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Perspective versus Plan/Proposal
Where did Community Reuse Organizations come from?

• Section 3161 of the Defense Authorization Act of 1993 initiated the creation of “Community Reuse Organizations” across the US in response to the negative social and economic impacts of workforce restructuring.

• DOE made a commitment to provide financial assistance for economic development and site reuse activities developed by the affected communities.

• 15 CROs were formed across the US.
SRSCRO Purpose

• Promoting the common economic interests and benefits of the residents, businesses and industries and to stabilize the economy with balanced growth throughout the service area

• Obtaining maximum utilization of other physical and human resources at SRS and other regional facilities and institutions through existing and new programs

• Helping to expand existing businesses and industries

• Assisting local economic development entities in recruiting new companies to locate in the service area, while protecting the existing quality of life in the service area and neighboring areas through economic growth and creation of job opportunities
A Regional Focus

• Board = 22 members (11 from each state)
• Five Counties, Two States
• Designated by DOE-SR as the CRO for SRS
• Private Non-Profit 501 (c) 3
President’s Blue Ribbon Commission

- **Recommendation #1** - A new, consent-based approach to siting future nuclear waste management facilities.
- **Recommendation #2** - A new organization dedicated solely to implementing the waste management program and empowered with the authority and resources to succeed.
- **Recommendation #3** – Access to the waste fees or using the waste fees for their intended purpose
- **Recommendation #4** - Prompt efforts to develop one or more consolidated storage facilities. (footnote - As used in this report, the term “disposal” is understood to mean permanent disposal; the term “storage” is understood to mean storage for an interim period prior to disposal or other disposition.)
DOE Strategy

The Department recognizes that the BRC Report represents "a critical step toward finding a sustainable approach to disposing used nuclear fuel and nuclear waste".

The Department acknowledges that "the specifics of a new strategy for managing our nation's used nuclear fuel will need to be addressed in partnership with Congress".

The Department "will work in parallel to begin implementing the new strategy" by taking sensible steps toward the implementation of near-term recommendations.
DOE Response to BRC

- Strategy was due to Congress in September but was not issued until Jan. 11, 2013
- Endorsed key principles in the BRC report
- Central focus on “phased, adaptive, and consent-based approach to siting…”
- Endorses a pilot interim storage facility (stranded fuel)
- Next, a larger, full-scale storage facility
- Development of geologic disposal capability
- Within 10 years (“with appropriate authorizations from Congress”):
  - Pilot interim storage facility by 2021
  - Larger storage facility by 2025 sufficient to reduce government liability
  - ”Make demonstrable progress” on a repository by 2048
Unique Nuclear Region

**SCANA (VC Summer):**
- 1 Operating Unit
- 2 AP 1000 Units (2012-2019)
- Shaw Construction

**Southern Co. (Vogtle):**
- 2 Operating Units
- 2 AP 1000 Units (2012-2019)
- Shaw Construction

**SRS:**
- Shaw/Areva MOX
- Savannah River Nuclear Solutions
- Savannah River Remediation
- Parsons
- Department of Energy
- NNSA
The Questions

Should a five-county region surrounding the Department of Energy’s Savannah River Site ("SRS") use its assets to help provide solutions to managing the nation’s nuclear fuel cycle?

If so, what are the terms and conditions under which we the community would agree to participate?
Community Considerations

• Do not want to consider HOSTING ONLY a storage facility.

• Consolidated storage by itself brings limited economic benefits and is construed by many as a negative image factor for the region.

• Any community role must include job-creating activities, including Research & Development and manufacturing associated with managing the nuclear fuel cycle.

• It must include legally binding commitments to a final disposition plan and provide opportunities for ultimate disposition of nuclear materials already stored at SRS.
Community Decision

• Additional research is required before a community consensus can be pursued, including determining how this initiative would impact other economic development in the region.

• Public/private partnerships would be considered along with strong multi-jurisdictional support if an initiative advances.
Study Background

- Washington, D.C. firm Dickstein Shapiro retained in 2012 to conduct independent study with respect to issues related to managing the fuel cycle.

- Study was commissioned by SRS Community Reuse Organization (SRSCRO) representing a five-county region in South Carolina and Georgia.

- Study was directed by Tim Frazier, former senior DOE nuclear official and Designated Federal Officer for President’s Blue Ribbon Commission on America’s Nuclear Future.
The Study

This is only a study to inform and provide needed information – no decisions have been made to pursue anything.
Fuel Cycle Study Scope of Work

• Technical Plan
  • Storage
  • Research & Development ("R&D")
  • Manufacturing
  • Training
  • Reprocessing

• Community Support & Consensus

• State and Local Government Support

• Estimate Economic Opportunities and Identify Potential Risks

• Develop a Comprehensive list of Necessary Incentives and Conditions

• Develop a Comprehensive Plan for Legislative Actions
Key Conclusions

• Community understanding and support are vital to the success of any effort to solve this protracted national problem.
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Key Conclusions

• Community understanding and support are vital to the success of any effort to develop needed fuel cycle facilities.

• Community involvement should objectively explore issues, address risks – both real and perceived – and rely on factual information that is trustworthy.

• The Community needs to fully evaluate and understand any potential for new skilled jobs and incremental economic impacts that can accompany fuel cycle activities.

• The Region has many assets that can be marshaled to facilitate a national solution, including H Canyon at SRS which is unique among U.S. nuclear facilities.

• If the local community determines the risk/reward ratio is acceptable, appropriate state and Federal entities and the public at-large must understand the basis for any community consensus on this issue.
Managing the Fuel Cycle
Modified Consensus Model

**Step 1:** Introduce and clarify the issue

**Step 2:** Explore the issue and look for ideas

**Step 3:** Discuss, clarify and amend your proposal

**Step 4:** Implementation
Consensus is not

• A unanimous vote
• A majority vote
• Everyone 100% satisfied
Consensus is ... 

Consensus is finding an acceptable proposal that all members can support.
“Tiers” of Stakeholders

**Tier I**
- Decision makers

**Tier II**
- Stakeholders with economic or political impact

**Tier III**
- Knowledge-producers
- Other affected stakeholders
Next Steps

The SRSCRO Board of Directors will consider its role in developing a comprehensive plan aimed at building a community consensus about hosting fuel cycle-related facilities.
The SRS Community Reuse Organization is serving as a facilitator for public dialog regarding solutions to Nation’s nuclear fuel cycle.

We believe it is imperative that a comprehensive national solution is identified and a consent base approach is pursued, which begins with the local communities.

SRSCRO Role

- Public Meetings
- Education and Information
- Communication with Local Elected Officials
- Communication with State Legislators, Governors, and Regulators
- Communication with Federal Congressional Delegation
- Communication with DOE and The White House
- Coordination with regional groups and Stakeholders
- Coordination with DOE communities nationwide
- Working with nuclear industry, as appropriate