actually ever been able to sit all the way
11 through.

12 You know, I first want to say that
13 approximately eight years ago I probably would have been
14 considered an environmentalist, a hippie, I followed the
15 Grateful Dead, Fish, very environmentally conscious.

16 But let me speak as a Pike County citizen,
17 a business owner. I have approximately 45 employees in
18 this county that are very dependent on this facility. I'm
19 a hunter, a conservationist, I enjoy the wildlife, I love
20 Pike County.

21 I look across this room, I see a bi-
22 partisan political gathering. You have republicans and
23 democrats from Pike County that have come together for
24 this facility. All denominations of religions. I have
25 faith in the NRC, USEC. I have two children that I would

1 never sell out for the economic impact of this plant.

2 This whole -- Waverly, Piketon, was built
3 on the first gaseous diffusion plant. My grandfather came
4 here in the '50s. I wouldn't be here today if it wasn't
5 for this plant. We really need this for our economy and I
6 do respect everybody's opinions, but I do think that Pike
7 Countians should have the larger say in this. We need
8 this, our children need this. That's a legacy. Without
9 it, there's not a whole lot here.

10 If you drive down 32 or wherever you came
11 in from, there's not a lot here exact for this. And we
12 appreciate you and we have all faith in you, from the
13 younger generation all the way up. Thank you.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,
15 Nathan.

16 We're going to go to Mr. Blaine Beekman
17 who's with the Pike County Chamber of Commerce I believe.

18 MR. BEEKMAN: I am Blaine Beekman,
19 Executive Director of the Pike County Chamber of Commerce.
20 And I actually have two things because I was given this
21 letter to read for the Mayor of Piketon who could not be
22 here this evening. And I apologize -- this is from Billy
23 Spencer.

24 I apologize for not being able to attend
25 tonight's meeting. The Village Council meetings are held

1 on Mondays and rescheduled for tonight due to the Martin
2 Luther King holiday.

3 As the mayor of the host community for
4 USEC's advanced technology plant, I know I speak for the
5 vast majority of the citizens of the Village of Piketon
6 when I say I welcome USEC's decision to locate the plant
7 at Piketon.

8 Also, as someone who has never lived in
9 any place other than Pike County, I feel safe in saying
10 that by far most Pike Countians feel the same.

11 At tonight's council meeting I'll be
12 asking council to rename the Village's Lucas Street Park.
13 This Park has long been neglected by the Village but in
14 the past year we've made great improvements at the Park,
15 we've upgraded the playground, installed a small shelter
16 house and greatly improved the appearance of the park.
17 I'll be asking council to rename the Park Enrichment Park.
18 The name will serve two purposes. One, I would hope the
19 Park would enrich the lives of the people in Piketon.

20 Secondly, it will show the Village's
21 longstanding support of USEC and their advanced technology
22 enrichment plant. I hopes this letter helps the NRC in
23 the process of licensing the advanced technology plant.

24 If I can be of any service to you, please
25 call. And it's from Bill Spencer, the Mayor of Piketon.

1 My remarks will deal with the issue of
2 community support. First, let me say that I respect the
3 opinions of all who speak this evening, consider it
4 important to consider all sides, even when I disagree with
5 their position.

6 But I am concerned about misconceptions
7 about the Pike County community held by those who oppose
8 this licensing. Apparently it's difficult for outsiders
9 to understand Pike Countians. They seem to believe that a
10 shroud of ignorance and indifference has descended upon
11 Pike County when it comes to the operation of the DOE
12 facility.

13 The impression exists that the presence of
14 this plant in this county is somehow left as a deserted
15 waste land. A gentleman called at the chamber last week,
16 implying that the plant had depressed land values in Pike
17 County, a fact which clearly isn't true because we know
18 when we try to buy property here it's very expensive.

19 Secondly, he also believed the county has
20 lost population over the past half century. Actually, the
21 county's populated increased twelve and a half percent in
22 the last decade, and that matches the increases in the two
23 decades before that.

24 But it's also inferred that the people of
25 this community ignored health issues at the plant. And

1 this is a thing that really is disturbing to us who have
2 lived here all of our lives.

3 No one in Pike County in 1952 knew the
4 exact mission of the facility. We understood the
5 importance of that mission and for half a century the
6 plant effectively carried out its mission.

7 People have suggested that we ignored
8 stories of possible health issues because of the high
9 paying jobs. When the plant went on line, I lived on
10 Dutch Run, a mile from the plant, my sister lived in a
11 Bailey Chapel Farm that backed right up to the DOE
12 property. We never worked at the plant, no one in my
13 family has ever worked at the plant, nor did our
14 neighbors. And we considered every story we heard.

15 We were all aghast at a study a few years
16 ago that supposedly showed the cancer right in Pike County
17 was amazingly high. The study played upon the fears that
18 we all have about cancer. The report blamed the plant
19 directly.

20 When the report proved to be a total
21 fabrication, it was one of the worst hoaxes that had ever
22 been perpetrated on this community.

23 Because of that, we do have a suspect of
24 outside experts and reports that we've seen over the last
25 few years. The community understood that operations at

1 the plant could involve a degree of risk. We also
2 realized the importance of following correct safety
3 procedures at critical operations.

4 I want you all to remember that the
5 largest employer in this county is the timber industry. I
6 grew up in the timber industry and so did several other
7 people in this room tonight. We knew the dangers of that
8 occupation. Whether a person is cutting logs or paper
9 wood or whether they're being sawers or off at a sawmill
10 or whether they're working on the line at any of the three
11 plants we have in Pike County that directly are dependent
12 on wood, safety is an absolute imparity. We know that
13 that first mistake causes injuries and that second mistake
14 can be fatal. We understand the necessity of safety.

15 I moderated the 1999 DOE hearings where
16 plant workers testified about safety violations from 1954
17 to 1993. I was shocked as were the officials who
18 conducted the hearings. We learned that an incomplete
19 understanding of an evolving technology put workers at
20 unnecessary risk in the plant's early years.

21 We also found evidence that safety
22 procedures were too often ignored. That workers had
23 unfortunately suffered and workers had died.

24 From those hearings came the Worker
25 Compensation Program. But also along with that came a

1 resolve in this community to become more involved.

2 We opened a stronger dialogue with the
3 Department of Energy. When the community learned that a
4 low level waste dump was being contemplated on land near
5 the Ohio State Research Center, the Pike County Chamber of
6 Commerce hosted a series of meetings with DOE and with the
7 Ohio EPA to work out an alternative.

8 With the stoppage of production at the
9 diffusion plant, the community also made it clear the
10 clean up of the past half century's activities was an
11 absolute must.

12 We're clearly in support of the ongoing
13 clean up effort. The community also believes in the
14 mission of the DUF-6 conversion facility.

15 The community also extended its contacts
16 with USEC. We looked closely at this company's commitment
17 to safety and reassured that the policies of previous
18 plant operators have been corrected.

19 We've also studied the advances in
20 centrifuge technology and are convinced it's a much safer
21 and more efficient technology.

22 As the community's awareness and its
23 active role has increased, so has the clarity of the
24 community's view toward the future of nuclear energy. The
25 next twenty years will bring a major increase in the

1 demand for electricity. We believe that nuclear energy
2 will be a major force in that growth.

3 The American Centrifuge facility will be a
4 key player. As a community we're pleased the USEC chose
5 Piketon. We expect the NRC to provide regulatory
6 guidelines that will allow USEC to operate a plant
7 efficiently with protections for both the workers and the
8 community. The community submitted thousands of letters
9 in support of this project.

10 We do look forward to another half century
11 of partnership with USEC and DOE, keeping Pike County in
12 the nuclear energy field. Thank you.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Mr.
14 Beekman. Our next three speakers are Elisa Young and then
15 we're going to go to Dan Menter of PACE and then to Mr.
16 Marvin Jones. Elisa?

17 MS. YOUNG: I'd first like to say that I
18 understand how it is to be from a community that needs
19 jobs. I am the seventh generation person living in Meigs
20 County, Ohio and until recently we had a 23 percent
21 unemployment rate. So I can very much relate to that.

22 But one of my real concerns with this is
23 that as taxpayers we're going to end up paying the clean
24 up fees again. I know that last year they said that -- I
25 think it was \$296 million of taxpayer money were used to

1 clean up at Piketon. So it's not just a Piketon issue.
2 So I think that there should be some alternative means for
3 paying for the clean up. Maybe there could be a
4 performance bond or an escrow account that's set up
5 sufficient to pay for the clean up in advance to show that
6 USEC does have, you know, goodwill and that they're
7 willing to pay for what they leave behind, so that we
8 don't, as taxpayers, have to fund it.

9 And since USEC is going to be renting the
10 land from the Department of Energy and the Department of
11 Energy is funded, one of my concerns is that if USEC runs
12 out of money, and I do understand that they do have some
13 financial challenges, will that funding for clean up rest
14 on taxpayers shoulder by default.

15 So I would like to see a fund sufficient
16 to cover clean up, set up in advance before any licensure
17 is granted, as a taxpayer.

18 I think that the NRC said that the largest
19 performance bond they have ever set up is one billion.
20 Between last year and this year, roughly between 500
21 million and 600 million is being spent on clean up alone.
22 And this is a decade after it's closed. I did ask the
23 Department of Energy for an estimate on what the entire
24 amount is that was spent on clean up and they did not
25 respond to me. That was a couple months ago.

1 I know that other facilities that have
2 waste storage, things like gas stations and drycleaners,
3 are only allowed to keep toxic waste on site for 90 days.
4 So I'm wondering, you know, what is the limit going to be
5 for depleted uranium waste on this site? Will there be
6 fines set up in advance for storing the waste beyond this
7 amount of time? And would fines be set up in a sufficient
8 amount to encourage USEC to move the waste on as opposed
9 to leaving it sit?

10 If they would choose to process it here,
11 my understanding is that the conversion facility is
12 already tied up for the next 25 years. So that means that
13 the depleted uranium, if they leave it in that form, would
14 be sitting here at least that amount of time.

15 And I have not gotten a response yet on
16 how much depleted uranium would be generated by this
17 facility. I would be curious to know that.

18 Some of my other questions -- I'm sorry my
19 voice is shaking but I'm not much on public speaking --
20 has as an alternative to water use, to releasing things
21 into streams and the rivers, is USEC proposing a closed
22 lid system. I have not been able to read the application
23 yet, so I don't know. I know that's a little bit more
24 expensive but it saves us money as taxpayers in clean up.

25 What water source will be used for

1 operations -- I'll just read off these questions that I
2 have. How much water will be used? Where will the water
3 be released? What radioactive concentration limits are
4 set for those releases? Who will monitor those releases?
5 What action will be taken if these release limits are
6 exceeded?

7 I know that in the Netherlands that Uranko
8 (phonetic spelling) was shut down for exceeding limits.
9 So I wonder what is going to be done differently here to
10 protect the safe and healthy -- you know, the health of
11 people and the integrity of the environment for people who
12 live near the rivers where this is going to be flowing off
13 site.

14 I know that in the risk based end state
15 that the DOE just proposed before, that they were trying
16 to limit the responsibility for any kind of contamination
17 traveling off site through the streams.

18 As far as decommissioning, I'm wondering,
19 when the plant decommissions, who is going to monitor the
20 radioactive landfills and can there be some kind of a
21 written agreement in advance to avoid another sacrifice
22 zone.

23 With transportation issues, I've heard
24 some people say that they are concerned about the safety
25 of the road conditions. That some of the things that are

1 traveling now on site from Tennessee are traveling on
2 roads that are known by local residents to be unsafe. I
3 don't live here, I don't know. I've just heard this from
4 other people.

5 I wonder what is going to be done in terms
6 of looking at the roads and the road conditions that
7 either the trucks will be traveling on or if it's rail
8 conditions, how it's going to be transported here to us
9 and from us.

10 I think that there should be some kind of
11 a contract in place before the license is granted that
12 states where the waste will go. Who is going to accept
13 it. I know when they built the conversion facility the
14 only thing that they got was a letter of acceptance from
15 Envirocare, that they would accept the uranium oxide if it
16 tested to be less -- if it was low level waste.

17 My understanding is is that it's higher
18 than low level waste. They can't even test a sample until
19 they have it anyway. I think that before this facility is
20 licensed, there needs to be some written contract in place
21 for where the waste will go so that it doesn't sit here.

22 So I guess one of my main concerns would
23 be looking at alternatives for funding clean up. I don't
24 think that should land on taxpayers to subsidize that. I
25 think it should be done by USEC or Pike County. If Pike

1 County is willing to have the jobs and profit from it,
2 then maybe there's a way for them also to pay back into
3 the clean up.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much
5 for those comments, Elisa. And I guess I would ask Steve
6 Lewis or other NRC staff to perhaps after the meeting talk
7 to Elisa a little bit about financial assurance issues.

8 Dan? Dan Menter?

9 MR. MENTER: Good evening, my name is Dan
10 Menter. I'm the President of the PACE work force at the
11 facility, also the Vice Chairman of the Southern Ohio
12 Diversification, SODI, which is a community reuse
13 organization here in the area.

14 I also serve kind of a quasi role working
15 with interest of the work force, past and present. We
16 also have the worker health protection program which is a
17 legacy issue of past issues of the site related to
18 exposures and other issues.

19 You heard testimony tonight by a number of
20 folks in this room about different aspects of this
21 program. Tonight's purpose, obviously, is the scoping
22 process related to the environmental actions and what is
23 the purpose of the facility I think was one of the things.
24 Obviously it's to produce energy. And what are the
25 alternatives? I guess everyone knows the alternative. I

1 think some folks that went without electricity for seven
2 or eight days know the alternative, not having energy.

3 And of course, what are the effects of the
4 environment. And those all have to be considerations.

5 As a representative of the work force and
6 based on some of the comments you've heard tonight by Mr.
7 Beekman and others, there are issues that clearly must be
8 learned from the past and applied to the future. Not
9 doing that, then we can't assure the safety issues as well
10 as the environmental issues going forward.

11 There has to be a process. I have
12 correspondence from a number of leaders in this room that
13 have been reliant on the PACE work force to ensure the
14 public safety and health interest. Obviously the interest
15 of the workers to work safely, not only for themselves but
16 for the family and the communities where we reside. That
17 has to be a priority.

18 We have demonstrated on a national and a
19 local level that that is an important issue. We have
20 taken it to the highest level of our government, including
21 testimony before our Congressmen, conducting the public
22 meeting that was mentioned earlier in 1999, and the
23 passage of law on several occasions. We continue to take
24 the issues of this community to the highest level of our
25 government and obviously the environmental issues as well

1 as the safety issues must be the highest priority.

2 We ask USEC, we ask the NRC, which
3 obviously is the regulatory process, is clearly different
4 than what we had seen with the Department of Energy in a
5 defense type mission. If you haven't crawled under your
6 desk -- a few years back in this same school they used to
7 have things called a drill. And that drill was because of
8 a potential of nuclear holocaust. Those risks that were
9 taken during those period of times were during a different
10 era of time, and a self-regulation of the Department of
11 Energy.

12 Clearly the NRC provides a different venue
13 and different regulatory process. And again, when you
14 think about that howling sound and a person crawling under
15 a desk because of a nuclear holocaust, the Department of
16 Energy, and this certainly is no defense for their
17 actions, may have taken risks that perhaps were not
18 acceptable, but yet based on the challenges posed risks to
19 the work force and the community. Those are the things
20 that do not need to be repeated.

21 The facility has had an environmental
22 impact statement in the past. I think there's obviously
23 something that can be gleaned from that. During the
24 1980's. Probably not any new archeological finds or new
25 settings during that period of time.

1 However, with that statement I'll --
2 again, not being brief, because that's not something I do
3 often, although I considered a written comment, I thought
4 it important to mention that with respect to corporate
5 citizenship, that I do remind USEC to meet expectations.
6 That's an important factor. We've had times when certain
7 expectations weren't met on operating facilities, certain
8 durations of that time. So meeting expectations is clear
9 and foremost and it must be met. That's an integrity
10 issue that we expect from our employer, we expect from our
11 corporate citizenship in Pike County. And we continue to
12 expect that and we will strive for that process.

13 We have support this process because of
14 the growth that it provides to the community. The
15 profound importance it has to our nation's energy and
16 independency, not relying on the Russian government or
17 other governments. We've learned what happens when we
18 rely on governments for oil and you can see the result
19 that creates. And certainly those are effects that are
20 pretty profound to say the least.

21 And not doing that certainly is a lesson
22 learned. So there are levels of this process that effects
23 our national government and our local citizens. A balance
24 must be achieved and certainly as a work force we try to
25 remain in a position to ensure that those interests are

1 met and continue to work with the citizens and the
2 leadership of this area to do that. So thank you.

3 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mr.
4 Menter. We're going to hear from Marvin Jones as a
5 Chillicothe Chamber of Commerce and then we're going to go
6 to Vina Colley and Vicky Mattson.

7 MR. JONES: Yes, I am Marvin Jones,
8 Executive Director of the Chillicothe/Ross Chamber of
9 Commerce that has 585 members, including USEC.

10 And I think Commissioner Brushart really
11 hit the nail on the head when he talked about that this is
12 a matter of trust. I think this community has supported
13 uranium enrichment production since the early '50s, as
14 pointed out in the information over here. And it still
15 does today, very much today.

16 In the past 50 years, the NRC and its
17 predecessors have established rules and regulations to
18 safeguard the health of workers and the community. And I
19 think there has to be a trust factor that they're using
20 the latest technology today and will use the technology of
21 tomorrow to make sure that the best possible safety
22 factors can be put into place using this technology.

23 And the community has a great deal of
24 faith in the NRC in enforcing the stringent measures to
25 protect workers and the community.

1 USEC has a great track record in meeting
2 or exceeding the standards established by the government,
3 by the NRC. And the community has a great deal of faith
4 that USEC will again exceed expectations for safety.
5 Thank you.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much,
7 Marvin. Next we're going to go to Vina or do you want --
8 go to Vicky first, Vicky Mattson.

9 MS. MATTSON: Hi, my name is Vicky
10 Mattson. I'm the Chair of the Appalachian Ohio Section of
11 the Sierra Club. The Sierra Club has a number of members
12 that live in Pike and Scioto Counties. And besides -- I
13 live in Athens, which I think is pretty darn close. I'm
14 here to speak also for them.

15 So I have more questions than I have
16 answers. I'm curious about whether the workers' health
17 are going to be affected by the previous pollution because
18 it seems like uranium sticks around a lot more than -- for
19 longer than more than three and four years. And if the
20 clean up is proceeded far enough to make it healthy for
21 the workers to be at the plant. And can it be cleaned up
22 before the new plant starts?

23 I understand that we pay more to clean up
24 the site than the wages at the plant would be, looking at
25 the amount of clean up that still needs to be done.

1 I'm very concerned about the waste
2 traveling across Ohio and other states. I don't think
3 they're going to do an EIS every place that this waste
4 travels to get to somewhere. So I think that needs to be
5 addressed in this venue, even if it's not in this town. I
6 think that the waste facility needs to be set up in
7 advance, before you start producing more waste that's just
8 going to sit here in southern Ohio.

9 We just had a big flooding event and how
10 is the facility going to deal with that?

11 Because we're the Sierra Club, I also
12 notice what a beautiful county this is and I wanted to
13 find out how the streams are going to be protected that
14 flow through the site. I haven't heard anything about how
15 the site is going to be run. I've heard about the plant,
16 but how about the protection of birds that are going to be
17 able to fly in? Will they be contaminated and then fly
18 back out?

19 I heard that the deer hunt was cancelled
20 in 2004 because of some kind of question on whether there
21 was radioactivity. There are fish in the Scioto River
22 that test positive for uranium contamination. I don't
23 know where that would come from. The streams seem to flow
24 from here to the Scioto River.

25 So I would be concerned with protecting

1 the species that go in and out of the grounds and I also
2 would be very concerned with the health of the communities
3 around here and the workers at the facility. Thank you.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much,
5 Vicky, for those specific comments and we're going to go
6 to Vina, Vina Colley.

7 MS. COLLEY: Well, I guess I just have to
8 catch my breath a minute before I start because I'm
9 overwhelmed about all the people are thinking about how
10 safe this plant is and how safe it's going to be.

11 But anyway, my name is Vina Colley. I'm
12 president of PRESS and co-chair of National Nuclear
13 Workers for Justice. And I am a victim of the past
14 practices of this plant.

15 I know first hand about the poor safety
16 practices from the contractors working for the Department
17 of Energy and the Department of Defense.

18 We have watchdogged this plant since back
19 in the early '80s. We have broken every major story of
20 this plant, including the plutonium that caused the
21 workers compensation, the EEOICPA to come in effect.

22 I don't know how we're going to clean up
23 all this plutonium. I don't know how we're going to clean
24 up all this uranium that's off site and on site, to make
25 it safe for your community that you think is safe.

1 The Presidential Council on Environmental
2 Quality describes in EIS as an action forcing device,
3 whose purposes are to provide full and fair discussion of
4 significant environmental impacts and to inform decision
5 makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which
6 would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the
7 quality of the environment, 40 CFR 1502.1. These impact
8 and alternatives must be addressed before action is taken,
9 rather than justifying a decision already made, 40 CFR
10 1502.2g.

11 The scope of the NRC's environmental
12 impact should be expanded to include the following issues
13 not adequately covered under USEC's environmental report.

14 DOE wants to relax its site wide clean up
15 standards on the presumption that the site will be decided
16 to do nuclear production under USEC agreement. Therefore,
17 USEC project must be considered as having the impact of
18 the relaxation of these standards such -- since with no
19 American Centrifuge Plant, the old standards would have to
20 be honored for the sake of the community reuse.

21 NRC should examine the impact of the
22 American Centrifuge Plant on site wide clean up standards.

23 If the American Centrifuge proceeds, it
24 will close the whole site off to alternative use because
25 of required security restrictions. This will change or

1 eliminate possibilities for clean up and reuse of certain
2 facilities outside of USEC license agreement.

3 For example, the old shops and warehouse
4 facilities at the gaseous diffusion plant sites, public
5 use of the perimeter road or opening undevelopment parts
6 of the site to the public use.

7 In the section that describes that no
8 action alternative, USEC states that if the American
9 Centrifuge is not built at Piketon, the site will be
10 unaffected. This is simply a lie and it undercuts USEC's
11 credibility on every other issue.

12 The whole project, DOE end-state for the
13 site is based on new nuclear production. Just look at the
14 highway sign for the American Centrifuge Plant. By
15 telling this lie, USEC avoids discussion of the benefits
16 to the site and the community from early project
17 cancellation.

18 Whether the American Centrifuge succeeds
19 or fails, it will turn the rest of the site into a
20 dumpsite by encouraging DOE to invite in waste from other
21 sites. This has already started. In the last two years,
22 DOE has transferred uranium in large quantities to Piketon
23 from three other sites, Fernald, Oak Ridge and Paducah.
24 These transfers would not happen without the American
25 Centrifuge Plant, and that is a real impact of the

1 American Centrifuge Plant because the projects will likely
2 fail and all the transfer waste will be its legacy.

3 NRC must examine the relationship between
4 DOE, a government agency, and USEC, a supposedly private
5 company, a relationship that is unclear, unexamined, and
6 untested. USEC makes constant referral to the
7 privatization legislation and to the congressional intent
8 as it had nothing to do with creating that legislation. A
9 circular agreement. In its licensing process, NRC should,
10 therefore, examine the entire site, USEC relationship and
11 a full range of impacts that the relation entails.

12 PRESS supports the need for a separate
13 culture resource assessment by NRC with its own scoping
14 process that is required. Because DOE has never complied
15 with the National Historical Preservation Act at the
16 Piketon site. And the site has tremendous historical and
17 pre-historical value that has never been studied.

18 Because USEC's future and the American
19 Centrifuge futures are both extremely uncertain, NRC must
20 examine the impact of the project's failures at various
21 future dates. For example, if the project proceeds to the
22 next four years with contamination of the existing
23 buildings from the lead cascade and the construction of
24 two new buildings for the American Centrifuge Plant and
25 then USEC collapsed after the next Presidential election,

1 where does that leave the community?

2 DOE already allowed the contamination of
3 the centrifuge buildings in a 1985 via test run of
4 uranium. Even after Congressional funding for the GCEP
5 project was cut. NRC cannot allow the same thing to
6 happen again.

7 PRESS is also aware of a study of the
8 workers at Oak Ridge from the centrifuge plant. Those
9 workers at the centrifuge plant had a high rate of stomach
10 cancer. When are we, as citizens and taxpayers, going to
11 put a stop to hurting our own kind?

12 I want to thank you for the opportunity
13 and I will be submitting more comments as we go.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you
15 very much, Vina. Next we're going to go to Charles
16 Wiltshire and then we're going to go to Patricia Marida.

17 MR. WILTSHERE: Good evening. My name is
18 Charles Wiltshire. I am the full-time Triangle of
19 Prevention Coordinator for PACE Local 56-89. I'm a
20 second-generation worker at the Piketon Enrichment
21 facility and I have worked there as a union member for
22 over 32 years. My father hired in in the '50s and he
23 passed away in '76.

24 The Triangle of Prevention program is a
25 union led, Company supported safety program that works to

1 prevent accidents and incidents before they happen.

2 In my 32 years of service I have seen
3 great strides in the improvement of plant safety and the
4 efforts put forth both by union and management as a team
5 to ensure that workers and the public is protected. We
6 may not always be on the same page when it comes to labor
7 issues, but let me assure you that we speak the same
8 language when it comes to the safety of the worker and the
9 public.

10 My son and I have hunted and harvested
11 game on the DOE reservation. Since 9/11, the hunting has
12 been closed to the public but they still continue to allow
13 employees to hunt. I would like to see future job
14 opportunities for my children and grand children who will
15 be finishing college about the time the centrifuge plant
16 is due to go on line.

17 USEC has a proven track record for
18 employee and public safety. As a taxpayer, I fully
19 support the construction of the American Centrifuge Plant
20 at the Piketon site. And I can submit this written
21 comment. Who do I give this to?

22 MR. CAMERON: You can give it to me, Mr.
23 Wiltshire, and we'll attach it to the transcript. Thank
24 you very much. We're going to next go to Patricia Marida
25 from the Sierra Club.

1 MS. MARIDA: Hi, I'm Pat Marida. I have a
2 bit of a cold, so I hope you'll bear with me.

3 I am the Chair of the Central Ohio group
4 of the Sierra Club. We have offices at 36 West Gay Street
5 in Columbus. I'm a volunteer.

6 The group has over 5,000 members in
7 Central Ohio, including, as Vicky mentioned, we have
8 members in Pike County.

9 I would like to ask that the deadline for
10 comments for the scoping be extended. First, the
11 information on the Environmental Report was removed from
12 the web for security purposes and was only recently
13 reinstated. Second, none of us who have been currently
14 involved in this issue were notified of a public meeting
15 on November 9th where USEC's record of accidents and
16 contamination releases was discussed. Third, some of the
17 information that was discussed at that meeting has been
18 classified as confidential for security reasons, so we do
19 not have access to it. Fourth, we have had a great deal
20 of difficulty viewing the rest of the material concerning
21 the violations on the web. Information on Reportable
22 Events was supposed to be on the web but we could not seem
23 to access it with our computers. Fifth, questions that we
24 asked at the public meeting on December 2nd have not yet
25 been answered. I gave a list of questions to Bill

1 Murphie, and I have not as yet received a reply. So we
2 respectfully request an extension of the comment deadlines
3 for at least 30 days beyond the current deadline of
4 February 1st.

5 At this meeting I will comment briefly on
6 a few subjects that we think should be addressed in
7 developing an Environmental Impact Statement.

8 First, there is debate over whether this
9 facility is needed. The Carnegie Report: A Strategy for
10 Nuclear Security, states that there are sufficient stocks
11 of enriched uranium to fuel existing reactors for several
12 years. Weapons are being disassembled that could provide a
13 good deal of reactor fuel. The report states that
14 production of even the lower levels of enriched uranium
15 could have a de-stabilizing effect on nuclear treaties and
16 initiate a stepped-up arms race. The cost to the public
17 coffers, the environment, and political stability mandates
18 that there must be a pressing need for such a facility.

19 And, indeed, the implications of this
20 facility go international.

21 Second, the public must be intimately
22 involved in the preparation of and comments on a draft
23 EIS. The public must agree upon the need for the
24 facility. The NRC should actively incorporate and respond
25 to public comments and questions throughout the process

1 and must give replies to questions on a timely or even
2 immediate basis.

3 Third, it is critical that the proposed
4 licensee, United States Enrichment Corporation, be
5 financially viable. NRC must verify the actual and
6 complete resources of this company. Given their past
7 history, how can we have any degree of certainty they will
8 remain viable as a for-profit entity? NRC must tell us
9 what will happen if USEC declares bankruptcy. Will
10 operations be able to continue? What agency would
11 continue the operation? Will the public be asked to foot
12 the bill? For past operations? For ongoing operations?

13 The public must have more answers to
14 questions on performance review of past USEC operations.
15 For instance, the Nuclear Criticality Safety Non-
16 Compliance graph of the Environmental Report apparently
17 deals only with releases or incidents that could cause a
18 nuclear reaction or critical event. Therefore, dangerous
19 non-critical or non explosive releases and their sources
20 are not addressed. I see what appears to be a number of
21 gaps in the NRC evaluation of the data. We would like to
22 have information on where the contamination came from and
23 how it was addressed. Accidental releases and elaborate
24 venting must be fully explained and evaluated. In the
25 graph of Contaminated Feed Cleanup Project Dose Trend, an

1 increase in worker exposure to uranium hexoflouride as
2 time went on was not an encouraging trend, and we would
3 like to see an explanation for this.

4 Worker and the public health must be
5 addressed. Will workers be monitored by daily urine tests
6 before and after work? Will such monitoring be done by an
7 independent entity? Will accidental and deliberate
8 releases be made immediately known to the public? At what
9 level will a public alert be triggered? What mechanisms
10 will be utilized for notification? What training will be
11 made available, and to what entities? Will drills be
12 conducted by the personnel that have been trained?

13 Of course, as the Environmental Report
14 states, continuing education of employees and a closer
15 monitoring by management can be used to help alleviate
16 incidents. While obviously true, such a statement is too
17 generic to be meaningful. Was anyone fired on account of
18 incompetence? Were people given warnings? Will incident
19 reports be written in the future, or will they be
20 considered a security risk? Will the public have access
21 to past and future incident reports? At what interval
22 after they occur?

23 Alternative uses for the site must be
24 developed and publicized. Will further contamination of
25 the site make it less qualified for an alternative use, as

1 Vina has suggested?

2 Waste management must be addressed. Where
3 will depleted uranium from the process go? Will it be
4 left on the site? What plans are there for disposing of
5 the depleted uranium that is generated?

6 Many questions are outside the scope of a
7 5-minute statement. Site contamination, water
8 contamination and air releases, as well as use of water
9 and electricity must be addressed.

10 And, you know, talking about trusting the
11 NRC, it's the same NRC that recently overlooked and
12 allowed to be overlooked the routine inspections at the
13 Davis-Bessie Reactor, letting boric acid drip on the
14 containment vessel until only one-sixteenth inch separated
15 us from disaster. So we need to -- it's not a matter of
16 trust. It's a matter of openness and public inspection so
17 that we can see what we're doing. We don't rely on trust
18 for -- that's something that we -- from people that we
19 know and understand and we know that government agencies
20 should be, like any other business, just needs public
21 oversight. Thank you very much for the opportunity to
22 speak tonight.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Patricia.
24 And you wanted us to attach your statement to the
25 transcript, right? Is that correct?

1 MS. MARIDA: Yes.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Do you have that?

3 Did she hand that to you?

4 FROM THE FLOOR: She did.

5 MR. CAMERON: Can we give it to the
6 stenographer? I think she wanted it to be attached to the
7 transcript, thank you.

8 Mr. Geoffrey Sea.

9 MR. SEA: My name is Geoffrey Sea. I
10 first came to Pike County 25 years ago as a college
11 student writing my senior thesis about the plant and the
12 history of the plant. And I came with an open mind,
13 wanting to understand the complexity here.

14 I'm still working on that project. Not
15 the thesis, I finished that. But I wound up staying,
16 getting very involved. I was hired by the union, then
17 called the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union, to work
18 on health and safety issues and to work on alternative use
19 planning for parts of the site, which gave me somewhat of
20 a unique prospective.

21 And before Dan Menter jumps up and
22 strangles me, I will point out that I'm no longer
23 associated with the Union.

24 But I am now going back to sort of my
25 original role as a writer and writing a book about the

1 history of the plant and the history of the county, which
2 will come out next year and I urge you all to buy it.

3 I'm in kind of a unique prospective. I am
4 probably, other than the argumently impartial people from
5 NRC, I might be the only one in the room who is not for
6 the centrifuge plant or against the centrifuge plant, and
7 I really mean that.

8 I'm a friend of Blaine's, I'm a friend of
9 Vina's. I'm an old friend of Chuck Wiltshire, although I
10 haven't seen him in 20 years. It's been a long time.

11 I'd like to think I'm always going to be
12 their friends, although I'm not sure I want to be in the
13 same room alone with Vina and Blaine.

14 But, I think I can kind of see things from
15 all sides, at least I try to. I especially try to as a
16 writer. And I am now moving back to the county, although
17 now I'm spending my time divided between New York and
18 Piketon, which I like to say are just about the same only
19 opposite.

20 And that gives me a unique prospective.
21 And there are two special feelings I have being in this
22 situation. The one is a feeling of de javu. They built
23 those buildings that USEC wants to use to put those
24 centrifuges in to house centrifuges in -- I think they
25 were finished in 1985. And at that time there was a very

1 similar process as what's happening now over whether that
2 plant, then called GCEP, would open. And the trust of
3 this community was betrayed at that time by DOE. We
4 should all look back and recognize that. There's no doubt
5 about that.

6 DOE came into this community at that time
7 and promised this community that the new centrifuge plant
8 would open and the old diffusion plant would stay open,
9 too, and we'd have two plants. And every one was riled up
10 to fight for all the great jobs that would come from both
11 facilities, all the many thousands of jobs. And it was a
12 lie from the beginning. And if people had, you know,
13 opened their eyes, they would have seen that it was a lie,
14 it couldn't possibly be true.

15 And finally, Congress stepped in and --
16 you know, they were funding everything. They were funding
17 the diffusion plant, they were funding the centrifuge
18 plant and they weren't answerable to anybody. They
19 weren't answerable to taxpayers, even to Congress. DOE at
20 that time had no one looking over their shoulder, so they
21 could do anything they wanted. And they had no market
22 competition.

23 Then they had market competition from the
24 Europeans and everything fell apart. And we, as a union,
25 were in a very difficult situation. Because we were

1 expected to support everything. Support the centrifuge
2 plant, support the diffusion plant, do everything, right?
3 For the county, for jobs, for the atomic industry. Let's
4 all hold rallies, and we did, right? There were all these
5 big rallies, I was part of that back in the '80s.

6 But it all fizzled, it all disappeared,
7 and it was worse than that. Because part of the story
8 that maybe not too many people in the room remember. But
9 it's really important to remember this part of the story.
10 And that is that when Congress cut funding for the
11 centrifuge plant, our union went to DOE and asked for
12 conversations about alternative use. We had two new
13 buildings that were clean buildings that could have been
14 used to house any kind of alternative industry. And we
15 started a project, the union did, at that time to find an
16 alternative use for those buildings after Congressional
17 funding was cut.

18 And that project that we started back then
19 evolved into SODI, Southern Ohio Diversification
20 Initiative, after many years.

21 But let me tell you what happened. What
22 happened was, DOE didn't want to have to negotiate with
23 the union at one of its facilities over alternative use.
24 And so what did they do? After the Congressional funding
25 for the centrifuge plant was cut, they ran a test run of

1 uranium through those centrifuges just for the purpose of
2 contaminating those buildings. Just so that they would
3 not have to engage this community in a discussion about
4 clean up and alternative use. Because once they ran
5 uranium through those buildings and those buildings were
6 contaminated, they were DOE property and domained forever.

7 And that is the reason, that spiteful
8 action that DOE managers did, is the reason why we didn't
9 get another industry in those buildings. And people from
10 SODI know this, that SODI actually located other
11 companies, especially a truck manufacturing company, that
12 wanted to locate in those buildings after a lot of
13 additional taxpayer money was spent to clean them up.

14 So what's the point of this story? Now
15 we're supposedly in a new world, right, that has nothing
16 -- has no relationship to this old horrible memory that
17 none of us would like to remember.

18 Well, I'm sorry, but I really feel a
19 strong sense of de javu. Because to me, see, another way
20 I'm different maybe than most of the people in this room,
21 is that I think you all come here thinking that the
22 important decision is the licensing decision. Will NRC
23 grant a license or not?

24 And frankly, I think that is the most
25 irrelevant question on the face of the earth. And this

1 probably has to do with my other strong feeling and that
2 is, going back and forth between New York and Piketon is
3 that the sense about this project and the sense about USEC
4 is worlds apart. It feels like I'm moving between two
5 twilight zones. Because here everybody thinks, just like
6 we did in 1985 about all the great promises and the great
7 atomic bouin that's going to come, that's bouin not boom,
8 sorry.

9 And people here think that all these
10 promises are going to be fulfilled. And you go to New
11 York and you go to Washington and you talk to people who
12 know about this industry, who follow the industry, and I'm
13 talking about reporters who I talk to, being a writer, or
14 industry analysts, Wall Street analysts, nuclear fuel
15 specialists, congressional staff people; the consensus is
16 there's not a snowball's chance in hell that this project
17 is going to succeed. There is the assumption that it's
18 going to fail.

19 Now, not everybody is sure how. Two years
20 ago the New York Times ran an article talking about plans
21 in Congress to re-nationalize the industry on the
22 presumption that USEC is going to go belly-up and declare
23 Chapter 11 bankruptcy. That was two years ago in the New
24 York Times, okay?

25 So there are all kinds of scenarios. Some

1 people think that USEC's just going to fold, some people
2 think that LES, the other company that wants to build an
3 enrichment plant in New Mexico, will beat USEC to the
4 punch and get their plant up and running first and then
5 USEC's stock will decline as a result. Or there are all
6 kinds of other scenarios. Maybe Iran and North Korea will
7 go to the bargaining table and say we're not going to give
8 up our enrichment plants unless the United States agrees
9 to cancel it's enrichment plants. That might happen you
10 know.

11 Or there are a million other scenarios.
12 But to me, the question is not does this plant get
13 licensed or not. The question to me is, are we going to
14 replay 1985 or not?

15 And that is, one thing we can all agree
16 on, every single person in this room can agree on, is that
17 the worst possible scenario for everybody here is if the
18 lead cascade, what do they call it, the initial test run
19 of uranium, goes through that building and contaminates it
20 again for a second time, and then the project fails.
21 Right? That is the worst scenario of all.

22 And that scenario is not mentioned in the
23 USEC environmental report. And in terms of scoping, I
24 think we can all have a consensus that NRC needs to look
25 at that scenario.

1 Now, this is a very different project than
2 any other project that NRC has ever licensed. And I think
3 they know that. And there's a lot of fudging going on
4 here. It's a different project because this is the first
5 time NRC has licensed a quasi-private company, and that's
6 what USEC is, nobody really knows what it is, it's quasi-
7 private, quasi-public, no one's quite sure. It might be
8 re-nationalized tomorrow, might become a totally private,
9 nobody's quite sure. What's their relationship with DOE
10 defined by legislation. There could be new legislation
11 tomorrow that could redefine the relationship. So there
12 are no guarantees in this game.

13 So NRC is supposed to license an entity
14 that is a complete creation of Congress but that claims to
15 private, to operate on land using the property of another
16 federal agency. NRC --

17 MR. CAMERON: Geoffrey, could you just
18 wrap it up? Very provocative comments for us to think
19 about.

20 MR. SEA: It's a unique situation and as
21 part of the scoping, NRC really needs to be honest and
22 open its review to this unique new kind of situation for
23 the sake of this community. Thank you.

24 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. Dr.
25 Manuta?

1 DR. MANUTA: Hi, everyone. I'm David
2 Manuta, President of Manuta Chemical Consulting. And up
3 until about four and a half years ago, research staff
4 member, too, or de facto chief scientist at the plant.

5 Among other things, as a private business
6 owner, I'm very, very interested in seeing that the
7 centrifuge be deployed for what it means to our community.

8 Unlike our previous speaker, I'm a native
9 of New York and I'm happy to have escaped. So this is
10 home and I'm committed to seeing that this works.

11 And I'll tell you, in my private business
12 interactions, I travel throughout this country doing
13 chemical and fire investigations. And the first thing
14 that I will mention to my clients is we need to apply
15 science 101. And that means we need to understand what
16 the fundamental facts are that govern what it is we intend
17 to do, or if there's a court case, whether somebody's
18 inventing the science. Because all too often I find my
19 advisories come off as stand-up comedians when they invent
20 the science and then somebody like me catches them.

21 And so this is really where I'm at. I'll
22 give you a good example. I just came back from Texas.
23 Union Pacific is a \$14 billion company. And they thought
24 that they could get a bunch of people working at a customs
25 border crossing to cave in on an exposure. So I want to

1 relate to some fundamental issues here, because whether
2 we're dealing with a chemical release, whether we're
3 dealing with something that may go on at a gaseous
4 diffusion facility or potentially at the centrifuge
5 facility, we need to understand what's going on.

6 The night of the incident, Union Pacific
7 didn't take any measurements. So when I was called in, we
8 had a railcar with a certain chemical in it and half a
9 mile away, people with illnesses and symptoms consistent
10 with an exposure to something else. So what was my job?
11 Go to from what was in the railcar through all of the
12 underlying chemistry to get to where the doctors were, who
13 could say, yes, this is what got the exposed population of
14 people sick.

15 Well, anyway, last Wednesday that trial
16 was supposed to start. Thursday morning I got a call from
17 my client. And what my client said to me is thank you for
18 putting all of the pieces together. Union Pacific has
19 settled to my satisfaction. Okay?

20 The reason why I tell you this is because
21 I have a very good idea of what the underlying facts are
22 with regard to exposures in the gaseous diffusion setting
23 and I can tell you from working at the plant for a long
24 time, this is, in the nuclear business, one of the safest
25 plants that has existed in this country. Period. Okay?

1 I can think of -- I think they've
2 estimated huge numbers of billions of dollars to clean up
3 Oak Ridge. I know the problems that exist at Paducah
4 because from time to time as an active employee and as a
5 consultant I've been down there.

6 We don't have those problems. And one of
7 the reasons why we don't have that problem is because
8 historically we've listened to people in the community,
9 we've listened to the professional staff in the laboratory
10 and we had the trained men and women in the hourly work
11 force who knew what they were doing. And so I still do a
12 great deal of work, not only with the PACE union here, but
13 also with the International and soon, hopefully, in the
14 merger, with the Steelworkers.

15 The Steelworkers in Columbus can tell you
16 some of the work that I've done for them over at Buckeye
17 Steel. And so really what am I driving at? We need to
18 know what the facts are. A lot of people aren't
19 interested in communicating what the facts are. I earn my
20 living determining what the facts are and then
21 communicating that to my clients.

22 Now, one of the issues I want to bring up,
23 when I worked at the plant I attended a lot of ASTM
24 meetings. The American Society for Testing and Materials.
25 And one of the key issues that came up was transportation

1 of nuclear materials.

2 The specifications are so tight now on the
3 materials, the construction, about how you containerize
4 and package, it would be virtually impossible in a
5 derailment scenario for any contaminated material to get
6 out. So I can tell you up front, the science has been
7 done and done to my satisfaction, if that's worth
8 anything. That some of the issues that have been brought
9 up by people who don't understand the process, I can tell
10 you that those are not issues, those are non-issues.

11 When we met a year ago I know that a lot
12 of people said why can't we get a lot of information out
13 of NRC. And I got up and spoke much like I am now. After
14 the birth of the Department of Defense and the conversion
15 of the OSS to the CIA, this is all part of the National
16 Security Act of 1947. That's what brought in the issue of
17 classification. Classification of technologies,
18 classification of processes and so on.

19 And again, I can remember working for
20 years and years at the plant. Signs on walls in certain
21 areas, do not talk classified. When I got to Paducah,
22 there are certain projects that I worked on, I've been
23 told I have to go out in the hall now. Why? Because I no
24 longer have a security clearance.

25 The point being this, a lot of things are

1 determined by the need to know. And without a need to
2 know, as I've told others, you can do cartwheels, you can
3 stand on your head but there's a reason why that
4 information, that technology, that process has to be
5 protected. And that's the way it is.

6 I work on military projects the same way.
7 If I deal with the underlying chemistry or in some cases
8 the physics, that's okay. But as soon as we get into
9 something that's process oriented, I don't have that
10 little blue badge any more with the letter Q on it. So
11 that's also my cue to go outside.

12 But again, what I want to bring to the
13 issue here is objectivity. We need to identify what the
14 facts are and I'll do whatever I can to help the NRC out.
15 Again, so not only am I consultant for hire, but I'm also
16 a resident of this community. So I've got a vested
17 interest in that. And to me, that's what it's about. Is
18 we are people here.

19 When I do projects for people where we
20 want to make something work, a lot of times the client,
21 all they're interested in at the end of the day is when I
22 push the button does it do what it's supposed to do. If I
23 do my job right, if I provide the kind of input to my
24 client or if NRC's interested, that's what I'd like to see
25 in this operation.

1 So when we have a work force in place
2 doing a particular job, we've got confidence that whatever
3 it is we're doing, is going to work according to the plan.
4 Thanks for listening.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Dr. Manuta.

6 I believe that that's the last speaker
7 that we have. Did you have a --

8 MS. COLLEY: I just heard that Portsmouth
9 was the safest plant between Oak Ridge and Paducah. And
10 according to a 1985 GA report, the workers at the Piketon
11 site had the highest exposures of all the gaseous
12 diffusion plants. I'm appalled that he thinks this plant
13 was the safest one.

14 We did the highly enriched uranium from
15 1954 to 1991 and that's why these workers here got sick
16 faster than the other workers did. So there is a 1985 GA
17 report backing up what I'm saying and not what he has said
18 about the plant.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay, if anybody wants more
20 information on that, please see Vina.

21 I have to thank all of you for your useful
22 comments tonight, from a facilitator's point of view. And
23 also particularly for your courtesy tonight.

24 And I'm going to turn it over in a minute
25 to Jennifer Davis to just close this out. But it was

1 pointed out, there's a handout that we have back there
2 that says staff of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
3 for the public scoping meeting on USEC, Inc. And there's
4 an internet address on the bottom that is incorrect and
5 it's very easy to correct. If you go to the end of that
6 you're going to see a phrase LES facility. Well, I think
7 it should be USEC facility, okay?

8 So please correct that. Unless you want
9 to find out information about LES, too.

10 MR. BLEVINS: The web address in the
11 slides is correct, so you could also look in the slides.

12 MR. CAMERON: Oh, in the sides it's
13 correct, good.

14 MR. BLEVINS: In the slides it's correct.

15 MR. CAMERON: Beautiful. So operate off
16 that. And thank you again. And, Jennifer?

17 MS. DAVIS: I'm not going to take very
18 long. I just want to thank you one last time for taking
19 the time out of your busy schedules to come down here and
20 talk to us and I really do appreciate the polite attention
21 to the widely divergent viewpoints.

22 So we'll be back again in the summer, and
23 we look forward to hearing your comments and seeing your
24 comments and thank you all and good night.

25 (The meeting was concluded at 9:07 a.m.)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings
before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
in the matter of:

Name of Proceeding: American Centrifuge Plant

Public Scoping Meeting

Docket Number: n/a

Location: Piketon, Ohio

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken by me and, thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.

Gary Baldwin
Official Reporter
Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.

Gary Baldwin
Official Reporter
Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.

(202) 234-4433

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

NRC Public Meeting Statement

Hello,

My name is Charles Wiltshire and I am the full-time Triangle of Prevention Coordinator for PACE Local 3-689. I am a second-generation worker at the Piketon Enrichment facility. I have work there as a union member for over 32 years. My father first hired in the early 1950's

The Triangle of Prevention program is a union led Company supported safety program that works to prevent accidents and incidents before they happen.

In my 32 years of service I have seen great strides in the improvement of plant safety and the efforts put forth both by union and management as a team to ensure ~~that~~ workers and the public is protected. We may not always be on the same page on labor issues but we speak the same language when it comes to the safety of the worker and the public.

offed this year

My son I have hunted and harvested game on the DOE reservation. I would like to see future jobs opportunities for my children and grandchildren who will be finishing college about the time the centrifuge plant is due to go on line.

USEC has a proven track record for employee and public safety.

As a Taxpayer I fully support the construction of the new centrifuge plant at the Piketon site.

Charles Wiltshire

Mr. Beekman

Release January 18, 2005

Portsmouth/Piketon Residents for Environmental Safety and Security (PRESS) was formed to educate, organize and empower residents and workers affected by the Portsmouth Uranium Enrichment site, locate in Piketon, Ohio and to represent their interest in economic vitality, environmental quality, health, and justice. PRESS is a nonprofit organization 5013c. Members are from the community and workers that have been affected by the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion plant.

We watchdog the activities of the Piketon Plant. Members of PRESS participation in local meetings, which have help, get the plant to admit to environmental and worker exposure. Press's documents help exposed the deadly Plutonium on site that put the worker in harms way in which started the compensation bill EEOICPA act of 2000

PRESS was formed in the late 80's to represent the interest in economic vitality, environmental quality, health, and justice. PRESS is a nonprofit organization 5013c. Members are from the community and workers that have been affected by the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion plant. Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion plant has been operating under a policy of production priority, the safety of workers, and near by resident, and the environment have been relegated as secondary, leaving a legacy of uncertainty for working and living conditions. I am Vina K. Colley president of PRESS and Co-Chair of NATIONAL NUCLEAR WORKERS FOR JUSTICE (NNWJ) and a victim of past practices and I know first hand about the poor safety practices from the contractors working for the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense.

January 18, 2005

NRC

EIS scope

USEC's request for ACP plant license

Pursuant to the Federal register notice by NRC

The purpose of the National Environmental Policy Act (42usc4321etseq) is to promote efforts to prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate public health, as well as enrich the understanding of the workings of ecological systems and natural resources. NEPA requires the preparation of and EIS for all major federal actions having a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

The President's Council on Environmental Quality describes an EIS as an "action forcing device," whose purposes are to provide "full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts" and to "inform decision makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse

impacts or enhance the quality of the environment." (40 CFR 1502.1) These impacts and alternatives must be addressed before action is taken, "rather than justifying decisions already made." (40 CFR 1502.2g)

The scope of NRC's Environmental Impact Statement should be expanded to include the following issues not adequately covered in USEC's Environmental Report1) DOE wants to relax its site-wide cleanup standards on the presumption that the site will be dedicated to new nuclear production under the USEC agreement. Therefore the USEC project must be considered as having the impact of the relaxation of these standards, since with no ACP, the old standards would have to be honored for the sake of community reuse. NRC should examine the impact of ACP on site-wide cleanup standards.

2) If ACP proceeds, it will close the whole site off to alternate use because of required security restrictions. This will change or eliminate possibilities for cleanup and reuse of certain facilities outside of USEC's lease agreement, for example the old shops and warehouse facilities at the GDP site, public use of the perimeter road, or opening undeveloped parts of the site to public use.

3) In the section that describes the "no action alternative," USEC states that if the ACP is not built at Piketon, the site will be unaffected this is simply a lie and it undercuts USEC's credibility on every other issue. The whole projected DOE end-state for the site is based on new nuclear production--just look at the highway signs for ACP. By telling this lie, USEC avoids discussion of the benefits to the site and community from early project cancellation.

4) Whether ACP succeeds or fails, it will turn the rest of the site into a dumpsite by encouraging DOE to invite in waste from other sites. This has already started. In the last two years, DOE has transferred uranium waste in large quantities to Piketon from three other sites--Fernald, Oak Ridge and Paducah. These transfers would not happen without ACP, and that is the real impact of ACP because the project will likely fail, and all that transferred waste would be its legacy.

5) NRC must examine the relationship between DOE (a government agency) and USEC (a supposedly private company), a relationship that is unclear, unexamined, and untested. USEC makes constant reference to the privatization legislation and to "Congressional intent" as if it had nothing to do with creating that legislation--a circular argument. In its licensing process, NRC should therefore examine the entire DOE-USEC relationship and the full range of impacts that the relationship entails.

6. PRESS supports the need for a separate cultural resource assessment by NRC, with its own scoping process. That is required because DOE has never complied with the National Historic Preservation Act at the Piketon site, and the site has tremendous historic and prehistoric value that has never been studied.

7. Because USEC's future and ACP's future are both extremely uncertain, NRC must examine the impact of the project's failure at various future dates. For example, if the project proceeds through the next four years, with contamination of the existing building from the Lead Cascade, and the construction of two new buildings for ACP, and then USEC collapses after the next presidential election, where does that leave the community? DOE already allowed the contamination of those centrifuge buildings in 1985 by a "test run" of uranium, even after Congressional funding for the GCEP project was cut. NRC cannot allow the same thing to happen again.

We would like to thank you for this opportunity to comment and look forward to reviewing the report that will come next. Please send us what is published next so we have time to review for input.

Sincerely

Vina K Colley

3705 McDermott Pond Creek



McDermott, Ohio 45652

740-259-4688 740-353-2275 cell 740-357-8916

President of PRESS

Co Chair of NNWJ



Patricia A. Marida, Chair
36 West Gay Street Suite 314
Columbus, OH 43215
614-890-7865

1-18-05

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Scoping Meeting
Environmental Impacts of a Proposed Uranium Enrichment Centrifuge
Piketon, OH

I am the Chair of the Central Ohio Sierra Club. The Group has over 5,000 members in the Central Ohio, including members in Pike County.

I would like to ask that the deadline for comments on the scoping be extended. First, the information on the Environmental Report was removed from the web for security purposes and was only recently reinstated. Second, none of us who have been currently involved in this issue were notified of the public meeting on Nov. 9 where USEC's record of accidents and contamination releases was discussed. Third, some of the information that was discussed at that meeting has been classified as confidential for security reasons, so we do not have access to it. Fourth, we have had a great deal of difficulty viewing the rest of the material concerning the violations on the web. Information on Reportable Events that was supposed to be on the web could not be accessed by our computers. Fifth, questions that we asked at the public meeting Dec. 2 have not been answered. I gave a list of questions to Bill Murphie, and I have not as yet received a reply. So we respectfully request an extension of the comment deadline for at least 30 days beyond the current deadline of Feb. 1.

At this meeting I will comment briefly on a few subjects that we think should be addressed in developing an Environmental Impact Statement.

First, there is debate over whether this facility is needed. *The Carnegie Report: A Strategy for Nuclear Security* states that there are sufficient stocks of enriched uranium to fuel existing reactors for several years. Weapons are being disassembled that could provide a good deal of reactor fuel. The report states that production of even LEU could have a destabilizing effect on nuclear treaties and initiate a stepped-up arms race. The cost to the public coffers, the environment, and political stability mandates that there must be a pressing need for such a facility.

Second, the public must be intimately involved in the preparation of and comments on a Draft EIS. The public must agree upon the need for the facility. The NRC should actively incorporate and respond to public comments and questions throughout the process, and must give replies to questions on a timely or even immediate basis.

Third, it is critical that the proposed licensee, United States Enrichment Corporation, be financially viable. NRC must verify the actual and complete resources of this company. Given

their past history, how can we have any degree of certainty that they will remain viable as a for-profit entity? USEC must tell us what will happen if USEC declares bankruptcy. Will operations be able to continue? What agency would continue the operations? Will the public be asked to foot the bill? For past operations? For ongoing operations?

The public must have more answers to questions on performance review of past USEC operations. For instance, the *Nuclear Criticality Safety Non-Compliance* graph of the Environmental Report apparently deals only with releases or incidents that could cause a nuclear reaction or critical event. Therefore, dangerous non-critical releases and their sources are not addressed. I see what appear to be a number of gaps in the NRC evaluation of the data. We would like to have information on where the contamination came from and how it was addressed. Accidental releases and deliberate venting must be fully explained and evaluated. In the graph of *Contaminated Feed Cleanup Project Dose Trend*, an increase in worker exposure to UF6 as time went on was not an encouraging trend; and we would like to see an explanation for this.

Worker and public health must be addressed. Will workers be monitored by daily urine tests before and after work? Will such monitoring be done by an independent entity? Will accidental and deliberate releases be made immediately known to the public? At what level will a public alert be triggered? What mechanism will be utilized for notification? What training will be made available, and to what entities? Will drills be conducted by the personnel that have been trained?

Of course, as the Environmental Report states, continuing education of employees and closer monitoring by management CAN BE USED to help alleviate incidents. While obviously true, such a statement is too generic to be meaningful. Was anyone fired on account of incompetence? Were people given warnings? Will incident reports be written in the future, or will they be considered a security risk? Will the public have access to past and future incident reports? At what interval after they occur?

Alternative uses for the site must be developed and publicized. Will further contamination of the site make it less qualified for an alternative use?

Waste management must be addressed. Where will DU from the process go? Will it be left on the site? What plans are there for disposing of the DU that is generated?

Many questions are outside the scope of a 5-minute statement. Site contamination, water contamination and air releases, as well as use of water and electricity must be addressed.